



# NATIONAL POLICY BOARD *for* EDUCATION ADMINISTRATION

**Meeting Minutes**  
**Tuesday, May 13, 2014**  
**12:00-3:00 pm**  
**AASA Headquarters, Potomac Room**  
**1615 Duke Street, Alexandria, VA**

## **I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

Jim Cibulka, chairperson, calls the meeting to order.

Present were: Jessica Milton (AACTE), Dan Domenech (AASA), James Cibulka (CAEP), Irv Richardson (CCSSO), Martha Morris (NAESP), Beverly Hutton - Dick Flanary (NASSP), Trey Clifton (NBPTS), Ron Skinner (ASBO), James Berry – Catherine Shiffman (NCPEA), Michelle Young – Ed Fuller (UCEA), Honor Fede (NPBEA Staff)

Guests: Joseph Murphy (virtual), Pamela Salazar (NASSP), Rosie Young (NAESP), Wendy (NCPEA), Joellen Killion (virtual), Terry Orr (virtual). Pamela Tucker UCEA,

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

Chairperson Cibulka reviewed the agenda and asked for additional items.

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

## **III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Chairperson Cibulka asked the board to review the minutes from the last NPBEA meeting on November 30, 2013.

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

## **IV. UPDATE ON ISLLC/ELCC STANDARDS REFRESH PROJECT**

Irv Richardson and Joe Murphy provided NPBEA members with an overview of the work to revise the ISLLC standards. Two years ago the NPBEA commissioned a look at the standards and we thought it should be refreshed. We submitted a proposal a year ago and received funding for the proposal and then redo the ELCC standards and Principal Supervisor standards. Held a kick-off meeting on January 9<sup>th</sup>. One of the things we wanted to do is look at the field and what the practitioners say around effective school leadership. Terry Orr reported out on her work with Gail Connelly on the Field Knowledge committee. They have been collecting focus group feedback from practitioners and superintendents on the current state of leadership practice. They have collected a lot of principal feedback through the efforts of NAESP and NASSP. They are now looking at superintendent and district leadership. They just put out a survey to principals (500 responses so far). The committee is now building a district

survey. The feedback included a look at critical leadership practices, how much time principals spent on those practices, what were the most challenging practices, and how principals have used standards in their work. The results of this collection effort will be tabulated at the end of May. We will then have a two-day meeting in Chicago to distill the findings and feed that information to the ISLLC standards committee. The ISLLC committee's work is to create a coherent and aligned system of education leadership standards with implementation and support tools that will develop and support future. The standards must inform and support the changing role of our education to support leaders throughout the career. Irv reported on the Laws and Regulations committee's work to collect and analyze multiple sources of data on leadership standards in the various states. They have submitted their committee report and found: nine states and D.C. have adopted the ISLLC standards verbatim; 36 States have adapted the ISLLC standards with some adaption; and five states have developed their own leadership standards. Irv will send this report out to the NPBEA members following the meeting. The committee will need to continually update the report as states change their policies. The committee's work done on April 1<sup>st</sup> is already out of date and they are now working on revisions to the report. Joellen Killion reported out on the work of the Principal Supervisors committee. This group has conducted focus groups on knowledge and skills of principal supervisors and developed preliminary core areas of knowledge and skill to use in the development of the principal supervisor standards. Unfortunately, they have not found a lot of empirical research to support their work. Instead they have had to review 100 job descriptions to find information on the role of principal supervisors. They found that the role has a lot of variability within the states. They have a meeting on May 19<sup>th</sup> to synthesize their results into standards. Those standards will be done this summer. Dick Flanary and Michelle Young reported out on the work of the ELCC Standards Committee. They explained that there are two sub-committees for this work – one to develop the ELCC standards and another to revise the ELCC process. At this point in time, the both committees are in standby mode waiting on the final draft of the ISLLC standards to be completed. The ELCC standards will use the ISLLC standards as it's foundation for setting standards for what leadership candidates in programs should know and be able to do. Up until this time we have been meeting with CAEP staff to gain a better understanding of how the ELCC review process takes place and how ELCC program decisions are made. Our work will begin as we get closer to a draft set of ISLLC standards. Michelle further explained that the ELCC committee has already taken a close look at the Advanced Standards and the process committee will work with CAEP staff and look at the review process. Carolyn Kelly did a review of literature looking at accreditation process. Alex is going to be sharing that at our next meeting. We are looking a variety of assessment tools. Doing a lot of background knowledge. The process committee will be looking at different assessment options that might be required including a 360 type of evaluation and a required internship assessment. Jim Cibulka expressed encouragement to the committee to look at designing assessments for institutions to submit that are reliable and viable. CAEP is looking at building up the reliability of assessments measures at the teacher level and the committee may want to take a look at what they are doing. Joe Murphy gave an outline of the ISLLC committee's work to date. He said the ISLLC standards serve as a foundation for all other standards. The new standards will have three big anchors: research, values as a profession, and field knowledge practice – craft practice. All three of those fuel what we do. Phase 1: everyone looks at everything based on research; Phase 2: Each committee's members will review their work in depth. The empirical research will be done in depth and tied directly to each standard; and then Phase 3: the field craft knowledge will come in from Terry's Orr and Gail Connelly' committee. We will have the Field Knowledge report by the end of May. We will take that information and look all of it together in July and August. Then we will gather feedback in August/September. Draft due August 1<sup>st</sup>. Do you want to see them before July 1 – July 1<sup>st</sup> report goes to Wallace? Will Wallace be a perfunctory review or will they change them? We want to get NPBEA feedback on the draft ISLLC standards this summer so that we get your support first on the work done. We will set up webinar meeting of NPBEA members to review the draft ISLLC standards around July 1 and solicit your feedback. This feedback will then go

back to the ISLLC committee. We will also solicit feedback from Wallace and the public at the same time. Joe suggested that we schedule our next NPBEA Board meeting in the middle or end of September for final draft look at the ISLLC standards. Joellen Killion reported on the work of the Tools Committee. They have reviewed recommendations made by Learning Forward on tools collection. What are the tools that are already there and where are the holes. As Irv indicated we have been in collection mode. We developed a brief survey to collect basic information on resource currently available. We had to get clear on what we meant about library that Wallace just announced. Web based resources coupled with video clips of principals perhaps. We are searching for video resources now. The Tools committee has sent out a survey to each of the NPBEA members and we are asking for you to respond back with any tools that you might recommend. On May 30<sup>th</sup> we will review what we have collected. We will look at how we might add a qualifier. Look at missing areas and recommendations for future. We anticipate that by early fall we will have a compendium and get a refined recommendation on what we need to develop. If you can offer suggestions we would love it. Send survey links to Beverly Hutton and Jessica Milton. Irv talked about Teamwork PM – their online platform for keeping track of this project and all of the committees. Each meeting and communication recording can be tracked for all committees including any materials. All the work for all the committees can be viewed there in one place so you can see how each committee is moving forward with their work. He is glad to say that NPBEA board members or their representatives are on each of these committees (those that volunteered names). It has been a true collaboration between CCSSO/Wallace and NPBEA members.

#### **V. NBPTS ADVANCED PRINCIPAL CERTIFICATION DISCUSSION**

Dick provided NPBEA members background on how the NPBEA came to be the first contributor of \$25,000 to NBPTS for the development of the Accomplished principal standards. Unfortunately, NBPTS has recently decided not to move forward with the certification process for principals for a variety of reasons. There are 230 principals that participated in the pilot certification process who were recruited from NAESP and NASSP. Three years these principals signed up to go through the NBPTS certification process using the Accomplished Principal Standards that were developed. They participated in the field test and have been waiting for NBPTS to score their results and provide feedback. While they were aware that it was a pilot project they assumed that they would at least get feedback from raters on the enormous amount of work that they put into their applications. Now NBPTS has ended the pilot and they are left with nothing. These folks have complained bitterly to NAESP and NASSP and NBPTS and have been aggressive with their concerns. Dick asked Pam Salazar and Rosie Young (who have been intimately involved in the design of the Advanced Standards and the NBPTS pilot process) to explain the work that has taken place over the past few years on this project. He suggested that NPBEA should be concerned about this situation and asked if NPBEA, as an original funder of the NBPTS Principal Certification project with NBPTS, could do something on behalf of these principals. Pam and Rosie explained their involvement in the project over the past 4-5 years and implored the NPBEA to continue to believe in the reliability of the Advanced Standards and the certification process that was developed. They said that there is a need to recognize accomplished principals. Using the recognition process in certification to drive performance in schools acknowledges what principals do. Part of this came about with NASSP and NAESP boards – end goal. In 2009, the NBPTS launched the advanced principal certification. 2 million dollars came from Chicago from public ed. At that point there was the development of creating Advanced Core Propositions for Principal certification. 7500 respondents provided feedback on the core propositions. It really did come from looking at the research and getting practitioner feedback. The National Board's Working Content Advisory Committee (WCAC) then developed standards, entries/tasks, and rubrics. Having high levels of performance and informed professional development, the core standards are geared toward becoming

better leaders as a result of reflective practice. We also wanted it to reflect what a leader in schools would do. How can we measure that and what is doable. We wanted to make it doable but have a high level of expectation of performance so that it translates into benefitting students in schools. The core propositions and values and the designation of nine accomplished principal standards. The certification process was built on these core standards. We launched it and piloted it to see if this was the right mechanism to recognize highly accomplished principals and also leaders from high student learning. NBPTS told the pilot applicants they would receive National Board Certification if they met their standards. We recruited a lot of people. We launched focus groups and feedback sessions on the project. Numerous principals were involved in the pilot for their own professional development. They submitted extensive portfolios on their practice and about their improvement and growth in taking steps in becoming a better leader. The rubrics took a lot of time to develop. This process was richly rewarding and how I was leading the school. There are 230 principals who have submitted completed the process. We need them to be rewarded for participating the 17-18 months they put into it. They have made important professional contributions to the field. Bev Hutton explained that we have an opportunity to reward these principals but also further the work of principal certification to create something that moves the educational leadership profession forward. Would like to have this group (NPBEA) recognize these principals who have participated in the NBPTS pilot. Dick added that both NASSP and NASSP have received numerous complaints and we have been gotten increasingly concerned about some resolution on their status. Trey Clifton and Andy responded on behalf of NBPTS and explained more about the pilot project and why they are now unable to continue. They said that their technical advisory committee told them that the results were not valid or reliable on the pilot and therefore they were unable to continue with the Advanced Certification project. They explained that NBPTS has a reputation to uphold and that any certification process must have reliability and validity. First part of April in closed session their board decided they couldn't go forward. Their board approved and notified immediately the 230 applicants with fedex letters about a resolution that states their pilot work is valid and has meaning to the field. NBPTS is now making every effort to recognize these principals for their effort and participation in the pilot. They have offered these principals press releases and letters to their superintendents and district; however, some of these folks are not satisfied and want "certificate" status. During the summer NBPTS will also provide each candidate with individualized feedback. They have scorers who will give individual feedback on each entry. However, the NBPTS can't offer these folks "Certification". NBPTS supports NPBEA doing something in way of recognition but they are can't release any names due to confidentiality. Not sure how NPBEA will be able to recognize these individuals. Dan voiced concern that the NPBEA may want to be careful how it gets involved with these applicant's cause with NBPTS if it became a legal matter as any support letter may be construed as NPBEA being an advocate for them. Especially if there was any implied promise of a pay raise. There was discussion from other NPBEA members and it was concluded that NPBEA should not do anything before seeking legal advice. Jim Cibulka said he would follow-up with an attorney about this issue.

## **VI. STATE IMPLEMENTATION OF NEW LEADERSHIP EVALUATION SYSTEMS**

Ed Fuller shared a journal article that stems from a series of research papers on the implementation of new leadership evaluation systems within states. The research looks at what states are doing across the nation with regard to principal evaluation. An extensive review of the research was limited due to time constraints for closing the NPBEA meeting. The overall recommendation from the research was that principal evaluation not be used for high stakes evaluation. The NPBEA was unable to fully discuss this report or what recommendations might be made for moving forward, so the chair, Jim Cibulka thanked Ed for a great report and asked that this agenda item be tabled for a fuller discussion at the next NPBEA meeting in the fall.

**VII. NPBEA BUDGET- FY2014-15**

On behalf of Gail Connelly, NPBEA Treasurer, who could not attend the meeting, NPBEA staff outlined the proposed FY2014-15 budget for NPBEA members.

- **MOTION to Approve.** Michelle Young proposed and Dick Flanary seconded a motion to approve the FY2014-15 budget. The budget was approved unanimously by NPBEA members.

**VIII. ADJOURN**

Chairperson Cibulka asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting at 3:00 p.m.

- ◆ **MOTION:** Michelle Young proposed and Dick Flanary seconded a motion to adjourn the meeting. The motion was approved unanimously by NPBEA members.