



The National Policy Board for Educational Administration
Meeting Minutes
Friday, September 4, 2009, 8:00-12:30 pm
CCSSO Headquarters, Faculty Room

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Michelle Young, chairperson, called the meeting to order.

Present were Jim Berry (NCPBEA), Gene Willhoit (CCSSO), Dr. Sonya Douglass-Horsford (AERA/Division A), Alan Shoho (President Elect - UCEA), Dr. Linda Skrla (AERA/Division A), Honor Fede (ELCC), Dick Flanary (NASSP), Jane West (AACTE), and Margie Crutchfield (NCATE), Fred Brown (NAESP), Judy Seltz (ASCD).

II. REVIEW OF THE AGENDA

Chairperson Young reviewed the agenda and asked for any additional items.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes were approved as presented.

Margie Crutchfield moved to approve the minutes.

Chairperson Young asked for a 2nd.

Jane West called for a 2nd.

Motion passed Unanimously.

IV. UPDATE ON ELCC STANDARDS DRAFT & REVIEW OF ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ADDED TO INSTRUCTIONAL ASSESSMENTS

The update on ELCC standards draft began by Dick Flanary reviewing the timeline and updating the processes followed. The group relied upon a similar structure as was used in the redesigning of education policy standards. Flanary explained that the group sought public comment on draft standards for a year.

Another ongoing project is SASB. NCATE is currently looking at the formatting and structure of those standards. Universities that are looking at 20+ SPA organizations found that having different standards and protocols for each SPA is quite an issue. NCATE has been working to standardize this process, thus the guidance from NCATE recently released. ELCC is planning to preview SASB at the October NCATE gathering. New standards will begin during the spring of 2011, so ELCC's goal is to be as transparent as possible. We anticipate that after the SASB process/pre-review, the ELCC will present at the NPBEA meeting in an effort to receive feedback.

Jim Berry asked if NCATE would formally approve them by this time next year.

Margie Crutchfield added that once a new set of standards has been approved they would be available for programs to use immediately. Crutchfield stated that there would be no more grandfathering by fall 2011 and fall 2012.

Chairperson Young asked for Crutchfield to provide more information about the standardization of SPA.

Crutchfield replied that NCATE has been working to organize standards under four principles in an effort to reduce diversity. Crutchfield stated that there are specific limitations and constraints on new standards in an effort to bring some clarity and consistency to the process.

Honor Fede responded by stating that's why preliminary review by SASB will be so healthy because they too are still going through process.

Linda Skrla asked what the 11 SPAs are.

Flanary corrected that there are 22 SPAs.

Crutchfield then listed all the SPAs.

Jim Berry asked how many SPAs schools must go through.

Crutchfield said usually institutions must use 10-15.

Chairperson Young asked if this might be the reason that they've been reviewing programs for the small programs vs. the large programs.

Crutchfield responded, stating that they are working to realize a board that will create a different review strategy for programs with low enrollments.

Fede added that the issue would be the number of elements and quality indicators, organizing ourselves around principles. The ELCC must get internship standards approved by NCATE, and many SPAs, are moving toward internships.

Crutchfield stated there is a specific component under proposal that allows for justification for those different internship components.

Gene Willhoit asked if the dilemma might be that ELCC may have more requirements.

Fede answered, stating that as far as elements are concerned, the ELCC does have more.

Flanary said they were close; they said 28 and we originally came in at 33.

Flanary stated that he's concerned about graduate programs. He doesn't want to separate knowledge from application of knowledge.

Fede claimed that for the standard specifically targeting knowledge, the ELCC has taken the position that they are both knowledge and skill.

Chairperson Young asked what the four areas were again.

Crutchfield stated that the areas are: content knowledge, pedagogy, learning environment, and professionalism.

Berry addressed asked if the technology group could provide any guidance for faculties when speaking to the development of the performance requirements.

Fede answered that they've looked at developing rubrics or criteria for developing assessment designs.

Flanary said they've been working to highlight successful assessments for guidance as well.

Crutchfield mentioned that NCATE is developing a database for quality assessments.

Chairperson Young asked if we have received feedback on the webinars?

Fede stated that the webinars are taking place every quarter and semester. The webinars are for new reviewers and for new lead reviewers. Participants of the webinar have a month to work through the assignments before writing up the online report. Fede then looks over the reports and provides feedback on the write-ups. The 2nd webinar is a feedback session where the ELCC gives examples of quality writing. The ELCC is working to improve the reviewers' quality of writing.

Flanary said that the review process is seen as laborious and often times are assigned to junior faculty. The ELCC's goal is at least to provide something that might be considered useful.

Fede followed up by stating that in terms of team reports, the biggest problem is that it's easy for reviewers to drop out or to be late in turning in their reviews.

Berry added that as a reviewer he could attest to steady improvement of what's being delivered.

Fede stated that NCATE is now putting measures in place that will help review teams. They've brought in 24 reviewers through the webinars and this number continues to increase.

Alan Shoho asked what types of feedback have been received from practitioners.

Flanary stated that comments were limited, and more often than not partial reviews are submitted.

Willhoit asked to revisit the discussion of indicators. He said clearly there is a bias that individuals must be able to demonstrate their skills and this implies that the statement of indicators is much more action oriented than the basic recall of knowledge. He stated that this also implies that it may be difficult to measure these things, which has major implications for

how this is brought to life in the field. If NCATE's case is that each institution can bring forward a method and instrumentation, then if states don't have movement toward more performance-based assessments and we don't have national guidance, what kinds of thoughts have been going into this? He added that some of us ought to be thinking about how this is orchestrated if states don't put forward the necessary resources.

Fred Brown entered the meeting at 9:12.

Fede said the ELCC is not doing away with assessments.

Chairperson Young asked if NCATE might be interested in sets of standardized performance assessments so that comparisons can take place.

Crutchfield stated that there is balance in telling them to do things and allowing them flexibility. She said we currently ask that they have 8 assessments, but would like over the next couple of years to have a set of approved assessments, or a menu that programs could select from. This has to be balanced by institutions that tell us that these choices don't fit and want to use their own assessments. NCATE has looked at national teacher examples and are trying to move forward on all fronts.

Chairperson Young asked if AACTE is doing something similar.

Crutchfield mentioned that AACTE is looking at broadening what they are currently doing and offering it to other states.

Berry said TIAC institutions could use standards if they want, but how do we broaden the appeal to other ferreting bodies.

Berry asked if ELCC standards could be stretched within our own field.

Crutchfield stated that in states where they are not used, many use the ELCC standards.

Flanary mentioned that the national board of teaching standards drives the revision of these standards. He said principal standards are out for current review, and this group is moving pretty rapidly already establishing the core propositions. By this fall the principal group will begin developing assessments.

Berry asked if the principal group is looking at ELCC standards as guidance.

Chairperson Young said they are looking beyond ELCC and ISLLC; the National Board is focused more on accomplished leaders.

Willhoit asked if they are wrestling with same domains.

Dick Flanary answered "basically".

Chairperson Young added that they are wrestling with performance assessments, and she didn't think leaving it to individual institutions to develop their own performance assessments would be a reasonable solution.

Willhoit stated that in best of all worlds there would be an alignment of standards and there would be a strong sense of competencies required from the very beginning. He stated that the source of "best knowledge" is the institutions.

Fede added that the ELCC has sample assessments that the audit committee has offered.

Willhoit suggested that if we got faculty from the premier twenty Universities this might allow us to create a shared network.

Crutchfield said NCATE is now offering an option where programs can review the validity and reliability of their own assessments. Stating that if institutions joined together it would benefit entire country.

Chairperson Young agreed that a much more intentional approach would be beneficial.

Berry added that there are institutions committed to this type of joint effort.

V. HONOR FEDE – REVIEW OF PASS RATE REPORT

Honor Fede shared trends showing steady improvement, thus teams are preparing better assessments.

Dick Flanary said if you look at substantive number of those early on, the reports were incomplete and team was simply unable to approve them. The only decision to be made was labeling them as not nationally recognized.

Fede answered that she counted incomplete referral as denials. She spoke to NCATE's new process where they cull incompletes.

Fede also stated that during her presentations only half are professors. These professors take information back to University, but information is not getting back to right people. Most professors attending are new professors, and it hurts when we don't get education leadership professors attending our sessions.

Jim Berry thought webinars were probably a good idea.

Chairperson Young asked if there is anyway to predict what institutions are coming up during the next two years.

Crutchfield answered that there is to some degree.

Gene Willhoit asked if the data file would allow you to tag a program by delivery type.

Crutchfield answered stating that at this time it did not.

Berry added that the great irony is that nationally recognized Universities don't need NCATE, but new providers need the quality stamp.

Willhoit asked about New Leaders for New Schools.

Margie answered, "yes" and that the approval rate in the 2nd semester is between 85-90%.

Willhoit asked if anyone is looking at the trend line against practice. The assumption would be as rates of approval rise there would be a different practice in place, or perhaps they are simply learning how to play the system.

Berry stated that we [colleges of education] were once criticized for being the ivory tower, but now we are being looked at for performance activity. He's not sure if we have any studies like the one Gene Willhoit mentioned, but this is a good idea.

Chairperson Young commented there are probably only 5 or 6 states that allow for this type of in-depth look. This is important because the other part of it is that many people coming out of principal preparations are going into assistant principal or other positions.

Fede mentioned that during the next cycle the ELCC might have as many as 101 reports that must be reviewed. We've increased the amount of reviewers to 64, which creates approximately 22 teams.

Crutchfield added that NCATE has established a board of program reviewers and once a reviewer has gone through training, they are named to board of program reviewers.

Chairperson Young asked how long a typical review takes.

Berry stated that when he first started, it was taking him at least 20 hours. But he stated that it now take him approximately 11 hours. He said it's very time consuming as an institution to do these reports.

Fede mentioned that in the old system we had a pool of experienced reviewers, but now the ELCC is dealing with a pool of reviewers that are new to the process.

Fede suggested thinking about incentives again. She asked if we have a carrot to hold or if institutions could offer discounts?

Crutchfield added that in the last several years there are more states requiring NCATE reviews.

VI. CHAIRPERSON YOUNG – THE FUTURE OF THE FIELD AND THE ROLE OF NPBEA

Chairperson Young asked the committee to review the initial problems listed in original report and pointed out that many of original problems still exist. She asked the committee to look at recommendations and then introduced an effort that was initiated by Gene Willhoit and others on the September 3rd.

Chairperson Young reviewed the slides.

Chairperson Young asked Fred Brown about the current challenges facing NAESP.

Fred Brown answered that NAESP is dealing with a constant supply of good candidates and many schools are looking to develop their own programs, but these programs do not necessarily have a quality control measure.

Gene Willhoit asked if there is a place where this type of information is collected. He stated that the disparity in capacity is enormous and claimed that prospective school leaders seem to be gravitating toward schools that are less rigorous.

Honor Fede said they do have data on faculty as part of the program report.

Chairperson Young said we could look at SASS data then map those over Carnegie classifications.

Margie Crutchfield added that NCATE could track by Carnegie within our own database.

NCATE is to report on this at next NPBEA meeting.

Willhoit stated this is a tough issue for everyone. He claimed that institutions are so good at linking themselves to the legislature; this makes the very weak programs tough to shut down.

Alan Shoho mentioned counselors' organizations as well. They have very high standards for faculty to student ratio.

Crutchfield stated that NCATE has a standard for faculty, but does not have numbers tied to it.

Fede added that at one point NCATE was looking for SPA feedback.

Chairperson Young stated that in Texas, current program approval depends on persons passing the principalship exam.

Fred Brown stated that this is a catch-22 for professional organizations.

Fede stated that we need to follow up on the idea of what we've done that's actually had an impact on the field.

Dick Flanary added that the message coming from the federal government seems to be highly supportive of NLNS and TFA. NLNS produced less than 1,000 principals and they've been around since 1991, and the fact that they are attracting a huge amount of Ivy Leagues in the face of this economy is a huge statement.

Willhoit added, that NLNS doesn't plan to expand.

Chairperson Young agreed, adding that they are indeed touted as the answer.

Willhoit asked what they [NLNS] do. He said they are much more individualized for each candidate, which is good. They take people where they are, give them a program of development based upon a state standard, but the biggest difference is that they stay with them.

Brown asked if NLNS is a full-time program.

Linda Skrla asked how NLNS gets funding.

Chairperson Young stated that NLNS funding come from private sources.

Jim Berry referenced Joe's thoughts of regarding a paradigm shift. He said there was a time when we [colleges of education] had a captive market. We need to have a better understanding in regards to this alternative environment.

Sonya Douglass-Horsford referenced UNLV's model of networking.

Brown referenced a 2000 page white paper that claimed everyone was going into EDAD, but only 60% or less were going to administration.

Chairperson Young stated that the resources being put into the development of people who are never going into administration are problematic. There's the idea of creating alternative tracts for those individuals who would like to benefit from some sort of development.

Fede referred to her program, stating the district would pay for most of schooling.

Chairperson Young added that most states overproduce leadership preparation candidates.

Brown referred to Ohio, stating that they had a large number of principals, but none that wanted to work in urban centers.

Skrla claimed that she's still not sure how much they've grappled with the fact that the principals role has changed; they've inappropriately indulged in their own ideological preferences in regards to accountability.

Flanary stated that the concern about achievement gap is more a system of adult beliefs than is about kids abilities, and referred to the "front line" report stating that 30% of teachers believe kids should be held to high expectations. We are working to identify exemplary schools with at-

risk populations and if you talk with principals of those schools, much of their improvement happened without any support of the district and much of what they've done concerns changing the culture.

Skrla added they didn't learn it in their preparation program.

Brown referred to ELCC's 7th standard regarding sustained internships; universities struggle with providing this in an effective way.

Shoho stated that the only way to do this is through partnerships, or you through an unsustainable grant, or you do what NC did and have the state legislature contribute the money.

Chairperson Young mentioned that another issue is that a number of states are redeveloping principal evaluation systems. She stated that there is a wide-degree of variety in these assessments.

Willhoit suggested framing this as a career development continuum as opposed to periodic and sporadic development.

Berry claimed that we teach students just enough to be dangerous; we are pre-service and now we have all of this post-professional activity.

Willhoit asked if this pre-service could be redefined.

Fede answered that at Hood College their contractual relationship with the district keeps them engaged.

Willhoit asked how we address the dual goals that everyone in society expects. The next generation of challenges centers on training the transformational leaders, not gatekeepers.

Judy Selts stated that this is why some of those attributes have to be open to the fact that not all learning happens inside Eastside HS; it's principals who are able to make partnerships with community.

Shoho stated that we have become pre-service and we have to change. He said our profession is loosely coupled we don't generally talk to each other. He doesn't think there is professional coherence.

Skrla referred to a Ph.D a committee where a student was working on dental hygiene. She looked at the aftercare phase of post-preparation and there was simply a standard expectation that universities understood and acted upon the conditions and problems that graduates encountered post graduation. She stated that the solutions are out there, but we are lacking the will to act.

Chairperson Young said based on yesterday's suggestion it was determined that the policy board was to be the leader.

Chairperson Young asked what the group thoughts were regarding the birth of a new commission that would address these issues.

Brown stated that his group would want to be involved.

Seltz wanted to make sure the charge was clear.

Chairperson Young stated that for many of these difficulties there are strategies already out there and this commission could help bring these strategies together.

Seltz asked what the time frame would be, and wanted to know how this would be couched in the current realm.

Margie Crutchfield questioned if the outcome would be a call to action.

Willhoit mentioned that people [in Thursday's meeting] wanted a product that provided direction for the future.

Berry added that for board members [NPBEA] there was consensus that this [commission] needed to happen.

Chairperson Young stated that it could be CCSSO. She continued, stating that it makes the most sense to do it through the NPBEA, but it could be done through other organizations.

Flanary stated that the willingness and capability in my mind are yet to be determined, and he would hope personally and professionally we would arrive there, but this is yet to be seen.

Willhoit mentioned that he thought if we had a compelling enough piece, and commitment from the organizations, we could find funds for this and we could find the best minds in the country to work on this.

Skrla said they were envisioning broad and significant participation.

Chairperson Young stated that in the interim between now and December, they will each receive the report.

Brown added that we [each NPBEA member organization] need to have executive directors at next meeting.

VII. NPBEA BUDGET

Chairperson Young restated the fact that AASA and NSBA were withdrawing membership. She also referenced NAESP's request for a fee reduction. She referenced conversations with Honor Fede about reducing ELCC monies so that we could reduce fees and maintain small program initiatives. Honor Fede provided us a revised ELCC budget.

Honor Fede stated that currently the ELCC is operated out of NAESP and has an independent budget. Fede put together a bare budget scenario.

Chairperson Young asked how this would impact the amount of hours she would serve the ELCC.

Fede answered that with this reduction in salary she would need to supplement her income.

Dick Flanary commented that when Honor Fede sent this he was upset because he's not in favor of reducing salary. He doesn't think we can replace Honor Fede with this type of salary as a draw.

Jim Berry asked if all SPAs do the same thing.

Crutchfield stated that individual SPAs handle things differently. Some have volunteers, but the ones that have this amount of reports the ELCC handles all have paid persons.

Dick Flanary also added that Honor was once ½ time, then she was ¾ time but this was before the NCATE redesign. It was originally thought that Honor would rotate between the different NPBEA organizations, but this made no sense in regards to retirement and benefits.

Chairperson Young referenced the reduction in incoming fees due to the reduction of NAESP members.

Willhoit asked if NPBEA had surveyed interests for next year.

Chairperson Young answered "no, but we can".

Fede said it's nice to be at an institution, so that when other organizations want to mail, etc, there is actually a home base.

Linda Skrla stated that the treatment of people should be at the top of the priority list and paying people less for the same job is last choice.

Berry added he would hate to see us retreat from the work that we've been doing. He would like to see us stay where we are and extend.

Chairperson Young said she needs a motion to approve NAESP's request to reduce fees.

The motion was made by Dick Flanary and seconded by Jim Berry.

The motion passed unanimously.

Chairperson Young requested a motion for keeping Honor Fede's budget the same.

The motion was made by Jim Berry.

Margie seconded the motion.

VIII. NPBEA STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIPS

Chairperson Young stated that NPBEA needs to think about organizations who wake up thinking about leadership.

Gene Willhoit suggested that a natural coalition of members would be those people who are engaged in assisting us or researching us. He gave examples such as CPRE – those that devote themselves to issues of researching leadership and policy; and SHEEO – those who sit in state houses and deal with licensure and certification.

Dick Flanary added that the national board for teaching standards would certainly make a lot of sense. The College Board is involved in leadership development, as is the Middle School Association.

Chairperson Young asked what affiliate memberships might look like. How would meetings, votes, dues, and participation in commission be handled?

Honor Fede stated that old by-laws had affiliate members as not having a vote; they could attend meeting and pay reduced dues.

Linda Skrla said that he would need to check on AERA-Division A's interest. She said the project we just talked about makes great sense for AERA-Division L as well.

Chairperson Young mentioned that December agenda items would include budget, commission, update of ELCC, discussion of incentive for reviewers, traction on developing performance standards, and a report on faculty capacity. She suggested that invite potential partners.

Chairperson Young asked when the December meeting date would take place.

Fred Brown said he had December 9th on his calendar as when the national board will launch their new certification.

Chairperson Young said to hold for now December 4th and 8th as possible dates.

Chairperson Young transferred incoming chair Gene Willhoit.

Gene Willhoit said thank you to Michelle Young for this year and helping us to move forward amidst this fiscal constraint.

Willhoit adjourned meeting.