I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Michelle Young, chairperson, called the meeting to order with an official role call. Present were Agnes Crawford (ASCD), Steve Jacobson (UCEA), Lois Adams Rogers (CCSSO), Gene Wilhoit (CCSSO), Richard Flanary (NASSP), Rich Barbacane (NAESP), Fred Brown (NAESP), Gary Martin (NCPEA), Joe Vilani (NSBA), Art Wise (NCATE), Gerald Tirrozi (NASSP), Joe Simpson (CCSSO), Paul Houston (AASA), Carol Smith (AECT), and Honor Fede (ELCC). Special Guests included: Ed Fuller (UCEA/Center for Teacher Quality), David Imig (CPED), and Don Knezek (ISTE).

II. REVIEW OF THE AGENDA

Chairperson Young reviewed the agenda and asked for any additional items. Young indicated that Don Knezek would be a late arrival, thus his item on the agenda would be moved to the end of the agenda.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes were approved as presented.

Motion Wilhoit
2nd Tirrozi
Motion Approved

IV. REPORT: THE LINK BETWEEN LEADERSHIP AND TEACHER QUALITY: WHAT DOES THE DATA SAY?

As per the suggestion of the board at the June 18th meeting, Chairperson Young extended an invitation to Ed Fuller, Center for Teacher Quality/UCEA, to provide a detailed report on the importance of principal retention titled, “Principal Turnover, Teacher Turnover and Quality, and Student Achievement.” Dr. Fuller’s research highlighted the large percentage of principal turnover in Texas schools. Fuller made the case that this type of turnover was detrimental to the educational field for three key reasons: (1) School reform takes time; (2) Principal turnover negatively effects teacher retention, teacher quality, and student achievement; and (3) Stability is needed to develop more positive working conditions.
Gerald Tirozzi suggested that NPBEA establish a national study looking at the issues raised in Dr. Fuller’s report. Chairperson Young asked board members if this was something it was interested in supporting as a national study. After discussion between Young, Houston, & Wise it was decided that NPBEA could begin a policy brief series, focused on topics such as the connection between principal turnover and student achievement.

V. REPORT: THE WORK OF THE CARNEGIE PROJECT ON THE Ed.D

David Imig reported on the CPED initiative. Imig stated the goal of the CPED initiative as, “Design, Develop, Pilot and Evaluate New Professional Practice Doctorates in Education.” Imig expressed that the interest of the initiative is to “seek two clear, distinct and different approaches to doctoral education.” After presenting collected data, Imig listed the following challenges for the doctoral preparation process: (1) avoid perception of “mission creep” or “degree inflation”; (2) avoid “PhD-lite” tag; (3) avoid perception of “easy”, less rigorous or inadequate; (4) create a set of standards for doctoral programs to prepare professional practitioners; (5) gain credibility for the Ed.D as the degree of choice for professional practitioners.

Gary Martin stated that his own institution only wants candidates to work in a K-12 setting and chooses not to prepare students for the professorate. Martin felt this project might be a bit biased towards universities who do not intend on preparing college professors. Gene Wilhoit stated that this is a critical conversation that could affect the desire of individuals to pursue a doctorate degree.

Young asked Imig what role he felt the NPBEA might play in this conversation and what the implications might be for ELCC evaluations of leadership programs.

Steve Jacobson commented that the struggle still lies in the creation of new capstone experiences. Jacobson asked if there were examples of new capstone experiences.

Honor Fede commented that many universities have rules disallowing them to change capstone experiences.

David Imig suggested that the ELCC could provide insight to CPED on expectations for superintendent preparation programs, and noted that the doctorate of practice might be an issue that is highlighted in one of the NPBEA’s policy briefs. He then highlighted the University of Maryland’s public health capstone experiences as a positive example. Imig suggested that his group revisit Stanford in June in an effort to locate a superior way to document the efforts of faculty. Imig also suggested that USC’s capstone model be inspected.

VI. STANDARDS COMMITTEE REPORT

Richard Flanary presented the final product of the standards committee work that was convened in 2002. The proposed standards follow the original footprint of the 2006 standards with the addition of function statements located at the end of each standard. Flanary requested that the board take action on each of the steering committee’s standards.

Young requested a motion.
Motion Houston  
2nd Wilhoit  
Motion Approved  

Gary Martin asked to move the discussion of the ISLLC name change forward on the agenda.  

Flanary calls for a friendly amendment.  
2nd Martin  
Motion Approved  

VII. NAMING THE NEW STANDARDS  

This item was moved ahead of the original item VII due to a friendly amendment.  

Gary Martin revisited the suggestion of renaming the ISLLC standards. Martin stated that if NPBEA wishes to obtain the voice that it deserves, it should incorporate the policy board’s name into the title of the ISLLC standards. Martin addressed the fact that ISLLC itself is a non-entity.  

Paul Houston raised a concern about removing the ISLLC “brand.” Wilhoit did agree that adjusting the name might be beneficial but felt that dropping ISLLC completely would not be a good business decision.  

Joe Vilani stated that because ISLLC was the initial name, a change away from the original name may not be of benefit. Vilani suggested that perhaps the board add, “as adopted by NPBEA” to the end of the ISLLC title. This adoption would allow for persons to recognize who is working behind the scenes on standards revision.  

Richard Flanary stated that the standards should reflect the actual function of the standards not the organization to which they are attached. Flanary also reminded the board that the title was unanimously agreed upon by the work panel and the research board.  

Art Wise stated the need to have a single descriptor for standards even if they have a different purpose. Wise stated that other disciplines tend to have a common name for standards.  

Joseph Villani motioned to adopt ISLLC with the words “as adopted by NPBEA,” added to the end of the title.  

2nd Houston.  

Martin indicated this would satisfy his concerns.  

Motion Approved  

VIII. REVISING STANDARDS FOR THE ELCC
Richard Flanary asked the board to review the proposal for revising the ELCC standards. Flanary suggested that based upon the structure the committee had previously taken; the committee would like to utilize the same process. Flanary wants to utilize the current audit group to serve as the steering committee for this review process. Flanary stressed that the group has 15 to 18 months to complete this review. Flanary also expressed his hope that the Wallace Foundation would fund this endeavor, but if not the group may have to request funding from NPBEA.

Gary Martin expressed concerns about NCATE being the approving body for NPBEA’s standards. Arthur Wise explained that NCATE standards become operational for programs wanting certification and requires appropriate standards for doing so, but that NCATE does not approve the actual standards.

Michelle Young recommended that the committee accept proposal for revision of standards. Young asked if there was a motion.

Motion Fred Brown
2nd Gary Martin
Motion Approved

Arthur Wise explained that over the next couple of years there would be a committee looking at the current NCATE unit standards. Wise suggested that these standards would be evolving.

Michelle Young asked how this committee would be constructed.

Wise Responded that the committee was already constructed but would allow NPBEA to be included in the process.

IX. SCHOOL TECHNOLOGY LEADERSHIP STANDARDS

Don Knezek, CEO of International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE), presented an overview of ISTE’s mission and goals. Knezek mentioned the upcoming national conference and reviewed ISTE’s current technology standards initiative.

Gary Martin asked if Knezek wanted individual organizations to participate or did Knezek want NPBEA to endorse and support new standards.

Don Knezek asked that the NPBEA both support and endorse new standards.

Michelle Young stated that an area where ELCC standards could be strengthened was in the area of technology. Young asked if the revised ISLLC standards provided stronger guidance in terms of the technology expertise leaders needed to have? Subsequently, she asked if technology was a major skill area for leaders or if technology was resource about which leaders needed to know how to tap expertise? How might the board tap organizations like Knezek’s to determine the answers to these questions?

Richard Flanary suggested that the ELCC board desires a stronger emphasis be placed on preparing leaders how are more adept in technology and would like to consult with people such as Don Knezek.
X. UPDATE ON DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL BOARD CERTIFICATION FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERS (FORMERLY KNOWN AS ABLE)

Joe Aguerrebere, NBPTS, provided an update on the development of the National Board for Educational Leaders project.

Aguerrebere informed the board that the committee has spent a great amount of time talking to a variety of different people, and are now looking for the committee to gain oversight. Aguerrebere solicited help in identifying persons and help in funding the continuation of this project. Aguerrebere stated that the committee has already had conversations with Wallace, Carnegie and Broad and has hired a consultant to serve as the project manager.

Aguerrebere defined the three next steps that need to be taken by the committee: (1) establishing a common consensus about accomplished practice standards; (2) developing the actual standards; (3) creating an assessment based on performance and evidence.

Aguerrebere mentioned that the committee recently went to the USDE Department of Innovation and Improvement to test the waters for interest and money.

Gerald Tirozzi mentioned that NPBEA debated in 2000 on whether or not ABELS fit the NPBEA agenda. Tirozzi reminded the board that NPBEA touted ABELS to several foundations but were unable to garner any financial support. Tirozzi also mentioned that the timing to address this issue is appropriate as congress is moving towards clearly defining Highly Qualified Principals. Tirozzi asked Michelle Young about the total amount of NPBEA’s budget, and reminded the board that in 2000 NPBEA committed its entire budget to support the project.

Motion to commit a portion of the NPBEA budget to support project: Tirozzi
2nd Houston
Motion Approved

Tirozzi amended motion and asked that NPBEA commit $25,000
Young asked if all were in favor
Motion passed unanimously

Young noted that after evaluating the budget and all financial documentation received from AACTE, she would set up accounts and an accountant and forward the requested $25,000 in funds to NBPTS along with a letter of support from NPBEA.

XI. HOSTING THE HEADQUARTERS OF NPBEA

Michelle Young reviewed the history of NPBEA regarding its hosting by multiple institutions. Young mentioned several potential hazards of NPBEA being continuously moved (including the fiscal instability, loss of historical documentation, and a lack of consistent focus on NPBEAs work). Young recommended that NPBEA consider the following: adopting a five-year hosting term, developing expectations for the hosting institution, drafting official language for host institutions to be placed within NPBEA bylaws, and determining costs the host institution might incur.
Young asked for a motion.  
Motion Houston  
2nd Terrozi  
motion passed unanimously

XII.  PROPOSED FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Michelle Young suggested this item be addressed through email correspondence.

XIII.  DETERMINE DATES FOR NEXT MEETING

Michelle Young suggested this item be addressed through email correspondence.

Motion to adjourn Gary Martin  
Motion Approved