



Meeting Minutes
Friday, November 30, 2012
1:00-4:15 pm
AASA Headquarters, Potomac Room
1615 Duke Street, Alexandria, VA 22314

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Jim Cibulka, chairperson, calls the meeting to order.

Present were: Jim Cibulka (NCATE/CAEP), Janice Poda (CCSSO), Dick Flanary (NASSP), Craig Thibaudeau (NBPTS), James Berry (NCPEA), Ron Skinner (ASBO), Michelle Young (UCEA), Mike Schooley (NAESP), Honor Fede (NPBEA Staff)

Guests: Ed Fuller (UCEA), Mary Canole (CCSSO), Irv Richardson (CCSSO), Hanne Mawhinney (UCEA)

II. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Chairperson Cibulka reviewed the agenda and asked for additional items.

- ◆ **MOTION:** Jim Cibulka proposed and James Berry seconded a motion to approve the agenda. The agenda was approved unanimously.

III. REVIEW and APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- ◆ **MOTION:** Gail Connelly proposed and Janice Poda seconded a motion to approve the minutes. The minutes were approved unanimously.

IV. NAESP/NASSP PRINCIPAL EVALUATION FRAMEWORK GUIDELINES – (Dick Flanary – 15 minutes)

Dick gave the background on NASSP's and NAESP's joint work to develop principal evaluation framework. The joint project was developed by researchers from Johns Hopkins University and the American Institutes for Research (AIR) and principal members from both NASSP and NAESP. It was developed by principals - for principals and captured their thoughts on what an effective evaluation system might look like. Mike Schooley gave the Board some background on the evaluation framework's six domains: leadership growth and learning, student growth and achievement, school planning and progress, school culture, instructional leadership, and stakeholder support and engagement. The work was aligned well to the ISLLC 2008 standards. One finding of the report found that the research shows that many times principals are left out of the principal evaluation process. NAESP and NASSP are now having preliminary conversations with AASA to train superintendents according to the principal evaluation model. Mary Canole thought the quote from Doug Reeves was great.

Implication trumps instrumentation. Hanne thinks the model proposed in the report is very powerful. The Hallinger and Heck model fits very well. It is a defensible model and a nice report.

V. REVIEW OF CCSSO REPORT ON EDUCATIONAL PREPARATION AND ENTRY INTO THE PROFESSION – (Janice Poda – 1 hour)

Janice provided the NPEA with a review on CCSSO's vision to help students. CCSSO developed a taskforce for the past year made up of former chiefs, NGA, NCATE, and NASBE. They will be releasing their report on December 17th. NPBEA is getting the first view after the White House. The assumptions CCSSO makes is that there should be multiple pathways to enter the educational profession that should apply to all preparation providers. This report is the first in a series of reports that will focus on different components of the developmental continuum for teachers and leaders. Janice provided background on the task force members. She outlined the assumptions in the report. Both licensure and preparation of teachers and leaders have to change at the same time. All programs should meet the same standards for outcomes based on demonstrated performance of the teachers and leaders they prepare. She outlined the definitions of "learner-ready teachers" and "school ready leaders" and levers that chiefs have that they can use as "levers for change". They focused on licensure, program approval, and data collection, analysis. Within licensure they made 4 recommendations: standards support diverse range of students; develop performance assessments that align to revised licensure standards; and include multiple measures of educators' ability to perform. They also created multi-tiered licensure systems aligned to a coherent developmental continuum that reflected new performance expectations for educators and their progression from one step to the next step. Lastly, the state will reform their systems to have true effective reciprocity across states. It needs to be they have the knowledge and skills on day one and that is more sophisticated system than what we see today. It needs to be more clearly articulated. It should also include dispositions that keep people from being successful. It has to be differentiated but Janice isn't convinced the chiefs can figure out how to do it.

The Board commented on Janice's comments. Michelle - Maybe those who hire should be held accountable for making the people they hire a good fit – the notion of working with the hires to make them successful in their job. The contract has to be two way. We should hold hiring people responsible for the people they hire be successful. Jim Berry - Preparation should be considered as "pre-service" not work ready – I make them dangerous and you have to accept responsibility for fitting them to the position. We should not be expected to make them fully formed – that is the responsibility of the district. Hanne – Many higher educational institutions still have not done enough to establish good working relationships with school districts. If we could nudge preparation programs and districts to better articulate partnerships and require them to articulate who is responsible for hiring that might be good – could we ask preparation programs to specify the settings and ask what they are prepared to do. States are not expecting

fully formed principals but the difficulty is that we don't agree to what day one preparation really means. The reality is that the level of accountability for day one is the same for entry-level principals as it is for experienced principals. Growing levels of accountability from day one is on the job learning practice and connecting with their peers. We should map out what the levels of preparation expectations really should be for an entry-level principal.

Program approval is the second area. Janice explained that CCSSO states are holding preparation programs accountable. They will establish clear and fair performance rating system to guide preparation programs continuous improvement. States will act to close preparation programs whose rating indicates non-exemplary performance. States will adopt and implement rigorous program approval standards to assure that educator preparation programs produce quality candidates who are capable of positively impacting student achievement. Add clinical practice and the need for early and residency experiences. That's where your preparation standards are mapped back to PK-12 student standards (CCSS). States will provide feedback, data, support and resources to preparation programs and act on any program approval or national accreditation recommendations.

Data Collection, Analysis, and Reporting – Janice explained that states will inform educator preparation programs by using stakeholder input. States will address and take appropriate action individually and collectively. At present there is no system for providing data on non-traditional preparation programs but state plan to collect this data and are willing to share the data across state lines. We need a better way to understand what people are doing after they graduate and where they are going. We need to find out if they are working the field in another state. States will use data collection for continuous improvement purposes.

We plan to have working groups look at these areas to identify and share lessons across states.

Ed Fuller thought this report was very good. It highlights that good practices on data use would be valuable. Dick raised question on teacher readiness and school readiness definitions – he wondered whether the dispositional aspects would be made stronger. Michelle said that preparation programs have gone away from dispositions because professors don't know how to teach and evaluate student dispositions. But we should revisit dispositions in the ELCC standards. The question was raised on how well state department personnel are trained to accurately analyze data. This is an interesting issue which the chiefs and state departments should now be thinking about as well as political funders otherwise we could have a huge problem on our hands. Janice concluded her remarks to say that CCSSO welcomes a collaborative partnership with NPBEA members as it moves forward on these initiatives. Jim C. concluded that CCSSO's work could have implications for our work on any revisions to the ISLLC and ELCC standards.

VI. REVIEW OF RESEARCH GAPS/NEEDS IN LEADERSHIP STANDARDS- (Michelle Young/Mary C. Canole – 1 hour)

Michelle and Mary shared a progress report on their work on a grant project between UCEA, CCSSO, and Great City Schools. The report was developed to inform the work of the NPBEA concerning the review of leadership standards and the available research on the gaps/needs analysis for updating the ISLLC standards. Michelle stated that the report was not a call to action but only serves to outline the research base on effective leadership and the data gathered from the study can help inform NPBEA's work plan for next steps with regard to the ISLLC and ELCC standards. She added that the decision rests with NPBEA as a body to decide what steps should be taken regarding this research on the standards. Mary stated that the report they were presenting was still not complete but a work in progress. There is still research that must be done that includes data collection that the Great City Schools is doing.

Michelle said that there are things they wanted to take a look at in the research base that was developed since the last reiteration of the ISLLC standards in 2008 to review current trends, evaluation frameworks, and national and state policy changes. They also want to provide a current picture of school leadership that might have implications on our standards. The final report will provide a helpful set of resources especially in mapping effective leadership practice to the standards and identifying gaps in the research base of the standards. Going forward the group anticipates that more good research will develop from the national principal pipeline project going on with the Council for Great City Schools. Principal evaluation is a major focus of this project. Michelle anticipates that as they vet and synthesize the results of the data collection from the members of Great City Schools we will be able to make some valuable conclusions regarding the state of educational leadership and relevancy of our current standards.

Michelle explained that while many states incorporated the ISLLC standards 2008 in their legislation for preparation and licensure of principals, they may not be reflective of the changing context of education in schools. Back in 2007 the committee that developed the ISLLC standards provided a list of empirical and best practice research however, it was weakly tied at best. We need to update this research in a more meaning way and we hope to provide the NPBEA board with that type of sound research through the mapping work we are doing through our state consortium on leadership practice. At the next NPBEA meeting we hope to provide the Board with an updated report that can focus our discussion on the standards including questions, options, and recommendations to inform stakeholder dialog concerning the review of our standards.

Some concerns have shown up now in the research including a lack of connection of the ISLLC standards to student learning; an omission of data-based decision-

making, issue of the changing context for schools, and the notion of non-distributed leadership. Some catalysts for changing the standards include:

- Development of the Common Core
- Better data systems
- Support for teacher/leader effectiveness – developing ongoing capacity building
- Turning around poor performing schools
- Making students college and career ready

When they looked at the research on effective leadership, most of the best research was found at the elementary school level but there was little research on effective leadership at the district level. With regard to mapping the research generally to the standards there was some, but when they tried to map to specific functions it became more difficult, especially in standard 6.0. Some questions arose when we looked at the goal of standards. Should ISLLC have a developmental pathway approach in terms of knowledge and skills – e.g., a development framework or should we assume a certain level of knowledge has already been obtained? The answers to these questions have specific implications with how we conduct our research review. What does the research say for what a new principal should know and be able to do versus a principal with 3-5 years of experience, or an experienced principal? Michelle stated that whatever input the NPBEA body can give would be most welcome for their research. Hanne stated that it was clear that there are distinct and growing body for the role of the district leader and the role of the school leader. Do we want to distinguish between school and district indicators in ISLLC? Should the standards reflect different leadership roles more specifically? We have to have a systemic perspective when we look at standards. We need to identify who will be accountable for what and at what level. We should look at a shared accountability at all levels.

Jim Cibulka summarized the discussion and suggested that Michelle and Mary provide a follow-up report at our next meeting and develop a series of questions that we might use in our discussion and then we can ascertain the discrete things that might be missing. There is obviously more work to be done and we need to get the data from Great City Schools. TQ has also come out with data on 60 teacher leadership programs – citing educational leadership effectiveness. We may want to think about gathering information from other key stakeholders in the field and ask them to weigh in on the relevancy of the standards.

VII. NCPEA POSITION PAPER ON TEACHER LEADERSHIP - IMPACT ON FUTURE LEADERSHIP PREPARATION

(Jim Berry – 15 minutes)

Jim quickly outlined NCPEA's NCPEA Position Paper on "Developing a National Perspective of Interrelated Preparation: Educational Administration Leading Teacher Leadership Programs". The position paper articulates a national perspective for the development of teacher leadership programs with leadership

from educational administration professors. Jim stated that as we talk about the standards the NCPEA Position Paper can be useful in highlighting the urgency for developing teacher leadership programs embedded within educational administration programs. He asked us to consider whether we should define standards for teacher leaders separately from building leadership. NCPEA feels that it is crucial for us to articulate knowledge and skills aligned to the national standards for preparing school leaders—leaders who know excellent instruction, but who also are excellent leaders. He asked us to consider what should teacher leaders need to know and be able to do – how do our standards fit that specific role?

The Teacher Leadership Exploratory Consortium initiated its work to formulate standards for developing teacher leaders in 2008. NCPEA’s rationale in reviewing these “national standards,” instead of presenting a state-by-state analysis, is based upon a similar vetting of the administrative preparation standards by national-level consortia. As anticipated, teacher-leader standards aligned well with Instructional Leadership (Standard 2), Inclusive Practice (Standard 4), and somewhat with the Socio-Political aspect of policy influencing classroom practices and policies (Standard 6). Perhaps this is due to the focus of initial teacher preparation programs. The bigger-picture aspects of school and district leadership contained in *ISLLC 2008*, such as Visionary Leadership (Standard 1), Effective Management (Standard 3), and Ethical Leadership (Standard 5) are evident in the crosswalk, but tend to be limited to building-level perspectives on classroom instruction or considerations for an individual’s professional success.

The report states that the strength of the *2011 ELCC Program Standards: Building and District* (NPBEA, 2011) lies in requiring leaders to consider the distinction between experiences at the building level from those at the district level. This is important when considering, for example, strengthening the use of technology to make data-informed decisions. This is a specific focus on administrator preparation that could be strengthened in both of the *ISLLC* and *ELCC* standards documents (ISTE, 2009). It is important that authentic preparation includes the knowledge, skills, and ability of leaders to recognize additional complexity within a school and between levels of schooling.

In this document NCPEA presents three principles for NPBEA consideration: Principal 1. Effective Teacher Leadership Preparation Requires Interrelated Leadership within Institutions of Higher Learning; Principal 2. Common Educational Leadership Standards Shape Focused Outcomes; and Principal 3. Interrelated Leadership Programs Require Greater Collaborative Partnerships between Universities and Schools

University preparation programs are faced with challenges and opportunities to prepare aspiring and practicing leaders to fulfill the expectation to transform educational environments where every student achieves and thrives. Calls for

pedagogic leadership in the training of principals are emerging in the literature (English et al., 2012). MacNeill et al., (2003) defined pedagogic leadership as a distinct priority for student learning that is based on expertise and understanding of student learning. Pedagogical leadership is the priority for a principal. The skills necessary for teacher leadership find a natural home with the educational administration faculty in programs where pedagogic and andragogic leadership can be cultivated. Interrelated leadership preparation seeks to integrate and incorporate the strength of multiple programs within a school of education to prepare school leaders. Interrelated leadership programs model a combination of distributed and pedagogic leadership practices centered on inter-relational processes and products versus a focus on individual roles. Characteristics of these programs include: 1) inquiry-based methods of instruction relevant to adult learners, 2) experiential-based activities to connect theory and practice for teachers, and 3) evidence-based decision-making using data from observations for both principals and teachers. Assuring the high quality of all programs that prepare principals has always been one of the goals of the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration. This goal serves as the basis for NCPEA's interest in developing a dialog that will continue to place the responsibility of preparing future educational leaders with faculty members who are most qualified and experienced for the relevant tasks.

(Jim Berry ran out of time for this discussion – so staff has added explanation summary from the position paper to help fill in background information about the report findings)

VIII. DISCUSSION REGARDING NEXT STEPS RELATED TO REVISION OF ISLLC/ELCC STANDARDS (Jim Cibulka-30 minutes)

Jim Cibulka summarized the discussion and asked members to consider how NPBEA can be a vehicle for helping states as they inform their agenda on leadership effectiveness. The prospectus development pathway idea provides us with an opportunity to think through what might be the leadership pathway stages through aspiration, develop, licensure, and program approval. We might take a certain orientation and develop a position for the progression. Jim asked the board the question: “How should we approach this standards review – how ambitious should we be – do we just “tweak” the standards or do we need to be bolder and take a more comprehensive look at revamping the standards?”

Expectations for student learning and the work of educational professionals have never been higher. Starting with the nation's implementation of President George W. Bush's No Child Left Behind (NCLB) law, the responsibilities of educational leadership have shifted and expanded significantly. School and district leaders have been expected to shape a collective vision of student success, to create a school culture that promised success for each and every student, and to purposefully distribute leadership roles and responsibilities to other administrators and teachers in their schools so that teaching and learning would improve and the

highest levels of student achievement would be realized. We need to come together to discuss whether the ISLLC and ELCC standards are still relevant and what is their purpose. Members discussed the issue and came to the conclusion that we should not be afraid to be bolder and be ready for substantive change to both the ISLLC and ELCC standards from the ground up.

JimC invited a subcommittee to have a conference call between now and our next meeting to plan out next steps including developing a set of questions for discussion at our next meeting and we should ask other key educational stakeholders such as Wallace, Gates, NGA, New Leaders for New Schools, and the Bush Center to come to our next meeting to discuss the standards questions. Jim asked staff to provide a copy of the 2006 prospectus that was developed on the original ISLLC 2008 standards revision as a means for comparison for the development of a prospectus. Dick, Michelle, Jim Cibulka, Mary, and Janice volunteered to be on the sub-committee and conference call.

The Board asked staff to schedule our next meeting in March or April and discussed changing the time from 1 p.m. to 12 p.m. to 4 p.m. so that we won't be so rushed. Honor agreed to find a time in March for our next meeting and change our meeting times to: 12pm – 4pm.

IX. TREASURERS REPORT – (Gail Connelly - 10 minutes)

Gail Connelly, NPBEA's Treasurer, outlined the results of this year's annual FY12 NPBEA Audit completed by Henry Wilfrey, CPA. The Audit report showed no significant findings.

- ◆ **MOTION** Dick Flanary proposed and Michelle Young seconded a motion to approve the FY2012 Audit. The FY2012 Audit was approved unanimously.