



**Meeting Minutes**  
**Thursday, June 7, 2012**  
**1:00-4:00 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), MaryAnn Jobe (AASA), Ed Milliken (ASCD), Gene Wilhoit (CCSSO), Dick Flanary (NASSP), Craig Thibaudeau (NBPTS), James Berry (NCPEA), Michelle Young (UCEA), Mike Schooley (NAESP), Honor Fede (NPBEA Staff)

Guests: Pam Weber (ASBO), Ed Fuller (UCEA), Hanne Mawhinney (UCEA) Mary Canole (CCSSO)

**II. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

Chairperson Cibulka reviewed the agenda and asked for additional items.

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

**III. REVIEW and APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- ◆ **MOTION:** Gene Wilhoit proposed and Dick Flanary seconded a motion to approve the minutes. The minutes were approved unanimously.

**IV. ASBO INTERNATIONAL**

Pam Weber provided the board with information on ASBO International and their membership. School business officials which make up their membership have varied backgrounds and degrees of business management and education experience. Some have education backgrounds but many come from the business or corporate sectors and therefore have no educational knowledge. Some are viewed as true educational leaders within the district and others act as assistants to the Superintendent. Since the school business official position is not well-defined it is often difficult to determine professional development needs and training requirements. Some members lack an educational background which can make it difficult to understand educational program needs and how best to operationalize district goals. The same is true for those members who have an educational background but may lack business management and/or accounting experience. States have varying degrees of requirements for the position and therefore the field has not had a consistent framework for defining what a school business

official should know and be able to do. They now offer a professional SFO Certification program that is built off of a code of conduct and recertification process. They have 135 professionals certified. ASBO International is beginning to work on setting national standards for defining the role of school business officials and has partnered with colleges and universities to develop an SBO degree program tied to Educational Leadership or MBA programs. They have completed a job task analysis for their certification exam and now want to identify specific performance competencies and link them to the ISLLC standards. With the work that NPBEA is doing to define the role of educational leaders and set national standards they believe membership in NPBEA would be most beneficial and have asked to join NPBEA.

- ◆ **MOTION:** Dick Flanary proposed and James Berry seconded a motion to approve ASBO for membership. The motion was approved unanimously.

## **V. BUILDING PROFESSIONAL CAREER PATHWAYS FOR LEADERS: CONTINUUM OF SUPPORT OPTIONS**

Michelle Young outlined the background on the role around developing a platform and policy statement for a leadership career pathway for educational leaders. The NPBEA board asked in the previous meeting for UCEA to present a white paper on the research in this area. Michelle presented the Professional Pipeline White Paper which includes empirical research and recommendations that can set the NPBEA agenda for future work. The paper presents research-based recommendations in the areas of recruitment, selection, delivery structure, preparation, induction, and professional development for the educational leadership field.

Michelle encouraged the board to consider accepting the paper as a resource in order to create an NPBEA leadership platform that states what we believe states, districts, and universities should think about in terms of leadership progression. Mary Canole asked why principal evaluation was not included in the paper. Michelle said that this is because there is not a lot of research. Jim Berry stated that there is nothing that NCPEA is opposed to in the paper, but that it does not include research on teacher leadership trends. He offered to have NCPEA present a second white paper on research that articulates a national perspective for the development of teacher leadership programs by the next NPBEA meeting. This will complement and complete the leadership pathway progression work that has been started by UCEA.

Jim B. also suggested that the Pipeline paper include a section for emerging trends that do not necessarily have empirical research but are future trends important to the field. He stated that the field is constantly changing and several emerging issues of educational reform are quickly becoming main-stream in education and should be included. One way to do this would be to add a paper that looks at the impact of future trends on preparation programs going forward. He applauded the

work that UCEA has done and felt that with modification this will be a great document for advocacy and has enormous policy implications. This research will add to the research base.

The board discussed several options for including emerging trends that may impact the field but do not have a lot of empirical research and encouraged NCPEA to present it's research on teacher leadership programs at it's next meeting. Jim C. suggested that we should structure the Pipeline paper in terms of a first part that outlines what we know based on empirical research and a second part that includes practice-based recommendations on things that we can stand behind but do not have solid empirical research. We can explain some emerging trends and set a proactive tone for the document as a living document that is future focused. The board felt that it could still endorse the paper with some refinement to acknowledge emerging trends. Jim C. encouraged the board to consider future conversations on how members can use this document to drive changes in our field. The principles in the document should disabuse the current status quo and can be a call to action for future research into areas of promising practices and provide recommendations for change in school leadership progression.

- ◆ **MOTION:** MaryAnn Jobe proposed endorsement of Professional Pipeline White Paper with amended changes and James Berry seconded the motion. The Pipeline Paper was approved unanimously.

## **VI. IMPLEMENTATION OF COMMON CORE STATE STANDARDS**

Gene described the work that CCSSO has done with regard to implementation of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS). So far 45 states have adopted the standards. Overall there has been good support for the standards, even in the few states that have not adopted the standards we have seen an alignment. There have not been substantial problems with the standards themselves, it is more political. We have a counter movement among a few states that want to do something different like Alaska who has held onto their own state standards, which are identical to CCSS standards and Virginia who has updated college and career ready standards which are closely aligned to CCSS. Nebraska has not yet adopted the standards, Minnesota in the process of adopting, and Texas has their own standards which are aligned to CCSS. Gene said that acceptance is solid and there is a desire to move ahead but there are still political challenges to define the state and federal role in education. He explained that the INTASC standards are now aligned to the CCSS. The changes in the new INTASC standards include an essential shift in the verbs within the content and pedagogy. The CCSS standards also require students to gain a deeper understanding of content knowledge and most of the state tests are weak in terms of how to accurately evaluate students on this deeper understanding. There has been some implementation challenges with regard to discrepancies between state and district data collection systems. So there will have to be an adjustment period to work out these kinks. The new

standards are going to be more rigorous. In math there will be a big shift, few topics per grade (3 issues per grade). Now we have a focus on the basics of math at the early grades. You have to master them in the basics. If you don't master it then they drop off at the middle level. The new standards will push us toward greater student individualization.

Dick stated a concern that principals by and large across the country are unaware of the CCSS standards and struggle on what guidance to give to their teachers. Where are the state and district resources for implementation of the standards? CCSSO is working with the states to increase communication to school staff. Gene explained that for this reason there is a planned phase in for implementation of the CCSS standards – schools will not be held accountable until 2016-17. That will provide time for training, resources, and pilot testing to take place. We are holding off on giving out assessment examples to the field right away. We would rather have teachers work through the standards and develop their own protocols for their classes to ensure that students are gaining deeper capacity and learning. We want them to go to the deeper level in interpretation of the standards. Schools need to spend some time deeply talking about the standards and what it means for groups of teachers and what kind of curriculum changes will need to take place to represent the standards. By allowing school personnel to work through these issues within their own local context we will get better innovation of curriculum in very different ways. Then we will have a better understanding of the implications for instruction and what we are going to need for professional development.

## **VII. NCATE/CAEP IMPACT ON FUTURE LEADERSHIP PREPARATION**

Jim C. described the changes happening in teacher preparation as a result of the new CCSS standards, changing demographics of P-12 student, increasing pressures placed on higher education institutions and the overall dissatisfaction with teacher and leadership preparation. They now have a CAEP commission that has been created to replace NCATE and TEAC's system of accreditation. This new commission is working now on setting standards for teacher preparation to replace the current NCATE standards. They have two sitting chiefs on the commission from K-12 and policy. There is a challenge however, with the development of the new teacher standards in that the content areas like principal preparation need to come along at the same time. There was choice as to whether to include leadership preparation within the CAEP standards, but Jim.C. thinks that the commission has its work cut out just looking at teacher preparation. He thinks we have a wonderful opportunity to have the NPBEA think seriously about developing new standards for leadership preparation that parallels the work that is now being done for teacher preparation.

Jim C. discussed the work of the five commissions and the leadership implications for leadership. As they develop the work for these areas there are enormous implications for principal preparation and the ELCC standards should reflect these changes. The five areas for standards are: Content and Pedagogical

Knowledge; Clinical Practice and Partnerships; Quality of Candidates; Capacity, Quality and Continuous Improvement; Accreditation, Public Accountability and Transparency. Each of the commission's categories offer opportunities to think about leadership preparation. What outcome expectations should we think about for leadership preparation in each of these areas? So that is to say that we might think about ways the CAEP commissions work might have implications for us to convene a parallel group for each of these areas looking at revising the ELCC standards to reflect leadership preparation in these areas.

There are several avenues we might think about collaboration: first is the Council for Great City Schools (CGCS). When NCATE released their Blue Ribbon report on clinical preparation we created an alliance of states to help us turn teacher preparation around. We now have 10 states working on this agenda. NCATE doesn't have a lot of emphasis on urban so we have been talking with CGCS (Mike Casserly) about building strong partnerships with urban districts around teacher and leadership preparation redesign. Their board is very interested in this. We could identify institutions that we could partner with urban districts. I would like to know if the board is comfortable with Jim C. moving forward and working with the CGCS on this issue. The board agreed that we should work with any other organization that is working on high quality leadership preparation. Another opportunity might be with the Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate (David Imig). The board was in agreement that Jim C. should move forward and keep the NPBEA members updated on ways we can collaborate together in the future.

## **VIII. NAESP/NASSP PRINCIPAL EVALUATION FRAMEWORK GUIDELINES**

Dick Flanary updated the board on the joint work of their organizations to create a more effective framework for principal evaluation. NAESP and NASSP principals have partnered with researchers from Johns Hopkins University and the American Institutes of Research to identify important components for effective principal evaluation. The researchers compiled all of the empirical and best practice research on principal evaluation. NAESP/NASSP then developed a principal evaluation committee from their membership representing every geographic region to review this research and develop recommendations for defining a more effective principal evaluation system. Dick stated that a draft report is now being pushed out to their respective membership and the field for review and comment. NPBEA board members will have an opportunity to review the report and provide comment before the report is completed. He encouraged the board to consider the document so that your perspective can be infused into this document. He stated his hope that the NPBEA board will consider endorsement of the six key domains outlined in the report at the next board meeting.

## **IX. REVISITATION OF ISLLC STANDARDS**

Gene said that based on our discussion, we may want to reflect on how the emerging trends and developments that we have discussed today in both practice and preparation can and should be reflected in the ISLLC and ELCC standards. It is time to step back and look at what we can do to align and provide clearer direction to states and preparation programs. It would be helpful if we can examine changing trends that have happened since our standards were last updated and then frame a future direction for changes we might need to make to both the ISLLC and ELCC preparation standards. We need to be forward thinking. Gene asked if Michelle's organization would be willing to examine the research even though we know that the research base will be difficult to do. The board agreed that the ISLLC standards should be revisited to keep up with changes and emerging trends that might come afterwards. Several of us will have things to contribute to the standards redesign work. Let's involve everyone who is interested and bring in all of our association's voice. The board agreed to convene a working group to develop a prospectus and work plan and share it at our next meeting.

- ◆ **MOTION:** Michelle Young proposed and Gene Wilhoit seconded a motion to convene a working group to develop a research prospectus and work plan for redesigning the ISLLC standards for the next NPBEA meeting. The motion was passed unanimously.

## **X. UPDATE ON NCPEA INITIATIVES**

Jim B. provided the board with information on NCPEA's work to move forward with the development of software for developing K-12 course materials. He explained that background on the "Open Source" movement and the huge impact it may have on teaching and learning. One of their journals is placed through open source and they are trying to develop an initiative for K-12 schools. This has great potential for allowing teachers to be authors of their own content.

## **XI. NPBEA BUSINESS**

- ◆ **MOTION:** Michelle Young proposed and Jim Berry seconded a motion to approve the redesigned NPBEA website. The motion was passed unanimously.
- ◆ **MOTION:** Michelle Young proposed and Jim Berry seconded a motion to approve the corrections made to the NPBEA Bylaws as outlined on the NPBEA website. The motion was passed unanimously.
- ◆ **MOTION:** Michelle Young proposed and Jim Berry seconded a motion to approve the NPBEA FY2012 Operating Budget. The motion was passed unanimously.