



# NATIONAL POLICY BOARD *for* EDUCATION ADMINISTRATION

**Meeting Minutes**  
**Friday, September 6, 2013**  
**12:00-4:00 pm**  
**AASA Headquarters, Potomac Room**  
**1615 Duke Street, Alexandria, VA**

## **I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

Jim Cibulka, chairperson, calls the meeting to order.

Present were: Mary Harrill-McClellan (AACTE), Dan Domenech - MaryAnn Jobe (AASA), Ronald Skinner (ASBO), James Cibulka (CAEP), Janice Poda - Mary Canole - Irv Richardson (CCSSO), Martha Morris – Edward Milliken (NAESP), JoAnn Bartoletti - Dick Flanary (NASSP), Lisa Stooksberry (NBPTS), James Berry (NCPEA), Michelle Young – Hanne Mawhinney – Ed Fuller (UCEA), Honor Fede (NPBEA Staff)

Guest: Angela Minnici, Center for Great Teachers and Leaders, AIR

## **II. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

Chairperson Cibulka reviewed the agenda and asked for additional items.

- ◆ **MOTION:** JoAnn Bartoletti proposed and MaryAnn Jobe seconded a motion to approve the agenda. The agenda was approved unanimously.

## **III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

- ◆ **MOTION:** Dan Domenech proposed and Jim Berry seconded a motion to approve the minutes. The minutes were approved unanimously.

## **IV. TREASURERS REPORT – NPBEA Audit**

On behalf of Gail Connelly-Treasurer, NPBEA staff–Honor Fede passed out the NPBEA Audit on the financial position as of June 30, 2013 and 2012 and the related statements of activities, functional expenses, and cash flows for the years which were conducted by Harry C. Winfrey, CPA. She also shared the CPA’s Summary Letter acknowledging a clean audit with no evidence of fraud or incorrect financial accounting for the NPBEA.

- ◆ **MOTION to approve NPBEA Audit**  
Michelle Young proposed and Ronald Skinner seconded a motion to approve the NPBEA Audit. The motion was passed unanimously.

## V. DISCUSSION OF CENTER FOR GREAT TEACHERS AND LEADERS INITIATIVES

Angela presented her power point presentation on the work of the Center for Great Teachers and Leaders Initiatives. The Center's mission is to support teacher and leader effectiveness within states across the country. She said the Center is part of a much bigger network of support for states. There are seven different content centers and 16 regional centers. Each regional center works on supporting regional centers to support educational reform. Each Center plays a different role in supporting states in their reform efforts. DOE has given the Center for Great Teachers and Leaders four goals: they try to identify the most pressing state and district needs for teacher and leader systems of support; provide high-quality technical assistance to regional centers and state education agencies (SEAs) to build SEA capacity; facilitate collaboration and coordination of efforts among regional centers, SEAs, experts, national organizations, pre-service and in-service education providers, and other relevant stakeholders; and raise public and policymaker attention and encourage support for state-led initiatives to build seamless systems of support for teachers and leaders. In reality this means that they provide support to states on information requests, or they may also conduct trainings to states, or states may ask the Center to act as a critical friend. So the Center provides a variety of different ways to help with technical assistance to states. They also facilitate conversations of other SEA's and like-minded organizations within states to become knowledge brokers within states and coordinate resources and information within states. If there is anything with regard to teacher and leader effectiveness the Center is charged with a focus on it. A large component of that work is with helping states to support teachers and leaders implement college and career ready standards, recruitment, retention, teacher and principal evaluations, safe schools, and how to use data. They have had a lot of requests around teacher and leader evaluations. The Center also creates products that can be used by states. Right now the Center is creating a data pool that states can use in a developing better data structures across major areas like recruitment, retention, preparation, professional development, etc.

Janice explained the need for states to share data in major areas. Right now it is difficult to match preparation program data with teacher and leadership data within the school districts. This area is going to be very challenging. Who is responsible for gathering this type of data in the states? How can you hold schools accountable for hiring when you don't have good data from preparation programs? Janice admitted that right now there not good data structures across the states. So that is something that CCSSO and the Center are working on right now to correct. Janice said that state data collections systems don't match so they can track it back to where teachers or leaders got their preparation.

JimB. asked Janice about who is responsible in the states for gathering data and how do we use the data for making policy decisions? Janice responded that the DOE gave out millions of dollars to states for the development of data collection systems; however, they didn't put any criteria on the kinds of standardization of the data collection across different data systems. So now the DOE is going back and asking states to revise their data systems. CCSSO has made this a major priority to work with states to get this done. JimB voiced a concern that the data that institutions submit to CAEP is not getting into the hands of states to be used. JimC responded that better data collection has become a central mission for CAEP. In the new standards they will be asking institutions for data as outcome measures and aligning it with what states are doing so there won't be any duplication of effort for higher education institutions. Then institutions can use the data for benchmarking and states can use the data for evaluation. CAEP will be working closely with the CCSSO to align these data measurement efforts.

DickF asked Angela now that the Center has become responsible for leaders, what kinds of capacity resources and program have been added to meet that requirement. Angela responded that Matt Clifford is taking on that work thinking about what is needed in the field. He is working with higher education institutions around leadership preparation and developing resources and tools like measures for principal

evaluation. Matt is also looking at product development for a practical guide for principal evaluation. As that work builds out she welcomes feedback from NPBEA members on input from their members and tools or products that you think we should be distributing out to states. Angela continued saying that the Center is also charged with building capacity of state education centers with grab and go training materials. They are training up state and regional center staff in high priority areas. They have developed a student learning module with learning objectives and implementing them with data. There are activity guides and training materials so states can adapt them to their use. The Center is also working on developing two more training modules: one on evaluator training module with a special learning module on supporting staff; and another module on how to use evaluation data. They will come out and train state staff on the modules and adapt them to each state. The first student learning module is now ready and the other two will be out in October. These modules are intended to be used as guidance materials to help states think through these issues. These materials are all free and available to anyone on their website. The other resource they just launched is the innovation station – information on recruiting, retaining, and supporting great teachers and leaders from all different sources – it is topic driven and you can upload them free. The Center also provides topic briefs that summarize their responses to states or different stakeholders on a particular subject. These are also available for free on their website. They are currently working to build out resources to support career and technical education and will have that done in October. Here is the Center’s website – please check it out at: <http://www.gtlcenter.org/>. Angela ended her presentation by saying that she would be happy to share what they have done with the states on different topics like the questions from different states on principal evaluation and would welcome any feedback from members on resources.

JimC thanked Angela for her presentation and said that we would love to share our work on the refresh of the ISLLC and ELCC standards as we roll out the new standards. This new standards will be a resource that the Center might be interested in sharing with the states. Angela said she would be pleased to support our work and encouraged the NPBEA members. She said it was the job of the Center to support our efforts to get resources out to the states.

## **VI. RESULTS FROM NPBEA MEMBERSHIP SURVEY**

JimC explained that at the last meeting we had opened a conversation about whether it would be advisable to augment our membership to be more inclusive of some of the other stakeholders and whether we want to have more than one membership category. Jim presented the results of a survey that we did on this question. He indicated that the survey results show that a majority of members support extending full membership to New Leaders, ISTE, and NGA. Then there was a mixed reaction for affiliate membership. He asked what members thought about extending membership to New Leaders, ISTE, and NGA. Ron suggested that we look at full membership only for those like organizations that have a membership base and a leadership focus as opposed to foundations who don’t have members in the leadership field. NPBEA membership should be representative of the leadership field and affiliates might be organizations that have an interest in leadership like foundations or think-tank type of organizations. We want the NPBEA to be representative of the leadership profession. Therefore ISTE and NGA would fall under the membership category and New Leaders and foundations might be affiliates. JimB asked members to also consider whether we should open the NPBEA to other organizations in professional education who have an opinion on leadership so that we all can come together to say what it is we believe as a professional education entity. Look at inviting other organizations that have an interest in leadership (like teacher leaders). Dan asked members to consider why we want to expand? Are we wanting to expand because we need the money or to provide greater input? As an organization expands, he cautioned that soon you reach a point where you can’t reach consensus on anything. That is a problem with LFA, some organizations are pulling out because they can never reach consensus on anything due to so many organizations having different competing interests. It’s almost impossible to get anything done. So he cautions the NPBEA against expanding too much. We can get different points of view by

inviting organizations to the meetings. Dan thought we should look at just making sure the NPBEA is representative of the leadership profession. It's not necessarily to invite every organization that has a viewpoint on leadership to be a member. JoAnn agreed with Dan and said that if we add too many we will lose our purpose. She cautioned against mission creep and she wasn't sure that we are clear on our own mission. JimC said that there was a time when the NPBEA had a discussion on about our purpose and we spent time looking at NPBEA's purpose. We have a core interest in leadership. Maybe we could offer these groups affiliate status without letting them in as a voting member. JoAnn still asked members to consider whether any of these groups would enhance our ability to do our job. Janice suggested that maybe there is a way for us to include them at the table without offering them membership. MaryH said she doesn't feel comfortable with adding foundations and that NPBEA should be membership focused. MaryAnn concurred with not including foundations as a member. Overall members expressed their concern over having foundations as members of the NPBEA. Janice doesn't support having foundations as members but she did say we need their input if we want to get foundation money for projects. We need to be more inclusive of their viewpoints. JimC agreed that the NPBEA needs to think about our criteria should be for membership. Should the NPBEA be more policy-orientated and inclusive? Who are we trying to influence? Is it policy-maker, think tanks?

JimC. ended the discussion and asked members what we should do with the survey results. Do we have a subcommittee look into this more? JoAnn suggested that we should have a facilitated discussion with an outside consultant on the mission and purpose of the NPBEA board. Members agreed that we should have a facilitated discussion on NPBEA's mission and look at updating the bylaws of the NPBEA board too.

◆ **MOTION to Approve Survey Results**

Dan Domenech explained that he thought we already had member consensus on Ron's suggestion about we only open full membership to like-minded organizations that have a membership base and focus on leadership. He suggested that the National Governor's Association meets that criterion and should be considered a stakeholder in the leadership field that would add an important point of view to the NPBEA. He made a motion to approve extending an invitation to the National Governor's Association (NGA) for full NPBEA membership. Ronald Skinner seconded the motion. JoAnn abstained from the vote. She did not feel comfortable voting on membership when we are not clear on NPBEA's mission. She would feel more comfortable waiting until after we have a facilitated discussion about NPBEA's mission. The other NPBEA members voted on the motion. The motion passed.

JimC asked members to give him names of possible facilitators and staff would arrange the facilitated discussion on NPBEA's mission and bylaws as soon as possible.

**II. RECAP OF CCSSO's WALLACE PROPOSAL TO REVISE ISLLC STANDARDS**

Janice, Mary, and Irv provided board members with a history of the ISLLC standards history and gave an update of where we stand with regard to CCSSO's proposal to Wallace to revise the ISLLC standards. CCSSO submitted a preliminary proposal to Wallace on May 5, 2013, and a final grant proposal on June 19, 2013. This final proposal addressed several Wallace requests. The good news is the proposal was approved by the Wallace Board for funding pending successful negotiations of a work plan and budget that are still underway. The ISLLC update process will be referred to as a "refresh" of the standards. The ISLLC standards "refresh" process will include:

- Creating a detailed inventory and database of the existing policy (statutory language, rules and regulations/guidelines) in each state pertaining to standards for educational leaders and a copy of each state's existing school leadership standards;
- Refreshing the 2008 ISLLC Standards with updated functions that reflect recent societal and education changes that affect responsibilities of educational leaders and includes a narrative that introduces underlying beliefs and guiding principles for the refreshed standards, summarizes the recent changes in educational research and practice, and explicitly shares the rationale for refreshing the standards based on research and practice;
- Identifying and creating a limited number of tools (based on priority and budget) to assist SEAs and LEAs with the dissemination and implementation of the refreshed ISLLC standards and their applicability to each component of the school leader pipeline.
- One tool will be updated ELCC Standards and Process.
- Developing an ongoing process to update and keep the refreshed standards current and vibrant over time.

Janice indicated that CCSSO wants this to be a collaborative process with NPBEA and expects NPBEA members to be part of the standard setting process to define the roles and responsibilities of all key participants to reach the goals and create workable structures and processes for effective interaction and communication throughout the project and lead the development process. The revision process includes periodic drafts and the final standards will be presented to this board for consideration and "adoption" by NPBEA and acceptance by CCSSO. The Co-chairs for the revision process will be: Jim Cibulka, NPBEA Chair and CAEP President and Joseph Murphy, Vanderbilt University Peabody School. With input from NPBEA, CCSSO will provide final approval to the refreshed standards document.

Michelle asked Janice a question about the intended focus of the revised ISLLC standards. Are the revisions going to be similar to ISLLC 2008 standards in terms of developing an overarching set of policy standards or are they going to be more developmental in nature responding to different roles and experience levels of administrators. Janice said that decision will be up to the committee's work. Michelle suggested that right now we have ISLLC functions but we don't have any sense of what they mean for different leadership roles or different levels of experience say for building or district leaders. In the INTASC standards they look at it more developmentally. She suggested that with the ISLLC revisions it might be good to have the standards focus in terms of what a building level leader should know and be able to do versus a district leader like we did for the ELCC. The research show there is makes a huge difference when we look at the different developmental levels for both practice and preparation. If we can differentiate for building and district at both the licensure level and the preparation level the standards it will be more useful for developing tools for different roles. Dick stated that originally when ISLLC was first developed they were only intended for entry-level practitioners but over the years the states have adapted the standards to use the standards to judge leadership performance over the life cycle of the practitioner. If we are going to now look at the life-cycle (developmental) goal then this is different purpose than what was originally intended. Michelle said that when we look at the terms of a refresh of the standards, it will be hard to get a good sense of what is needed for preparation until you at least look at the ISLLC standards developmentally between building and district levels. After further discussion among the group, JimC stated we seem to be in agreement that the ISLLC standards should at least focus at both the building and district leadership levels. He asked Janice if Wallace would accept that approach. Janice stated that she thought Wallace would accept our recommendations if they were based on sound research and practice. JimC mentioned that if ISLLC standards revision moves

in that direction, we may have to stagger the revisions to the ELCC standards as they are based on the ISLLC work.

Hanne agreed with the differentiation focus for the ISLLC revisions between building and district leadership levels and said that we can now support the request with solid research. She said there is a whole body of research on what district leaders do grounded in new theory that would suggest that we start at a different place in the revision process in terms of looking at what is effective learning and a district leader's skills. We also have high quality empirical research and impact research on district leadership that tells us more about the work of principals and superintendents that we didn't have before when we revised the ISLLC and ELCC standards before.

JimB stated that he agreed with the idea of differentiating the standards but we need to realize that preparation program are always going to be about five years behind leadership practice. For higher education preparation programs, the standards will not be as important as the NCATE/CAEP performance assessments in terms of changing faculty behavior. That is where the real change in teaching is taking place. Assessments are shaping a different pedagogy for faculty. So how we implement the revised ELCC standards is important but just as important will be how we communicate the standards to faculty and the assessments that get developed from those standards.

EdFuller said that Wallace wants us to also look at developing standards for principal supervisors; however, he thinks that we should also consider standards for teacher leadership. There is a role definition emerging for what a teacher leader show know and be able to do. We have some research to support standards for teacher leaders that should be considered. LisaS described the NBPTS advanced (accomplished practice) standards that are based on the ISLLC standards. She agreed that we should think about a coherent trajectory for teacher leader standards then principal standards (entry-level) to accomplished principal standards (NBPTS) and then superintendent standards. It is a developmental process. We need to think about teacher leaders and NBPTS is already starting to undertake a look at that area.

JimC suggested that it might be helpful to backward map the NBPTS Advanced Standards and performances to the developmental needs and revisions when redoing the ISLLC/ELCC standards. We appreciate the work that has been done on the NBPTS standards and they should be considered as part of the process.

Dan described how AASA has already developed superintendent standards as part of their national program certification for superintendents. They brought in nationally recognized superintendents and asked them to consider what a superintendents should know and be able to do. Their program is totally experientially based and provides support structures for developing the capacity and skills of superintendents as they go through the certification process. AASA is able to define the reality of the job within a supportive developmental skill structure.

JimC commended AASA's certification program and said that the ISLLC standards process should look at what AASA's standard say about superintendents. He said Dan's certification process can be thought of as a tool that applies the standards into modification of behavior but the standards are the guidelines for where we want to go – the structure – the skill set.

Dan supports Michelle's suggestions regarding the focus for the revisions to the ISLLC and ELCC standards. ISLLC standard revisions should focus at both building and district levels – like Michelle's laid out. AASA built out the developmental level at the district level. The reality

however is that the majority of superintendents come from the principalship. We've been talking about aspiring superintendent as coming from principals. We need to think about this as a developmental approach for building and district then look at standards, curriculum, lesson plans, and other tools for applying the standards developmentally.

JimB added that we should think about how the ISLLC standards can be used as a foundation for developing tools that are role-specific and how you would use them and communicate them to the field. These can then be personalized to the specific job functions. ISLLC standards should be thought of as a foundation for describing a professional set of leadership skills at the building and district levels.

Hanne pointed out that the function of ISLLC 2008 and CCSSO's performance indicators are different. The performance indicators are a much more finder grade of setting expectations for leadership behavior while the functions are an overall guideline. Mary Canole thinks that it is part of our work with the refresh to define better what behavior we want to see happen. Clearly the tools will give more definition of what we want in practice. They are essential to translate what the standards means in terms of roles. It will be necessary in the refresh to have tools to define the different types of role expectations. JimC asked if the performance indicators were written in a developmental way – no. Two different ways to look at this. There can be a way of thinking of the standards as a foundation with developmental tools attached to each role or look at revising the standards in a developmental framework approach. We will need to struggle on how to approach a set of companion documents to go with the standards. JimB said that the standards are used as a framework and then different stakeholders have the flexibility to interpret how to develop performance activities based on the appropriate role specific level. If we revise the standards to be granular, then we lose the flexibility in interpreting the standards for each leadership role that is now or may develop in the future (like teacher leaders). How much do we make the standard rigid for each and every type of leadership role? The standards process should allow the type of flexibility for developing different types of role-specific tools. Janice summarized that the grant was somewhat limited in terms of funding over the next two years and they don't have the resources for developing role-specific standards. However, that shouldn't limit our work. If we decide to go that way then we will need to seek more funding. Right now CCSSO wants to do it right and be inclusive of everyone's involvement in the refresh of the ISLLC standards. JimC suggested that we might not be able to disentangle the tools from the process. We may need to seek more funding to continue the work. We definitely need to set up a mechanism for keeping the Board involved and informed of the work of the ISLLC and ELCC revisions. Ed asked what it is we are trying to do. We are now uncovering some of the complexities of how to work the revision. It looks like Wallace might be willing to do the revision of the ELCC standards as well. We will know at the end of October about the ELCC. Janice also informed the board that Wallace has asked them to develop Supervisor standards.

Janice ended the presentation to say that work is currently underway to develop a more detailed implementation plan for NPBEA consideration. However, she encouraged members to send her ideas that they can consider. They need and want NPBEA member input and feedback as they develop more specific plans for the revision of the ISLLC standards. JimC asked members to send him feedback and suggested that we meet again soon to finalize our revision plans.

## VIII. DISCUSSION OF DATA SUBMITTED TO WALLACE ON THE LEVERAGES FOR NATIONAL LEADERSHIP STANDARDS – WHAT WORKS (Michelle Young – 1 hour)

- ◆ **Findings from the ELCC 10-year Research Study.** Honor shared a brief 10-year data on all of the institutions that have gone through NCATE accreditation since 2002 under the ELCC 2001 standards. Overall the data shows that the ELCC has had an impact on leadership programs over the years and institutions have shown a change in their curriculum and internships to align to the ELCC standards. Initially the ELCC had a very poor pass rate on the standards but over the years the approval rate has steadily increased which means that institutions are changing.
- ◆ **Findings from UCEA’s Research on the ELCC Standards**

Michelle reviewed the research that they did as part of their Wallace grant to revise the ELCC standards. They were looking for evidence that the standards have made a difference. Jody asked them to do research around questions of whether Wallace wants to invest in the revision of the ELCC specifically they wanted to know what the standards are and what evidence there is that the ELCC standards matter. We looked at doing a crosswalk comparison between the different standards and leveraging what how they have been used to influence programs. The questions are on page 3. How do the various program standards compare and contrast in their content and approaches, and how are they leveraged to improve the quality of education leader preparation programs? To what degree can standards, and how they are used, have the potential to improve program quality? Are there alternative approaches to strengthening education leader preparation programs? The report has four primary sections: (1) Standards for Educational Leadership Preparation; (2) an Assessment of the Research Base Anchoring the Standards; (3) an Assessment of How Influential Standards Have Been in Improving Preparation Program Quality, and (4) Recommendations for Strengthening Educational Leadership Preparation. Michelle said they looked at the ISLLC standards, the ELCC standards, UCEA program quality standards, and Quality Measures standards (Education Development Council). Michelle went over what those standards are and how they are used. Then she pointed out the different crosswalk at the back of the report. The report also looks at mapping of the research literature and where we saw gaps in the standards. They also did a meta-analysis of how accreditation matters, licensure matters and finally a set of surveys from 170 institutions on what they perceive of what matters most in making change to their behavior. A summary of the finding of the report is as follows: “Preparation program directors were asked to rank six sources of program change according to: (a) how influential the sources were in fostering program change and (b) how beneficial or helpful the sources were for fostering program improvement. National and state program accreditation and approval systems and requirements were listed as the two most influential sources of leadership preparation program change. While almost all universities participate in some kind of accreditation review, some states require that programs participate in national or regional accreditation for program approval. Elaborating on the influence of state licensure, program directors noted that their programs operated primarily to prepare candidates for licensure. Statements such as, “Few would likely apply to our program if it did not lead to the state licenses needed to serve as K-12 administrators in our state” reflect the typical comments provided on this issue.” Recommendations from the report were:

1. Support and promote the ongoing development of the ISLLC and ELCC standards.
2. Promote the use of program feature standards along with content standards in program review and accreditation.
3. Conduct a continuity mapping of systemic potentials.
4. Support universal participation in CAEP.

ELCC assessments are having a huge influence over what is taught in programs. The ELCC standards are getting taught in leadership programs. The way courses are taught is changing with the types of performance-based activities. In looking at course content areas have changed. In general there is support for the idea that standards do matter and accreditation matters. It is important, in the final assessment we need to really do an audit of the influence in the states for adoption of the ISLLC standards and how well the standards get articulated in the ETS exam. Michelle began a quick discussion of the Gap analysis but we ran out of time.

JimC. commented that Michelle's report has a lot of information for the board to consider and we have run out of time to give it the consideration it deserves. He asked that we table this item to our next meeting and asked Michelle if she would create some talking points to consider. Members are asked to read the entire report before our next meeting so we can have a thoughtful discussion on the implications for the NPBEA board.

#### **IX. EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP IN THE AGE OF GREED**

JimB quickly shared this NCPEA book and recommended that members read it.

#### **X. ADJOURN**