

4

Causing Change: The National Policy Board for Educational Administration

SCOTT D. THOMSON

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the formation of the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA) and to identify various initiatives launched by the NPBEA to reform programs in educational leadership during the decade 1988-1997. Initially, the chapter focuses on chronological events as the NPBEA is founded. This approach provides a baseline for the players and developments that follow. Later, the chapter becomes more topical, describing program initiatives and publications aimed at revitalizing the profession of educational leadership during the 1990s. The chapter concludes with a brief analysis of the contributions of the NPBEA to reform in the field of educational leadership during the period as viewed by the author.

A Charter for Action

The key implementing recommendation of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration's report, *Leaders for America's Schools* (1987), was "to establish a National Policy Board on Educational Administration." Chaired by Daniel E. Griffiths and sponsored by the University Council for Educational Administration, the Commission's 27

prominent educators and lay people included Governor Bill Clinton of Arkansas.

Tasks for the NPBEA to address, as conceived by the Commission, included conducting periodic national reviews of preparation programs for educational administrators and professors, encouraging the development of quality preparation programs for educational administrators, holding forums to discuss issues in educational administration, creating a national certification board for advanced professional standing, and publishing papers on critical national policy issues (Griffiths, Stout, & Forsyth, 1988).

Meanwhile, several people familiar with the Commission's draft reports began to discuss the early formation of a National Policy Board on Educational Administration. These participants included David Clark of the University of Virginia, Tom Shannon of the National School Boards Association (NSBA), Patrick Forsyth of the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA), and Bruce Anderson of the Danforth Foundation. Developments moved ahead rapidly, resulting in the establishment of a "Planning Board for Policy on Educational Administration" that incorporated several national educational associations, UCEA, Danforth, and the University of Virginia. Subsequently, on July 14, 1987, the planning board met with Scott Thomson of the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NAASP) as chair and David Clark as executive secretary.

Planning board members, in addition to Forsyth, Clark, Anderson, Shannon, and Thomson, included Rich Miller of the American Association of School Administrators (AASA), Sam Sava of the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP), Bob St. Clair of NAESP, Lloyd McCleary of the University of Utah, and Jim Esposito of the University of Virginia. The board, after discussion, endorsed founding the NPBEA, voted to support it with member dues, and scheduled a second meeting to consider (a) additional members, (b) initial issues to address, and (c) bylaws and other organizational matters (minutes of Planning Board of National Policy Board, July 14, 1987).

Concurrently, a formal proposal to fund the NPBEA was presented to the Danforth Foundation by Clark and Forsyth. A 3-year grant for \$179,000 in support of the NPBEA was then awarded by Danforth for 1988-1990. These funds were supplemented by annual dues from member organizations and support from the University of Virginia.

Having been fathered by three groups—the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration, an ad hoc initiating body, and the planning board—the NPBEA was ready to begin serious work at its initial meeting on January 20, 1988. Joining as additional members then were the

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) and the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD). Later, the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration (NCPEA), and the Association of School Business Officials (ASBO) also became members, creating an NPBEA membership of 10 national associations—three from higher education, six from elementary and secondary education, and one governance body (the National School Boards Association). A representative of the Danforth Foundation served as an ad hoc board member as well. Scott Thomson of NASSP was elected chair of the NPBEA Board of Directors for 1988, and David Clark of the University of Virginia continued as executive secretary.¹

Major business conducted at the first and second formal meetings of the board of directors of the NPBEA in January and May 1988 included approval of the bylaws, which defined three core purposes for the National Policy Board:

1. Develop, disseminate, and implement professional models for the preparation and inservice training of educational leaders.
2. Increase the recruitment and placement of women and minorities in positions of educational leadership.
3. Establish a national certifying board for educational administrators.

In addition, three program areas were agreed upon for the executive staff to address: (a) improving the preparation of school leaders, (b) redefining roles for school leaders, and (c) raising certification and accreditation standards for school leaders. Other organizational business conducted included establishing the annual dues of members and approving the budget (minutes of the January 20 and May 11, 1988 meetings of the NPBEA Board of Directors).

Following this agenda, actual program initiatives launched in 1988 included the following:

1. The appointment of a National Study Group "to draft a set of proposals for action and models of preparation to improve the education of school leaders. . . . The action agenda will focus specifically on *how* reform will occur" (NPBEA minutes, July 22, 1988). These proposals, after review by the NPBEA, would be considered by a larger body, the Convocation of 100, at a national meeting in 1989. The study group met initially on October 1-3, 1988. Participants were James Guthrie (UC Berkeley), Wayne Hoy (Rutgers), Karen Seashore Louis (Uni-

versity of Minnesota), Joseph Murphy (Vanderbilt), Charol Shakeshaft (Hofstra), David Clark (Virginia), and Patrick Forsyth (UCEA) as chair. The study group was considered essential for several reasons, including the observation that *Leaders for America's Schools* was not perceived generally as an agenda for reform, and

the first crucial step in [our] reform effort is to create a platform, a set of distinguishing features or characteristics, that are understandable, achievable and directed toward the endemic characteristics of our field that have driven us to the point where our professional model of preparation is recognizable by its weaknesses rather than its strengths. (NPBEA, 1988)

The Study Group's recommendations were reviewed, modified, and approved by the Board of Directors prior to their publication in early 1989.

2. A proposal to establish a National Task Force on the Recruitment and Placement of Minority Groups and Women in Educational Leadership was not successfully funded.
3. A Working Committee on certification and accreditation was established. A short policy paper was prepared and forwarded to the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) summarizing the work done to date by each of the member associations in developing curriculum guidelines for accrediting programs in educational leadership, and in coordinating these recommendations for NCATE.

In addition, David Clark, representing NPBEA, advised and consulted with several universities and organizations, including the Holmes Group, on the purpose and plans of the NPBEA. Likewise, the NPBEA sponsoring organizations briefed their boards of directors, carried articles in association publications, and spoke at association meetings about the NPBEA.

Initial Sponsored Activities

Completing the National Study Group's work, circulating its findings, and organizing the Convocation of 100 to discuss the working group's recommendations was the first major national initiative of the NPBEA.

The Convocation, by invitation only, included professors of educational leadership, state commissioners, association executives, deans, superintendents, principals, foundation officials, and lay people interested in re-

forming the field of educational leadership. Held at the Boar's Head Inn in Charlottesville, Virginia, on May 30-31, 1989, the program focused on recommendations found in the NPBEA's (1989) published report *Improving the Preparation of School Administration: An Agenda for Reform*.

The intention of this report was to guide improvement efforts in educational leadership at the state and local levels by applying the nine major initiatives outlined in the publication: (1) launching vigorous recruitment strategies to attract bright and capable candidates; (2) raising entrance standards for administrator preparation programs; (3) improving the quality of faculty and maintaining a minimum of five full-time faculty in university departments; (4) making an EdD the only path to certification and licensure in educational leadership, with a master's degree and 6-year programs being abolished; (5) requiring 1 year of full-time academic residency and 1 year of full-time field residency in precertification programs; (6) revising the common core of knowledge of skills to ground them in practice and to focus on school improvement, the teaching and learning process, organizational studies, management processes, inquiry, the ethical and moral dimensions of schooling, and cultural factors; (7) organizing permanent cooperative relationships between universities and school districts; (8) establishing a national professional standards board to manage a program of advanced professional standing; and (9) withholding national accreditation for programs failing to meet the standards just outlined.

The outcome of the convocation was mixed. Although some questions arose about several of the major recommendations, the discussion guides focused primarily on implementation issues (Clark & Astute, 1989). Participants appeared to be uncertain about the central purpose of the convocation, was it to debate the recommendations and possibly revise them, or was it to discuss implementation strategies for the nine core recommendations? No consensus was reached by conferees on this point. Major points raised, however, were summarized and circulated to conferees.

Following the Convocation of 100, the executive staff made several presentations to state, regional, and national groups interested in reform. In addition, more than 1,000 copies of *Improving the Preparation of School Administration: An Agenda for Reform* were requested and mailed.

Additional early activities of the NPBEA included the publication of four newsletters through a supplementary grant from the Danforth Foundation. Seven *Notes on Reform*—white papers that addressed specific topics such as "The Importance of Being Pluralistic," "Educational Administration Programs: The Cash Cow of the University," "The North Carolina Story," "State Certification Requirements for Superintendents," and "Integrating Knowledge

in *Educational Administration: Moving Beyond Content*—also were published and distributed widely. In addition, a task force was established to examine the potential role of a National Professional Standards Board for Educational Administration.

Reflection and Redirection

David Clark resigned as executive secretary effective December 31, 1989, citing the unanticipated time demands of the position. Also resigning was Terry Astuto, his chief assistant. However, in his letter of resignation, Clark remained hopeful about reforming the field of educational administration in the immediate future.

The board of directors, after discussion, voted to continue the NPBEA and its present mission but to focus primarily on strengthening preparation programs for school leaders. To advance this goal, it was agreed that a new "Statement of Beliefs" should be developed to clarify the intentions of the board. Scott Thomson, recently retired executive director of the NASSP, was appointed as executive secretary effective January 1990 with offices at George Mason University in Fairfax, Virginia. The Danforth Foundation agreed to continue its funding support for the calendar year 1990, accepting the changes in staff and location.

Subsequently, the board of directors reviewed and approved in March 1990 a "Statement of Purpose" for the NPBEA. The statement declared that the central aim of preparation programs for educational administrators "is to develop school leaders who will actively shape organizational cultures that promote high performance and provide for individual creativity." Furthermore, graduates should be able to demonstrate the application of professional knowledge in a school environment and be fully prepared to improve instructional programs as their prime responsibility to students.

The statement calls for a strong program of professional certification at the entry and advanced levels of practice, including the formation of an independent certification body to determine professional standards. It also describes the architecture of effective preparation programs, declaring that "connections between the knowledge base and professional skills necessary for success as a school administrator are essential, as are clear linkages between these (proficiencies) and tasks performed in the workplace" (NPBEA, 1990b).

The recommended knowledge base included eight areas, many of which had been proposed jointly by the UCEA, the AASA, and the AACTE:

- Social, cultural, and developmental influences on schooling
- Legal, political, and economic relationships to education
- Learning environments, including teaching and learning, diagnostic processes, applications of technology, and supervision of instruction
- Leadership and management functions and processes, including applications of technology
- Theories of organization and methods of organizational change and development
- Policy studies and methodologies of policy analysis
- Assessment and evaluation processes
- Moral and ethical factors in schooling

In addition, the NPBEA statement incorporated a strong emphasis on critical leadership capabilities, including communication skills, interpersonal skills, and decision-making procedures. Another NPBEA declaration was for extensive clinical and fieldwork to provide opportunities for candidates to apply knowledge and skills in working environments.

The statement also addressed a need for school/university partnerships to provide sites for clinical programs and applied research, the importance of "vigorous and systematic recruitment programs" to attract promising candidates, and the significance of maintaining full-time faculty who are clinically oriented as well as research oriented.

Also at this time, a new NPBEA logo, letterhead, and quarterly newsletter, *DESIGN for Leadership*, were approved, with Bob Beach of Memphis State University appointed as editor. Six regional correspondents were selected to provide articles on innovative preparation programs in their geographical areas.

Responding to movements in several states to eliminate certification requirements for school administrators or to develop alternative certification procedures, the NPBEA published in 1990 the policy document *Alternative Certification for School Leaders* as a guideline for states considering nontraditional routes to the principalship or superintendency. The publication argues, in sum, that although alternative routes to certification are acceptable for exceptional candidates, this alternative route must meet the same criteria for demonstrated professional knowledge and skills as does the regular route. "The criteria for substantial equivalency are essential to maintaining the quality of professional service and for protecting the public interest" (NPBEA, 1990a).

The policy statement also refers to certification procedures in other professions, noting that

while avenues to alternative certification are open in many professions, standards of admission are carefully controlled by specific procedures, including peer review, which confirm acceptable levels of professional performance. This prevents the scrambling of criteria for admission to a profession. (NPBEA, 1990a, p. 7)

The document then defines six guidelines to determine the qualifications of candidates for an alternative credential: (1) knowledge of teaching and learning; (2) leadership experience; (3) postbaccalaureate preparation; (4) certain personal attributes, including adequate written and oral communication abilities; (5) familiarity with current social and economic issues related to education; and (6) an understanding of the procedures and process by which school districts and schools are governed, develop policies, and deliver programs for students.

Alternative Certification for School Leaders proved to be popular. A reprint was required, and 2,500 copies were distributed nationally. The NPBEA had begun to act where politics and the profession intersect rather than confining its initiatives to the profession alone.

Turning directly to address the question of improving the education of school leaders, the NPBEA published *School Leadership: A Blueprint for Change* (Thomson, 1991). This 52-page paperback addressed six key issues central to the preparation of school leaders: (1) the nature of leadership, (2) leadership in schools, (3) the knowledge base for school leaders, (4) gaining consensus in the preparation of school leaders, (5) professional certification standards, and (6) ethics of professionalism. The book was conceived as a platform for planning specific initiatives to improve preparation programs for school leaders, and for responding to growing expectations for educators from the public and from the profession itself. It aimed at moving the conversation beyond an analysis of shortcomings to a plan of action for the NPBEA.

Following the NPBEA work plan of focusing first on national certification standards for principals, the NPBEA Board voted to use a publication by the National Commission for the Principalship (1990) titled *Principals for Our Changing Schools: Preparation and Certification* as the framework for developing a description of the core knowledge and skills, and the performance standards, to certify principals. The commission, chaired by former U.S. Education Secretary Terrel H. Bell, was organized in 1988 by the NAESP and the NASSP.

The commission's report, developed over 2 years and funded by the Danforth and Geraldine Rockefeller Dodge Foundations, addressed the question, "What must principals know and be able to do for successful school

leadership today?" To answer this question, a developmental process was launched that resulted in the identification of 21 domains or areas of knowledge and skill considered essential to the principalship.

The developmental process involved several steps to identify the domains:

- Conducting a task analysis of the principalship
- Convening focus groups of principals, assistant principals, and assistant superintendents to identify the knowledge and skills necessary to perform these tasks; these groups used a list of knowledge and skills consolidated from several sources for their initial reference
- Using a conceptual model and "Taxonomy of Standards" for the principalship developed with the Principals' Center at Texas A&M University to identify the knowledge and skills theoretically applicable to the role
- Integrating the outcomes of the two approaches, one inductive and task driven and the other deductive and theoretically driven, to develop an initial list of performance domains
- Distributing the initial list of domains to a national "Jury of 50," which included prominent educators and a nominated group of principals, superintendents, and professors, for their review and comment
- Consolidating the recommendations of the Jury of 50 to develop a revised list of performance domains
- Receiving comment on the revised list from the Jury and making minor adjustments for the final definition of performance domains

The 21 domains, organized under four broad fields, blend the traditional, content-driven curriculum with leadership and process skills to create a new architecture for preparing principals. This framework recognizes the leadership skills and interpersonal competencies required of principals to succeed in today's school environment as well as the central responsibility of principals for the instructional program.

Using the Principals Commission structure, NPBEA staff planned and organized a second publication that provided a comprehensive description of the core knowledge and skill base required of principals in contemporary settings. This document was authored by 21 teams, one for each of the domains, and included 107 professors of educational leadership, elementary school and secondary school principals, and central office staff. Titled *Principals for Our Changing Schools: The Knowledge and Skill Base* (Thomson, 1993), this publication described performance standards for each of the domains and identified the specific knowledge areas and skills central to these

domains. By 1997, more than 8,200 copies of the book had been purchased in the United States, Canada, and Europe, in addition to separate licensing agreements.

The book proved to be influential—it was used by groups setting standards for state certification, by faculties revamping educational leadership programs, by school districts for professional development programs, as a college text, as the framework for a textbook series on educational leadership, and as the basis for a nationally published professional development handbook. Its creation was funded by the Lilly Endowment, by the Danforth and Geraldine Rockefeller Dodge Foundations, and by an anonymous donor from the Northeast.

Two other initiatives of the NPBEA were stillborn because of unsuccessful funding efforts. A data collection and intervention project designed to increase the participation of minorities in preparation programs for school administrators failed to attract funding. Also, a proposal to establish a national certification board with the instruments and processes for voluntary professional certification could not attract funding from the 30 foundations contacted.

Other initiatives were more successful, including well-attended national forums on school district/university partnerships and on problem-based instruction conducted just prior to UCEA and American Educational Research Association (AERA) annual meetings; continuous interaction with the two federally funded educational leadership centers at Harvard and Illinois, and staff presentations at national conventions, LEAD Centers, state associations, and so on. Meanwhile, the quarterly newsletter *DESIGN for Leadership* was transferred to NPBEA headquarters, and Scott Thomson became editor. The newsletter began focusing on interesting and innovative new preparation programs and state certification standards for school leaders around the nation and in Canada. Also, an editorial board was established that included Joe Beckham from the University of Florida, Bob Beach from Memphis State, Nelda Cambron-McCabe from Miami University of Ohio, Tom Mulkeen from Fordham, Stan Landis from the East Penn School District, and Peter Wilson from the Danforth Foundation.

Two national test development firms indicated separately a strong interest in forming a partnership with the NPBEA to develop assessments for national certification. The board of directors voted to pursue this possibility should funding be found to establish a national certification board.

An Evolving Agenda

Given the foundation world's lack of support for a national professional certification system, a grant application was prepared to develop with states common content and technical standards for the licensure of principals and to organize an examination board of state licensing authorities that would develop a common assessment package for licensing principals. The grant application was presented to the Pew Trusts, the Annenberg Foundation, and to 12 other foundations. Pew and Annenberg both indicated serious interest, and staff met with Pew Trusts officers in Philadelphia.

Meanwhile, with strong encouragement from the Danforth Foundation, board members decided to organize a retreat to develop a revised mission and work plan for the NPBEA. A 2-day "Board Futures" planning meeting was then held at the Lansdowne Conference Center near Leesburg, Virginia, in July 1993.

The outcome of this retreat involving all 10 NPBEA sponsors was agreement on a new core mission statement and five central goals.

1. Define a set of outcomes for candidates in educational leadership preparing for state licensure, both the generic requirements and for specific roles. Implementation strategies will depend upon the priorities of individual states.
2. Agree on common accreditation standards for programs preparing school leaders for implementation by the NCATE.
3. Develop model policies for recruiting, selecting, and supporting candidates for administrative positions, with emphasis on women and people of color.
4. Develop an integrated, synergistic model of leadership for schools, beginning with teacher leaders.
5. Envision and define the tasks, performance expectations, and attributes of school leaders for the year 2000, with a focus on improving student outcomes.

Implementation of Goals 1 and 2 began immediately with the formation of an NCATE Working Group, cochaired by David Imig of AACTE and Ed Keller of NAEFP, to develop common curriculum guidelines for the accreditation of departments of educational leadership, and with plans for an early National Convocation of States to consider designing common and higher standards for the state licensure of principals.

Developing Accreditation Guidelines

NPBEA staff had met earlier with Arthur Wise, president of the NCATE, to discuss converting the principalship domain materials to their format. Meanwhile, Wise and several members of the NPBEA expressed concern that educational leadership organizations had been working individually with NCATE on a piecemeal basis, and that these separate initiatives were failing to provide a cohesive framework for the field of educational leadership with which NCATE and NCATE-accredited universities could work. From this discussion evolved the Lansdowne decision for all NPBEA organizations to cooperate on a single set of NCATE Curriculum Guidelines for programs in educational leadership. As a result, an NCATE Working Group was appointed, including participants from four dues-paying NCATE members—AASA, ASCD, NALSP, and NASSP—plus three representatives from higher education—AACTE, NCPEA, and UCEA.²

In addition to the usual start-up agenda, the working group commissioned Joe Mathews, from the University of Utah, to develop a matrix of knowledge and skills from the recent publications of seven national groups that had independently formulated their own descriptions of the knowledge and skill base necessary for educational leaders to practice at high performance levels. The seven publications analyzed included—in addition to NPBEA's *Principals for Our Changing Schools* (Thomson, 1993)—NAESP's *Proficiencies for Principals* (1991), AASA's *Professional Standards for the Superintendency* (1993), ASCD's *Proposed NCATE Curriculum Guidelines for the Specialty Area of Educational Leadership* (1993), and the Northeast States/Region I DOE document *Framework for the Continual Professional Development of Administrators* (1993). Also incorporated in the matrix was *Principals Assessment Center*, developed by NASSP in 1975, and *Administrator Diagnostics Inventory*, implemented by NAESP in 1994.

Initial draft curriculum guidelines were developed from this matrix and then further refined in subsequent meetings of the working group. During this effort, working group members considered several broad shifts in the knowledge and skills required of educational leaders today compared to traditional roles. These include the following: (a) an increase in the importance of interpersonal skills as compared to technical skills, (b) a movement toward consensus building and motivational skills and away from issuing directives, (c) a responsibility for learning processes and outcomes rather than simply allocating resources, (d) the need to integrate community and campus resources rather than administering on-campus resources alone, and (e) the importance of becoming a policy participant rather than simply a policy recipient. Be-

yond these changing expectations, the working group addressed the importance of applied knowledge as well as analytical and conceptual competence.

Draft guidelines were presented to the NPBEA Board of Directors in April 1994 and, after feedback, were redrafted and presented again to the board of directors and a small sample of universities. Based on this feedback, third and fourth drafts were developed and presented in September 1994 to NCATE's Specialty Areas Studies Board (SASB) for preliminary review and comment. Using the SASB's responses, a fifth draft was approved by the NPBEA Board of Directors and circulated nationally by NCATE. Again, applying new feedback, the sixth draft was accepted by NCATE effective in autumn 1996 (Educational Leadership Constituent Council, 1995). Administration of the guidelines is by the Educational Leadership Constituent Council, which is composed of four national associations that hold membership in the NCATE—AASA, ASCD, NAESP, and NASSP. Offices of the constituent council are located initially at ASCD headquarters in Alexandria.

The new curriculum guidelines apply to institutions seeking NCATE accreditation for master's degrees through 6-year and specialist programs in educational leadership. These guidelines differ in five fundamental ways from earlier versions sponsored by individual associations:

1. The revised knowledge and skills are integrated and are generic for all school leaders.
2. They emphasize outcomes rather than simply providing a listing of courses and descriptions of content. To this end, the working group and ASCD sponsored the development and pilot-testing of program performance evaluation in six universities using the new curriculum guidelines.
3. Folios will require some evidence of content learned and applied.
4. Folios will be examined by teams of reviewers that include university professors, district administrators, and school-based personnel.
5. A robust internship is required.

The new guidelines include 11 knowledge and skill domains integrated under four broad areas and one process domain (the internship). The four broad areas are (a) strategic leadership, (b) instructional leadership, (c) organizational leadership, and (d) political and community leadership. The internship is defined as a variety of substantial experiences in diverse settings planned and supervised cooperatively by university and school district personnel.

NPBEA members assert that all preparation programs for educational leaders should be NCATE approved and should agree to advance that goal. Currently, only two thirds of these programs meet NCATE standards. In taking this position, the NPBEA noted that in all major professions except education, people cannot be licensed to practice unless they graduate from an accredited institution. The NPBEA believes that the current situation weakens the professions of teaching and school leadership and provides unnecessary opportunities for criticism of the profession and public education.

Common Standards for Licensing Administrators

Acting on its agenda generated at the Lansdowne conference, the NPBEA in 1993 appointed a steering committee on "Common and Higher Standards for State Licensure." Committee members representing the 10 NPBEA sponsors decided to convene all states interested in discussing the question of common standards as a basis for licensing school leaders.

Based on this decision, invitations were sent to the departments of public education in all 50 states and the District of Columbia to attend a "National Convocation on Common Standards for the State Licensure of Principals." The Convocation, held in January 1994 and funded by three foundations, was attended by representatives of 37 states and 10 national associations.

After 2 days of structured meetings, the participants voted for several recommendations: (a) Stakeholders will use and benefit from the development of common standards, (b) coherent standards should be developed and implemented, (c) a broad group of stakeholders should be involved in developing the standards, (d) intent as to purpose and process must be widely communicated, and (e) a steering committee should be formed to plan the next steps in the development of entry-level standards for the principalship.

Meanwhile, the CCSSO Board of Directors voted in mid-January to establish an "Interstate Principals Licensure Consortium" as a parallel to their national program to develop common standards for entry-level teachers. After discussion of several issues and the CCSSO plans, the NPBEA Board of Directors agreed that competing initiatives would be counterproductive to achieving the professional goal of common and higher licensing standards for school leaders. Therefore, the NPBEA voted to revise its mission from being the primary advocate of common standards for licensing principals to that of a working partner with CCSSO. The board of directors also voted to continue pursuing funding for the project with leads already established, as

the goal remained the same as previously defined. Therefore, the original NPBEA grant request to the Pew Trusts to develop common and higher standards for the state licensure of principals was amended to designate CCSSO as assuming the primary responsibility for this work. The NPBEA remained the grant recipient for technical reasons. A 2-year grant for \$300,000 was then received from the Pew Trusts for the 1995 and 1996 calendar years to develop common state standards as proposed. The Danforth Foundation also contributed almost \$50,000 to the effort.

The initial meeting of the new Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) was held in August 1994 and attended by 27 state representatives. The agenda had been planned by Ramsay Selden of CCSSO, Joseph Murphy of Vanderbilt University (appointed as chair of the Consortium), and Scott Thomson of the NPBEA. Most of the states involved with the CCSSO initiative to develop common standards for teacher licensure joined ISLLC.

The ISLLC crafted over 2 years, from 1994 to 1996, models standards and indicators for school leaders. Forged from research on productive educational leadership and from effective practice, the standards were drafted by representatives of 24 state education agencies and several professional associations. The final work was published as a monograph (ISLLC, 1996).

The document is organized by six broad standards, each with the lead phrase, "A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by . . ." The standards are (a) facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community; (b) advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and professional growth; (c) ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment; (d) collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources; (e) acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner; and (f) understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

As an introduction to the monograph, Joseph Murphy, Chair, and Neil Shipman, Director of ISLLC, noted that

the standards present a common core of knowledge, dispositions, and performances that will help link leadership more forcefully to productive schools and enhanced educational outcomes. Although developed to serve a different purpose, the standards were designed to be compatible with the new National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher

Education (NCATE) *Curriculum Guidelines* for school administration, as well as with the major national reports on reinventing leadership for tomorrow's schools. As such, they represent another part of a concerted effort to enhance the skills of school leaders and to couple leadership with effective educational processes and valued outcomes.

One intent of the document was to stimulate vigorous thought and dialogue about quality educational leadership among stakeholders in the area of school administration. A second intent was to provide raw material that will help stakeholders across the education landscape (e.g., state agencies, professional associations, institutions of higher education) enhance the quality of educational leadership throughout the nation's schools.

Since the publication of these standards, the CCSSO and several states have formed a partnership with the Educational Testing Service to create new assessments based on the standards to be used for the initial licensure of candidates in participating states. The test will become available nationally in the fall of 1998.

National Networks

From 1991 to 1996, the NPBEA sponsored a series of national forums funded by Danforth, commissioned several publications on issues considered critical to the national conversation on educational leadership and schooling, and developed a national resource bank for programs in educational leadership.

The national forums were scheduled to precede UCEA and AERA annual meetings and included these four topics in addition to the themes cited earlier in this chapter: (a) developing and using clinical materials in preparation programs; (b) integrating services for students and families; implications for the preparation and development of school leaders; (c) transformational leadership for school, family, and community partnerships, and (d) using technologies in the preparation of school leaders. Each forum attracted 120 to 200 participants. Several were cosponsored by UCEA.

The NPBEA also commissioned, published, and distributed nationally several monographs. The initial monograph, *Gender and Politics at Work: Why Women Exit the Superintendency* (1993) was authored by Marilyn Tallerico, Joan N. Burstyn, and Wendy Poole. Subsequent monographs included *Building a Career: Fulfilling the Lifetime Professional Needs of Principals* (1994) by David A. Erlandson, and *Educating Democracy: The Role*

of *Systemic Leadership* (1996) by Gary M. Crow and Robert O. Slater. Copies of the monographs were mailed to all chairs of departments of educational leadership nationally as well as being marketed generally.

With funding from the Danforth Foundation and in cooperation with LCFA, the NPBEA initiated the development of an international resource bank of exemplary programs for preparing educational leaders. A panel of educators appointed by the NPBEA and UCEA, and chaired by Joseph Murphy, developed a framework for the resource bank that included 12 main areas of preparation and development, ranging from recruitment and selection, to program content, to teaching and learning strategies, to internships, to student and program assessment. Documents were mailed by the NPBEA to all institutions preparing educational administrators in the United States, Canada, and Australia, inviting them to participate in building the resource bank. The completed materials were collected and assembled into hardcover and on-line formats for use by professors of educational leadership. LCFA assumed responsibility for managing the resource bank in early 1996.

In the continuing search for new foundations for educational leadership, the NPBEA and the Danforth Foundation organized in 1995 an invitational conference of 80 professors, school administrators, and representatives from six nationally based school improvement programs (Accelerated Schools, The League of Professional Schools, The Coalition of Essential Schools, Foxfire, Impact II, and The Center for Educational Renewal).

The conference, facilitated by Hunter Mooman of the U.S. Department of Education and Joseph Murphy of Vanderbilt University, grappled with this question: How can an understanding of school improvement inform our conception of educational leadership and our understanding of the preparation needed for tomorrow's school leaders? A report of the conference findings, summarized in the September 1995 issue of *DESIGN for Leadership*, outlines these major points:

1. Common elements and principles found in the six school improvement initiatives include the following: (a) Each group was able to articulate where it was coming from philosophically, (b) the efforts represented powerful communities engaging in a powerful dialogue, and (c) all stakeholders assumed responsibility for learning.
2. The foundations of educational leadership identified were that leaders need to focus on student learning and teaching, that leaders must operate on a set of moral imperatives, and that the leaders must demonstrate a passion for people.

3. The dimensions of leadership distilled from conference proceedings emphasize that leaders are "the builders of dreams, keepers of the vision, and translators of ideas"; that leaders must have a passion for student and teacher learning; and that leaders must promote consensus building and shared decisions based on purpose.
4. The implications for leadership preparation include the need to anchor programs well by attending to belief, attitude, and philosophy; programs should be constructed from problems of practice; and professional learning communities involving schools and universities should develop around preparation programs. These findings affirm the general thrust of efforts to reform and strengthen preparation programs during the 1990s.

The NPBEA quarterly newsletter *DESIGN for Leadership*, an eight-page publication, provided a consistent source of information on interesting and innovative preparation programs, the development of professional standards for school leaders, and the evolution of state licensure policies. Mailed to a national and Canadian audience of 2,000 educators and policymakers, each issue of *DESIGN* typically included five articles describing new or revised preparation programs or state licensure standards together with announcements of new publications or conferences in the field of educational leadership. Over the period 1991 to 1996, *DESIGN* articles described program revision or reform in 72 universities (Beach & Thomson, 1991-1996). This information, provided by six regional correspondents, created a catalyst for a continuing appraisal and recasting of preparation programs in departments of educational leadership nationally. It also offered, prior to the development of on-line networks, a ready reference to new activities in preparation and licensure nationally for the field.

Other networking activities by NPBEA staff included consulting directly with 20 states on standards for the principalship, consulting with universities on preparation programs, speaking at national meetings on NPBEA programs, and participating in national organizations such as the Holmes Group.

The Evolution Continues

Following the retirement of Scott Thomson as executive secretary in September 1996, the board of directors voted to move NPBEA offices to UCEA headquarters at the University of Missouri—Columbia. Patrick Forsyth

was appointed corporate secretary, and a reappraisal of the priorities of the NPBEA began a new cycle.

The NPBEA and Reform: An Analysis

Although several organizations¹ and many individuals participated in constructing new foundations for the field of educational leadership during the 1990s, the NPBEA contributed some unique elements to this widespread effort.

1. Never before had all of the national associations representing higher education and elementary and secondary education in educational leadership worked together in one organization to address current issues and create new programs in the field. Initially, the professors and the school administrators were cautious, even suspicious, of one another's agenda. After several meetings, however, board members representing the 10 sponsoring organizations forged a common purpose and comfortable working relationship.² This development brought considerable weight to programs agreed upon and completed. The field became more unified, and the chasm between the professoriate and school practitioners narrowed appreciably. Educational leadership became less fragmented and more unified as to purpose, program, and process.
2. The incorporation of applied knowledge and professional skills to programs in educational leadership, a movement already under way, was enhanced by NPBEA initiatives. These initiatives stemmed from the conviction that the theory-based movement launched in the 1950s was threadbare and approaching obsolescence, and that it required a major makeover to accommodate contemporary requirements.
3. Similarly, the integration of clinical activities and robust field experiences into preparation programs—an NPBEA priority—although already used by some universities, clearly benefited from NPBEA advocacy.
4. The national dialogue on developing common standards for the state licensure of educational leaders was materially influenced by NPBEA publications, conferences, newsletters, and consultancies.
5. The development of new curriculum guidelines for the accreditation of programs in educational leadership by NCATE was initiated and completed. These guidelines incorporated a contemporary knowledge

- and skill base and required program performance appraisal as part of the accreditation process. NPBEA members have agreed, as a continuing campaign, to advocate that all university programs preparing school leaders be accredited.
6. The initial national meeting to develop common professional standards for the state licensure of school leaders was sponsored by NPBEA. The NPBEA then contributed to, and supported, the CCSSO effort to develop and gain approval of these standards by the 24 participating states.
 7. The NPBEA consciously chose specific program initiatives such as program accreditation and professional standards rather than confining its efforts to policy development or issue analysis in the belief that program changes "on the ground," if thoughtfully conceived and executed, affect a larger number of people in the long run than does a narrow adherence to analytical work. The NPBEA focused on integrating the conceptual and applied approaches to advance the profession.
 8. The NPBEA gave priority to selected concepts to improve the field. For example, the notion of "educational leadership" was consciously applied, replacing "educational administration" to differentiate from old stereotypes and as an accurate descriptor of the role actually required of school leaders today. Leadership was viewed by NPBEA members as the core responsibility of principals and superintendents. A concept that had fallen on hard times among academics because no overarching theory proved adequate, leadership was becoming ever more critical to the success of individual schools. Therefore the NPBEA became an active advocate of the notion that the core skills, attributes, and processes of effective leadership are understood and can be taught and practiced apart from a general theory of leadership.
 9. The NPBEA offices served as a national catalyst for universities and state associations interested in revising preparation programs, for states and professional associations planning new and higher standards of practice for licensing principals and superintendents, and for school districts seeking progressive and effective professional development curricula. Correspondence and calls from across the nation flowed into the NPBEA headquarters seeking information and advice. In addition, staff consulted directly with 20 states planning to revise standards of practice, and on-site with almost 50 universities nationally, ranging from Arizona to Connecticut and from Washington State to North Carolina.

10. By advocating that departments of educational leadership give priority to preparing practitioners and to applied research, the NPBEA acknowledged the natural tension between theory and academic research, on one hand, and professional practice and applied research on the other. Additional pressure on universities to differentiate between professional schools and schools of arts and science in their criteria for promotion may evolve from this position, allowing schools of education to reward clinical activities equally with more traditional academic routines as do other professional schools, such as architecture or engineering or pharmacy.

Final Word

Looking ahead, the NPBEA must continue to evaluate and reshape its activities and programs as contemporary priorities and research dictate. However, one central purpose should remain inviolate. Never again can the profession be divided and unfocused as it has been periodically in the past. The presence of the major national associations working together, analyzing issues and initiating activities as NPBEA colleagues, can preclude damaging fragmentation and nourish the strength of a unified and rising profession.

Notes

1. Other chairs of NPBEA were David Imig of AACTE (1989, 1990); Sam Sava of NAESP (1991); Pat Forsyth of UCEA (1992); Rich Miller of AASA (1993); Don McCarty of NCPEA (1994); Gene Carter of ASCD (1995, 1996), and Paul Houston of AASA (1997).
2. In addition to cochairs Imig (AACTE) and Keller (NAESP), NCATE working group members were Mary Reese (AASA); David Sperry (NCPEA); James Keefe (NASSP); Barbara Jackson (UCEA); Michele Terry and Susan Nicholas (ASCD), and Scott Thomson, secretary (NPBEA).
3. Chief among foundations supporting the reform of educational leadership was the Danforth Foundation; its president, Bruce Anderson; and staff members Gary Wright and Peter Wilson. Major financial contributions also came from the Pew Trusts, the Geraldine Rockefeller Dodge Foundation, and the Lilly Endowment.
4. The ASBO resigned from the NPBEA in 1995, leaving nine members. ASBO has developed a separate set of professional standards.

References

- Beach, R. H., and Thomson, S. D. (Eds.). (1991-1996). *DESIGN for leadership*, Volumes I-VI. Fairfax, VA: National Policy Board for Educational Administration.
- Clark, D. L., & Astuto, T. A. (1989). *Final report to the Danforth Foundation from the National Policy Board for Educational Administration*. Unpublished report.
- Crow, G. M., & Slater, R.O. (1996). *Educating democracy: The role of systemic leadership*. Fairfax, VA: NPBEA.
- Educational Leadership Constituent Council. (1995). *Curriculum guidelines for advanced programs in educational leadership*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Erlanson, D. A. (1994). *Building a career: Fulfilling the lifetime professional needs of principals*. Fairfax, VA: NPBEA.
- Griffiths, D. E., Stout, R. T., & Forsyth, P. B. (Eds.). (1988). *Leaders for America's schools: The report and papers of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium. (1996). *Standards for school leaders*. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.
- National Commission for the Principalship. (1990). *Principals for our changing schools: Preparation and certification*. Fairfax, VA: National Association of Elementary School Principals and National Association of Secondary School Principals.
- National Policy Board for Educational Administration. (1988). *Charge to the study group*. Unpublished report.
- National Policy Board for Educational Administration. (1989). *Improving the preparation of school administrators: An agenda for reform*. Charlottesville, VA: Author.
- National Policy Board for Educational Administration. (1990a). *Alternative certification for school leaders*. Fairfax, VA: Author.
- National Policy Board for Educational Administration. (1990b). *The preparation of school administrators: A statement of purpose*. Fairfax, VA: Author.
- Tallerico, M., Burstyn, J. N., & Poole, W. (1993). *Gender and politics at work: Why women exit the superintendency*. Fairfax, VA: NPBEA.
- Thomson, S. D. (Ed.). (1991). *School leadership: A blueprint for change*. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin.
- Thomson, S. D. (Ed.). (1993). *Principals for our changing schools: The knowledge and skill base*. Fairfax, VA: NPBEA.