



NATIONAL POLICY BOARD FOR EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION
Meeting Minutes
May 10, 2011
CCSSO Multi-Media Room
1:00-4:00

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS: Started 1:05 pm
Gene Wilhoit, chairperson, called the meeting to order.

Present were: Gene Wilhoit (CCSSO), Janice Poda (CCSSO), Mary Harrill-McClellan (AACTE), MaryAnn Jobe (AASA), Judy Zimny (ASCD), Gail Connelly (NAESP), Rich Barbacane (NAESP), Dick Flanary (NASSP), Margie Crutchfield (NCATE), James Berry (NCPEA), Michelle Young (UCEA), Hanne MaWhinney (UCEA), Terry Orr (UCEA), Joe Aguerrebere (NBPTS), Joe Murphy (Vanderbilt University), Honor Fede (NPBEA): Gayle Owens, (ASCD), Autumn Toom (UCEA), Terri Orr (UCEA), Hanne MaWhinney (UCEA), Andrea Rore (UCEA), Mary Canole (CCSSO).

II. REVIEW OF THE AGENDA.

Chairperson Wilhoit reviewed the agenda and asked 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. BUILDING PROFESSIONAL CAREER PATHWAYS FOR LEADERS:
CONTINUUM OF SUPPORT OPTIONS

Gene Wilhoit: With all of the research that has come out in the past two years about the profession, the NPBEA is now in a good place as a collective group to make some statement what we think it is going to take to build the educational leadership profession. With this kind of background and framework, we can put out reports that will build a framework for future direction and will anchor the conversation. Of course, all of us around the table have different backgrounds and perspectives and from the richness of the work that is being done by our groups we could use this to fill in various pieces of this

framework and fulfill what we would need to provide to the field and policy-makers, and practitioners to assist them in their work. So the idea is that we would have a general conversation and agreement on the part of this group about creating this framework for the profession that would serve as this contextual piece and then second, we would begin some other serious work that builds off of preparation programs and the information that we have gotten over the past year.

I am going to describe what I think this piece might look like and invite you to critique it and to add to it. Michelle and I have had conversations about our willingness to take a stab at starting the development of this piece that would cause a lot of interaction and development on the part of all of our groups before it is complete.

So I will give you an idea of what were thinking about developing a framework that will outline a professional career pathway for leaders – a continuum of support. The idea is that this is a systems issues and that no one single solution will work to the dilemma we all face in providing outstanding leaders in all school districts and schools. In creating a framework, we are going to have to do this in a comprehensive way as opposed to haphazard or disconnected types of efforts on each of our parts. So part of our goal is to try to pull of our work together. I would like to propose as a beginning point to this framework and sort of an outline of what this might look like:

Professional Career Pathways Framework:

1. Lead this piece with a statement about the condition that we (the profession) find ourselves in - that is, how is the world different today than it has been historically. I think that is important because it's not that we had great leaders and suddenly we did a poor job of preparing them or that people in those schools/districts are more inferior to school/district leaders in the past. What we propose in this piece is to say that we are engaged in a transformation environment in this society led by major drivers such as globalization, technology, and information that is causing us to redefine the job that we have in front of us and redefine the expectations for the students that we are charged to serve. That is the case that should lead this paper. Followed by a very direct statement about the critical role of leaders in bringing about the improvements that are necessary. The conversation primarily has been around the critical role of teachers and their influence on the school and children. While a good teacher can have an impact on student learning in an isolated classroom within a school, I think we have sold ourselves short in terms of the critical role of leaders in bringing about whole school and district reform. We know that large groups of leaders together can change a state. Teachers can't do that.
2. This is a good case to make because it is the most efficient investment for people to make in education today. The critical mass of individuals to be reached is one that can be taken on and the impact of bringing this change to be.
3. We also propose to make the statement that this cannot be done by chance and it's going to take some systematic thinking at the district, school, and state level. It's important for all of us to think about these systems changes. This leads us to thinking about a continuum of support. What we mean by that is that we really need to dig

deeply into the elements that are going to be necessary in a continuum support system that will bring about the kinds of change that we are talking about and that includes:

Continuum of Support:

1. **Recruitment versus chance in the profession.** This would imply setting very high standards for entry into programs. Outreach and selection of those individuals and close attention of who gets into the profession – even into preparation programs.
2. **High quality preparation programs.** Look at the characteristics of those programs – what makes them different from other programs and some sort of definition of what the elements of those programs would be in enough detail that the preparation programs would have a good sense of what would be required for their re-definition or improvement or support of the stronger programs that do exist. Central to that is the redefinition of the relationship between districts, schools, and universities and the partnership of delivering the program which leads to a redefinition of what effective preparation programs are bringing to the table.
3. **Proficiency based entry into the profession.** This means the kinds of standards that have meaning and the interpretation of those standards for entry into the profession would require individuals to show proficiency in real situations in schools and school districts around the job requirements and professional responsibilities. This would imply more than a simple test – it would require a portfolio and actual demonstration of competencies to be fleshed out.
4. **Conditions in school environments that are needed for success.** As opposed to putting highly effective people in dysfunctional environments without support. We have had interesting conversations around this table already about the role of district and schools in this environment because there is a lot of literature that says we need from a top-down model and centralized to more autonomy with greater responsibility. I think that raises the question about what is the new role of the district in all of this and what should the role of the state be in putting the systems in place to support this kind of structure.

The other two pieces of this that I see as important is:

- Role clarifications of different leadership functions in states. We were just talking about the state of Connecticut that has a generic requirement for leadership and we are not going in that direction with the ELCC accreditation standards. We have divided those into building level and district level leadership standards. The NPBEA ought to take a stand on that.
- Another issue that we should look at is the continuum of growth for a leader throughout their career. That raises a number of issues including the national leadership standards or the standards of highest practices (NBPTS) serving as the ultimate kind of definition and role that a person can play. What are the steps that we (NPBEA) could help people walk through move in a professional leadership career that would lead to that kind of professionalism - from novice and mastery. We need to think about what are the domains of practice that are being put out and how do we mirror those in the kinds of

qualifications and experiences we have to offer people. This leads us into thinking about what are the professional development responsibilities of the system.

So that is the design we would like to propose for you all to consider. I would suggest the following questions to think about: Are we not thinking about some things in this design that we should take into consideration and are there some things that should be raised or amplified in this framework.

Gail Connelly: I commend what has been said – it is music to my ears – I can see how it will amplify our work on behalf of principals and bring new levels of focus especially the recruitment piece. We, as an organization, seem to focus well on in-service and how you fill those gaps and how you support principals to be successful once they are in practice. However, this notion of how you recruit specifically for the kinds of qualities or capacities that enable a principal to be effective – I think is a viable new approach and opens a whole new body of interest that can help build the case for the kinds of professional development that can not only close those gaps but invest at the very beginning so that those gaps are not so large. I'm delighted and eager to work with you and think about this continuum approach thinking about where schools leaders fit into that larger system. I really like the context rule part too, thinking about how leaders operate within a school context and district context.

Dick Flanary: I also am impressed with this framework design. Too often the various segments that you addressed become too bifurcated and we really need to look at them as a continuum. We can't continue to look at them as separate, stand-alone pieces because they are not. They are connected at both ends of the spectrum. Our organization has said for too long that you can't talk about high school reform without looking at middle school reform – it's connected. So I applaud the architecture because it takes a step in looking at this as a continuum in it's totality.

Michelle Young: I think it also promotes collaboration among members of the policy board when we have been searching for ways to really have something that enables our different interests to coalesce – I think this is an excellent plan for doing this because we all represent that continuum around this table.

Gene Wilhoit: That is an excellent point. We all have a part and voice in this continuum - the voice of all of us in this will have a greater impact to others than any one association could make – as collective voice – the NPBEA - we are much more powerful.

Mary Harrill McClellan: Within the preparation piece, I hope there is a stronger emphasis on the clinical preparation – I think we know there are many pathways into the principalship and we need to see more demonstration of their ability as a leader before they get into the leadership position regardless of the program they are in.

JimBerry I was thinking that we should start collecting state data on what I call - Hire to Retire systems. For instance, in Michigan we have a continuum model in place that has some enhancements and endorsements that a leader has to do in order to continue. We should do some research and look at what states are doing in this area as far as a continuum model.

Michelle Young: We have a lot of research already through the Wallace foundation and NCPEA/UCEA taskforce. I think we can get started in drafting this out and then as a board we can look at the gaps which we might need more research.

Gene Wilhoit: Yes, I think we can start drafting this out and pull all that has been developed over the past few years so it is not initially the creation of new research but existing research from what we know now. By doing this exercise we will know more clearly what we don't know.

Jim Berry: I know I've said it before, but I really believe in the synergy of this group, just by sending something out from this group that would have the endorsement of all of the professional organizations here is powerful. We don't recognize our power.

Mary Ann Jobe: From AASA's perspective, most of the states right now don't have superintendent certification programs in place where superintendents will gain the knowledge that they need. We need to look at the pipeline and not see leadership as an ends to a mean because there is growth in leadership and we need to fill the pipeline and we need to fill the next leadership – having principals step up into the superintendent role. Those jobs are very different jobs.

Margie Crutchfield: I want to applaud your effort. I think it is good to look at a continuum, it has the potential to really have an impact and set the research agenda and I assume you will think about this as not a report that will sit on the shelf but will be a strong message to folks about where we need to move as a profession and our commitment to do what we will do.

Gene Wilhoit: It seems to me that we should think about in this report some charge to various responsible parties so that a person could take this back to the state level and begin to coalesce their leadership organizations in some sort of action that would move the agenda forward. I think we could use this as a blueprint for the states to show them how this is a strategic advantage for them to think about using.

Hanne MaWhinney: This could be a powerful tool – I would recommend that we need to think about how technology can be utilized more effectively in this systems design. Our culture is changing rapidly and we need to learn more about making the connections using the technology resources that are out there such as I-phones, etc and look at such systems collection like a portfolio that follows a leader through-out their career it would be a powerful anchor. There are some good processes out there now for managing these processes that are cost effective. Everything should rest on high levels of student achievement – sacred ground

Joe Aguerreberre: We should look at a cost comparison between the fragmented systems that are out there now and the savings that this new framework might save a district or state. Ideally you would like to make the case to policy folks that what it costs in this fragmented way versus a systematic approach that is comprehensive. We need to make the case that this is a better system/

Michelle Young: The Wallace foundation has funded a finance project to look at the cost of preparing leaders through district collaborations with universities. But that does not looking at it

statewide. You are right if it is done in a more collaborative way and investing in individuals who are going to get the most. Not sure if we have a lot of research in this way. It would be an interesting thing to add but we don't have robust research in this area.

Jim Berry: We need to look at the process for getting this out to the public. We need a thoughtful roll-out plan. People in higher ed look at the ELCC standards with anticipation and we don't realize how much weight the ELCC standards have on leadership preparation. How we present this work will be important – newspaper headlines?

MOTION: Gail Connelly proposed and Jim Berry seconded a motion to approve the design of a Professional Career Leadership Progression Framework Paper. The motion was approved unanimously.

V. EFFECTIVE PREPARATION MATTERS FOR LEADERSHIP EXCELLENCE

Michelle Young: One of the things that Gene and I talked about in the recruitment selection piece up to the redefinition of leadership preparation is how we might leverage what has already been done to make a difference. While we have a number of things already in place that may affect this, what we need to do is to think about things more broadly in terms of the larger objective where we can strongly impact leadership preparation. We have the ELCC standards now but they are not national standards – only some states have adopted them. What we really want to see is full national universal adoption of the ELCC standards related to leadership preparation. Another thing that we talked about is how we have a robust knowledge base around preparation teacher matters so what we need national endorsed preparation program feature standards. We also have NCATE but it not the only accreditation system. So if we really want to move forward in each of these areas then we need to be really pushing a seamless universal acceptance of these three features. We know that the ISLLC and ELCC standards have had a strong impact on the profession. So far 44 of the 50 states have adopted or adapted the ISLLC and ELCC standards as their states standards. There is much more confidence in these standards but the way we focus on the standards is too narrow because what we want is for all states to adopt the ISLLC and ELCC standards. We want to push for universal adoption of these standards. We should also push for a universal common licensure exam with rigorous test scores – we have the SLLA exam that aligns to the ISLLC and ELCC standards if we were to add an element that had something to do with practice piece – maybe ETS could be a partner with the NPBEA so we could compare test scores across the states and so that all states had a common framework for the licensure exam. Research demonstrates that the program features standards are just as important as content standards in improving preparation and if we combined them with the ELCC and ISLLC standards we would have a powerful piece for preparation of leaders. There is strong body of evidence that supports these features including recruitment and selection based on leadership potential, the idea of curriculum being integrated with field work being

standards-based and focused on instruction for improvement, having knowledge and high quality faculty and quality internships, use of adult learning theories and active learning strategies, cohort structures and other supports, assessments of candidates and program for improvement, and collaborative relationships with school districts. Most of the work that Terry Orr has been done in this area has contributed quite a bit to this growing body of knowledge as well as a number of taskforces. So I think that if we were to see the ELCC and program feature standards nationally accepted I believe that we would see the improvement of leadership preparation. But this is not the whole picture because national accreditation also matters. NCATE is an effective accrediting body and it uses the ELCC standards. This is incredibly important because over half of the 500 educational leadership programs have revised their programs to align to the ELCC standards and have gone through the ELCC process. So we know that NCATE can have a substantial impact on our field so we should put our support behind NCATE and try to leverage it as a nationally accepted norm. We need to support and leverage it as norm for the field. We should make sure that all programs whether they are located in a university or not are engaged in the same accreditation process. We should push for a rigorous review process. Alternative programs should go through the same rigorous accreditation review process.

So the policy brief that we looked at last time noted that model leadership preparation policy agenda would include: preparation content standards, national licensure assessments, leadership preparation program feature standards, national system of accreditation, national system of program evaluation to include assessment of features, standard knowledge of graduate practice, and consideration of graduate placement data. One of the key elements of an effective leadership preparation program is whether the program's graduates get a job and what they do once they get the job. We need to pay attention to placement data especially those programs that produce large numbers of graduates.

Systematic program evaluation: what you want to have in place if we are putting together a national model is to have common program evaluation components across the nation so you can compare features across states and nationally based on the types of programs. You can differentiate and measure the impact that of preparation on candidates and graduates. It also helps to build knowledge on effective preparation for the field and program improvement supports. What we currently have in place are a set of SLPPS suites surveys that are valid and provide reliable measurement of program effectiveness for a number of integrated survey. It is important is that it aligns to the program feature standards. There are questions that tie to the features we want in programs. There is also the graduate edition – so it measures what graduates initially learn and compares it to what they do in the field. Primarily it is about knowledge that they can then use as a practicing principal. Teachers and supervisor editions also provide a 360 evaluation – these are all tied back to the program feature standards – so we can understand that the preparation is having on the practice. Also under development is an educational doctoral

edition. This is the theory of action behind the surveys – evaluation pathway for preparation programs. It can also give you a sense of how the program impacted the building level position, their career. What SLPPS evaluations reveals see slide. This can be a helpful to preparation programs. We have this available as an interactive. Four different programs similar and different delivery and SLPPS ratings. Then they could impact and make some changes. Used results and repeated the evaluations

Summary – If this body were to approve and endorse these SLPPS it would be a powerful addition to the ELCC standards and program feature standards. We could also see the impact of the preparation program. We also have it available in an interactive format. We feel this is a significant and could make a positive impact on educational leadership preparation and outcomes.

If we think about moving the leadership preparation piece of the continuum, I would propose that we need to think about:

1. Pushing for universal, national acceptance of Leadership Preparation Content Standards (ELCC)
2. Pushing for universal, national acceptance of a Leadership Licensure Exam (SLLA)
3. Adopt universal leadership preparation program feature standards
4. Support national system of accreditation (NCATE)
5. Adopt national system of common evaluation for preparation programs.

One question that we discuss is how would you actually test out whether preparation programs actually had these features and to what degree. In response, UCEA has been building a set of rubrics around program features. It is almost complete.

Gene Wilhoit: Do we think that these five components would be something that we are willing to support? It sounds like a lot has already been done but what more needs to be done?

Michelle Young – If the group felt like we could endorse these things than all is in place and Terri and Andrea can continue to work with the national center on evaluation in weaving all of these components into a cohesive whole.

Gene Wilhoit: I think what we need to do is to step back from those a bit and build a general case for framing the system together that includes these components and presenting them in fairly straight order and direct way so that we can present them to our organizations in a way that could get a sense of whether we are ready to march ahead together on this. Right? It seems we want to

have the summative work done first and then present it at our next meeting. We can then give it to our respective boards.

Michelle Young: What format would work best for you?

Gail Connelly: I think for me I would like to know how this fit with this continuum and if the continuum begins with recruitment of candidates who have the capacity then either the recruitment stems from the preparation or the recruitment has implications for the preparation process. We need to see more about the stages of the continuum and what constitutes the capacity of the candidates, what would lead one candidate to be more likely to succeed as opposed to another candidate. So at the beginning do we start with the candidate determining which program to enter because that program may have the capacities they need or do we start with recruitment – the interrelationship between these is not clear, I still see them as discrete bodies of action and I know that we want to integrate them. The interrelationship in terms of the continuum really needs to be fleshed out.

Michelle Young: The program feature standards have two points on this that are important – first, it talks about district relationships with universities and second recruitment of individuals who have leadership qualities. I also relate this to the ELCC standards. I can see how we might need to develop the thread in relationship to the continuum process. Gene: Do we have more knowledge in this area that we can pull out and use it as an exemplar of the kinds of work that need to be done in the continuum for preparation. But in order to do that we need to think about are these all the domains that we need to think about across the continuum and if not do we need to supplement it. For example in a state if we are going to accredit a program we should probably think about the accreditation for the ultimate process that leader are their other steps we want to put into a professional career for which an accreditation system might be necessary. For instance, licensure assessment – we can also outline the components and structure of that assessment should be similar to other assessments that are given throughout one’s professional career. It seems that as we develop the continuum we can also talk about the application of the domains across that continuum and we might have something that would fit together. We can see the correlation between pieces of the continuum. It might culminate in saying yes we can endorse.

Mary Ann Jobe: I would like to add an additional item – can you help me as a district to develop teacher and principal evaluation according to these ISLLC and ELCC standards? I don’t know how many are using the ISLLC standards that are using in their evaluation systems but it is something to think about. So many districts are calling for principal evaluation. How many districts using ISLLC exam in their principal evaluation – only a handful.

Dick Flanary: Terry, I am curious about the program feature standards – how many universities are engaged with using these program features? Right now there are a lot of forums and conversations around this. If the USDOE adopted these standards or state policy makers we

could see some powerful state levers around licensure and eligibility for candidacy. If we saw this as a beginning, this might drive change at the institutional level and would assist states that are going to develop ISLLC standards or are beginning to build their professional systems. UCEA has roughly 50 programs in this system. 16 states are in the SREB – these both use the quality feature standards.

Margie Crutchfield: Transition to CAEP. We will be looking more closely at data collection. One of them is placement rates and recruitment rates. We will be looking at collecting this retention and placement rates in an annual report. We also have some state longitudinal collection systems are being built now and can be populated in a regular way. That is part of what are looking at – a platform that is usable. The other thing that we are going to be looking is the national platform that is more dynamic and can be populated on a regular basis without being too labor intensive. This will build that lifecycle for how we can connect that to a wide variety of uses and will provide versatility in comparing outcomes across institutions. We might think about giving institutions an incentive for completing the program features database and connect it to with the NCATE annual report. Make it easier for the institution.

Joe Aguerreberre: I can buy into this but I think we need to be sensitive about the language of the five bullets and include more words that reflect a common perspective. We need to expect resistance and push back for local control when we talk about a “national adoption”. Gene did a masterful job with the Common Core standards – In talking about this we might want to center this on the word “common” or “similar” We need states to understand that we are all in this together and convince them that a comprehensive systems approach makes more sense. I still get knee jerk reactions to the word “National”. We need to change the language – there is going to have to be a sales job for getting states to buy into a comprehensive systems approach versus a piece meal approach.

Jim Berry: Universities are pre-service, we don’t have enough on organized fashion – real opportunity map out direction on what we need to do. Michelle: we don’t have enough research on professional development. What we are missing is the piece that goes beyond the credential. We need better articulation for what should be expected in the continuum after a person has completed the credential – then what. This articulation could help get people to buy into the logic map with supports. Then disseminate to the members for them to buy into. We need to ground the vision with a logic map that articulates to constituents the pieces. We need to articulate an overall vision that is different.

Dick Flanary: I want to speak to Joe’s comment about my membership. When you mention to principals the word standards they cringe on the word “standard”. While language does matter, the reality is that there is a huge disconnect between what a university does with the ELCC

standards and what schools and districts look for in a candidate. The ELCC standards mean a lot to university people who are trying to get NCATE accredited but I am not sure that it means anything to anyone else in the schools or districts. No one else cares – when I talk to district personnel directors and ask if they look at those institutions that have passed ELCC in selecting individuals for leadership positions they look at me like I’m crazy. I really wonder if what we do impacts decisions that principals and districts make in hiring quality leaders? What we need to do here and I am fully supportive of this is to influence the conversations of people in the field as well and not just talk to each other and tell ourselves we have done good.

Gail Connelly: If we can back up the continuum to speak to what the implications for this drawing upon this body of knowledge to say this is the criteria you should be looking for when you are seeking those candidates then it becomes pretty powerful. Getting to the HR personnel and the criteria they use to make hiring decisions.

Terry Orr: The race to the top is going to be able to publish a variety of data that can be used in HR decision making. This is very timely and opens up the conversation and can help people in the field understand the ISLLC and ELCC standards as a continuum of standards. Program quality will be based on data.

Gene Wilhoit: Let me summarize the motion. I think that what we are saying is that what Michelle proposes is not a bad idea but whatever we do here ought to be consistent with the continuum as a whole and this ought to be the exemplar for the work that would be done in the other areas of the continuum and would be developed with the mindset of the implications of the preparation design on the rest of the continuum model. Is that what we are getting at? Also we need to keep a keen eye on language and also keep a mindset on the impact of the role-out for the consumers of our work – institutions, schools, and districts.

MOTION: A motion was made by Gail Connelly and seconded by Jim Berry t to accept this action. The motion was passed unanimously.

VI. DISSEMINATION OF InTASC AND TEACHER LEADER MODEL STANDARDS

Janice Poda: InTASC standards have now been updated and are getting considerable attention in the states - 33 states are out there and are working to implement these standards. Originally these standards were published in 1992. The old standards can look at teams of teachers and differentiated roles. There are still ten standards and should look at teams of teacher and we have

two content standards to facilitate the knowledge acquisition. There are also added a section on leadership. We invite you to look at the alignment of these standards in the back of the book. The last thing we have are the new publication on the Teacher Leader Standards. These outline what teacher leaders should know and be able to do. We want teachers to see themselves as responsible leaders for their own work. Districts and schools are expected to deliver high levels of learning and there is a growing body of districts that are beginning to delineate roles and responsibilities for teachers to be leaders. We are seeing a new recognition of the teacher leaders.

Hanne MaWhinney: these are very powerful that you have aligned between ISLLC and these teacher leader standards. What we found the leadership functions was embedded in the relationships with the principals. This is an example of the continuum in place. I see great potential here to different roles with faculty so that accountability is not place on only one individual within a school. However it takes a self assured principal who can take this and implement a team concept within a team. I wonder if society hasn't created the leadership position to be undoable. How can we make the "leadership team concept" to be less threatening. About profession of teacher leader – school leaders need to realize that these standards are for those teachers who want to stay in their field. They don't intend to go into the principalship. It does have impact on differentiating roles and relationships within schools.

Gene Wilhoit: I think many principals would be in favor of redesigning those roles in ways that allows them to be successful.

Gail Connelly: As a point of clarification, Gene, you are not saying that these teacher leader standards are one of the career pathways for school leadership but that this is really about the profession of teacher leadership. I think this is a very valid and an important body of work that I would love to share with our members. It has an important impact on differentiated on roles within a school.

Jim Berry: We have a large number of programs that have candidates that never plan to become school leaders. These standards could address this new role. We could see states developing a new certification role for these people - Kansas is developing a separate certification as is Ohio.

VII. TEN YEAR SUMMARY - WALLACE GRANT PROJECTS ON LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT

Gene Wilhoit: Wallace has geared down. It is important to look at what we can do to step into the void. It is important for us to think about the solid work that they have done over the past ten years. We can build from these resources.

Joe Murphy: Let me give you a history of where we have been over the past ten years in educational leadership. If you look at the leadership framework slide – the profession has spent an enormous effort on looking at how school leadership drives student success. If you want to get success we know that experience is a precursor to success – look at the background issues. The context matters extremely well where as in district and states it doesn't matter. They have tremendous power to shape what happens in the school.

The research shows that in leadership behaviors – principals don't impact students directly – they touch the things that touch kids. They also touch the academic program and the culture and environment of the school. There are about six or seven things that predict student success. So how do we get principals to spend their time on the six or seven things that predict this success? This is where we have been.

For 100 years we were on a path where management, organization, politics and finance was an absolute then in the late 90s we saw a huge fork came and we had a choice to re-center the profession around learning and teaching. The profession overall made the decision to re-centered the profession. That is the struggle. The standards reposition the professional so that learning and teaching is at the heart of the profession. That is the background story. Given that so what?

What do you do about it? How do you take the knowledge base and then build the standards that drive the profession down this pathway.

Slide on Career Line – 12 leverage points. So here's these standards that can power the profession into a new direction. This slide lays out the 12 leverage points that we need to influence so that we can drive the profession. For instance, we have the ETS licensure exam and a system that we can use to leverage influence. The second leverage point is accreditation - Dick and Jim Cibulka remember what we went through after we fought the battle on accreditation. In the preparation leverage – UCEA has really turned the profession over with the research on what it takes to improve the preparation. The NCATE accreditation and ELCC standards has been tremendously powerful in making a difference. Others leverage points have gotten less attention by the profession and they need considerably more: Induction, Professional Development, Relicensure, Mentoring. The point for NPBEA to consider – we need to get a critical mass of these – none of these will do anything on their own. There are two that need to be in the package or we will fail – have to get control of preparation programs and those who go into the profession. You want to get great people on the bus to start with and the second leverage point you need to get control of is principal evaluation. It makes no sense for a superintendent to talk to principals about learning-centered leadership and instructional leadership but then hold them to other accountability measures. The NPBEA is in a unique position to change this situation and have some leverage as a collective support to make a difference in our profession.

Joe Murphy's asks the Board to consider the following actions:

- A. The Board is uniquely positioned to aggressively support the research base in the ISLLC standards – this is the holy grail of where we need to be about. Professions have a common core of what is valued and they throw down what is important for the profession. NPBEA can be powerful in influencing that for the profession.
- B. The NPBEA can act to influence and exercise quality preparation programs statement
- C. The NPBEA can look at getting support for looking at the impact of the ISLLC standards on these various leverage points. Right now there is little research to show the impact of the standards on anything. NPBEA is in a great position to begin to think through the impact of the ISLLC standards on these various leverage points.

Gene Wilhoit: You have laid out before you the elements of a continuum system, take that as part of our continuum conversation. We agreed that we would come forward with a agreed upon position of the professional design for leadership continuum – many of the elements we have spoken about could be found on your leverage point slides. This is helpful to our consideration and folding this into our continuum plan. We should continue to talk with you about being part of the review process. This also reinforces our need for good evaluation and also we need to dive into a strong prototype for what a high quality preparation program looks like.

Michelle Young: As a result of the consistency of our conversations – in particular we see the ISLLC as the core with something before. We talked about using the ISLLC standards as a core and universally adopted while allowing folks to have add-ons. If you had a national certification exam that was based on ISLLC and ELCC you could look across states and transferability across states. We don't have right now and as a profession we need to have complete portability of licensure across states. It works for other professions – unfortunately right now, pension plans are driving licensure.

Joe Murphy: Every state is doing what ever they want. Thinking about this of leaders – chart role of federal government play and reauthorization. Role of principals is stressed – should add this as a lever. Federal resources to build the system. Two issues – policy leverage that influences any of the other leverage points. What they can do – resources. Second issue the federal govt providing resources linking the standards to professional development. Real incentives to get principals to go to low income districts. Resources have to align to those resource points.

Joe Aguerreberre: I think there are few things we should add – the role of government in reauthorization in setting the role of principals – this might be another leverage point that could address some of these things. We might want to add that as a leverage point – they might have resources that can build the profession.

Joe Murphy: That is a good point. One is what is the policy role for the feds. The second issue the federal government's role in providing resources and linking them to influence the other leverage points..

Jim Berry: We have a paradigm shift – we are seeing a real change, now we have accepted the ISLLC standards as the common accepted standard for driving the profession. My colleagues use to gripe about the ISLLC standards as a new, strange paradigm but I don't hear that now. A profession has to throw down on what is valued. They are accepted and they kind of have to sell themselves. The standards have provided that platform. We have now a real foundation for setting core acceptable performance for our profession. I think we are now ready to take the next step.

Gail Connelly: Two levers you haven't talked about are professional development and mentoring. Those are the two key areas of advocacy that we are pushing in the federal reauthorization legislation. We feel these two would address the need and provide a direct correlation to the ISLLC standards and our standards work. It would acknowledge what is important for those who are already in the profession and ideally lead to additional resources. We know that principals only spend two percent of time on professional development. That is due, in part, because there is not an allowance for them to spend that time or they do not have the resources to understand it. We are also working with those principals who come in with a gap knowledge from the preparation programs and we are able to help them to close the gap through our mentoring work. Those two levers we hope to get support on that. Also another point we need to add support for induction and resources on that.

Terry Orr: Just to build on mentoring and induction – as part of principal evaluation we have to have improvement plans. People are at a real loss of what should go into improvement plan and we could develop structure and expectations for districts to support principals as they go through improvement plans. We could provide structure in this area with expectations of district to support. New York should be a professional growth plan for all principals. It might be helpful to develop a brief six page white paper as a framework for states to use on these issues – it would be a huge asset.

Joe Aguerreberre: Joe, your reaction to how we might be able to get some of these different approaches to kind of get in line more of a systems approach. There is still concern around country that anything developed by the educational establishment is no good – we are part of the problem. As you know Jim Guthrie at the Bush Institute has a lot of resources. They are going to have a lot of seeds and programs – it will be interesting to see whether their work will fall in line with this vision or be very different.

Joe Murphy: Markets and free enterprise have high ground. I am not troubled about that and I don't worry about alternate programs. What I do worry about is that whoever gets into the business should play by the same standards that are laid down for our profession. The standards

are the DNA of profession and should be the platform that everyone uses. The industry standards should be foundational and platform. Unfortunately, our critics work on the assumption that because A doesn't do it right we should give it to B instead. But this assumption is wrong – B won't do it necessarily better. Reform should be about creating quality and rigor. That's the fight. There are different opinions on different roads we should take.

Hanne MaWhinney: On this last point was that we have no research of the impact of the standards. However, one of the things we do have in place is building in some mechanisms for ongoing research on these leverage points. We could build that into our continuum system.

Joe Murphy: We should add for each of these leverage points a question to ask what research and study whether it has an impact on the leadership profession. Lets say we were going to invest in NCATE as a leverage we can investigate whether it has an impact – are they impacting preparation programs and same with licensure SLLA exam as a leverage – does using this leverage point have an impact or what is the level of impact. Same with re-licensure – did it have an impact on the profession?

Dick Flanary: In terms of this body gaining the high ground and support for leading schools. You mentioned New Leaders for New Schools, if you look closely at what they are doing they have no comprehensive high schools and they only take on schools with 600-700 students, and only about 11% of their schools are now achieving significant gains. You would think that they have an impact based on the resources that being given to them. How do we get the reality of that and gain the high ground in preparation.

Joe Murphy: This is a perfect example that just giving it to another provider does guarantee anything. This is a tough one – the political climate is such that people have made up their mind that somehow things aren't good and that perception becomes reality. I would say that if you look at the work that Michelle and UCEA have been doing for six years and now to have the fight over quality programs. What are the elements of good preparation – we need to push them forward into an integrated, coordinated, coherent effort that brings them all together we could have an impact on the policy players. The NPBEA has a lot more power and influence than they know – if we will work together I believe we will have a great impact on the profession.

VIII. 2011 ELCC PROGRAM STANDARDS

- ◆ Dissemination of ELCC Standards Plan

Dick Flanary: The draft ELCC standards have been submitted to NCATE/SASB for approval. Since we were last here and those were submitted last fall we have begun to work on the feedback that has been given to us in making changes to the standards revision. I would like to principally thank Michelle and UCEA along with Jim and NCPEA for their assistance because we have relied very heavily on their assistance for these revisions. Hanne MaWhinney and Linda LeMasters have spent an incredible amount of time writing the appendix on the research – we have over 40 pages worth of research references tied to each standard and element. I am extremely pleased their efforts. Honor has coordinated all of those efforts and spent tremendous of credit for the coordination goes to her. The committee has relied heavily for feedback from them on each revision to the standards, rubrics, and research and they are to be commended for their time, effort, and assistance. Hanne and Linda and others have invested a lot of numerous hours of time in crafting leadership standards - we think the NPBEA will be pleased with the product. We do have some additional work on a prologue and a glossary to do. We should have that in to NCATE at the end of the month.

Margie Crutchfield: As soon as we get that, I have already alerted the SASB to review it within a month. This would make it potentially possible to hit the ground running in the fall if there are programs that want to submit using the new standards. Institutions will have 18 months in which to use either set of standards.

Dick Flanary: In your packet you have a dissemination plan for roll-out of the new standards. Once the standards are approved by NCATE, we plan to disseminate them on our website with a hot-link back to the specific research and bibliography and a hot-link to ELCC assessments. We will also have a blog on the NCPEA website and Margie and Honor will be conducting a series of webinars about the new standards. We want this document to be more interactive than just posting it on a website. We plan to have a pdf version of the standards on the website that institutions can download. We will also have forums at different association conferences (UCEA in November, AASA in February, NAESP in March). Margie suggested that we plan to create assessments tied to the new standards. Jim suggested getting the new standards out to the states – work more proactively to push the standards out in the states. Gene commended Dick on his leadership of this huge effort over the past three years – kudos to your leadership in making this happen.

- ◆ Dick Flanary: We are going to relocate the ELCC operations over to NAESP beginning July 1, 2011. I will continue to stay on as chair of the ELCC Audit Committee. The new budget for 2011 reflects NAESP's financial commitment to house the ELCC operations and Honor will be working out of their offices.

IX. NPBEA BUSINESS –

- ◆ A **MOTION** was made by Dick Flanary and seconded by Michelle Young to approve the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) as a member of the NPBEA. The motion was passed unanimously.

- ◆ NPBEA Treasurer's Report:
 - As the new NPBEA Treasurer, Gail Connelly discussed the NPBEA FY2011 Operating Budget proposal. Michelle Young commended Gail on taking over as NPBEA Treasurer.
 - **MOTION:** Michelle Young proposed and Jim Berry seconded a motion to approve the NPBEA FY2011 Operating Budget. The motion was passed unanimously.
 - Gail Connelly discussed another proposal to reduce NPBEA membership dues so that they only cover maintenance of NPBEA operations and ELCC budget expenses as outlined in the NPBEA Operating Budget. The proposal recommended that any additional special projects that are approved by the board should have to submit a separate project budget. The NPBEA will then need to approve the project budget and pay for these expenses in one of three ways:
 - provide an assessment to members for this project expense;
 - use NPBEA cash reserves,
 - obtain funding from an outside source; or
 - a combination of all three of these methods.
 - **MOTION:** Dick Flanary proposed and Mary Harrill McClellan seconded a motion to accept this proposal. The motion passed unanimously.

X. ADJOURNMENT