



The National Policy Board for Educational Administration
Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, December 8, 2009, 1:00-4:00 pm
CCSSO Headquarters, Faculty Room

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Chairperson Wilhoit called the meeting to order.

Present were Michelle Young (UCEA), Honor Fede (ELCC), Dick Flanary (NASSP), Jim Berry (NCPBEA), Alan Shoho (President Elect - UCEA), Fred Brown (NAESP), Gerald Tirozzi (NASSP) James Cibulka (NCATE), Ed Fuller (UCEA) Lois Adams Rodgers (CCSSO), Gene Carter (ASCD) Agnes Crawford (ASCD), Gale Connelly (NAESP)

II. REVIEW OF THE AGENDA

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

Gene Carter asked the group to comment on press club event. Tirozzi commented that it was a great event and well attended. He also mentioned those who attended and celebrated the fact that they now had more money on the table to support efforts.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes were approved as presented.

Michelle Young motioned to approve the minutes.

Fred Brown called for a 2nd

Motion passed unanimously.

IV. PRESENTATION BY ED FULLER

- Ed Fuller began the presentation by reviewing the following:
 - The number and percentage of school administrators in 2009 from selected institution types.
 - The proportion of individuals obtaining principal certification from research/doctoral institutions.
 - The average principal tenure by school level and percentage of eco-disadvantaged students.
 - The percentage of newly hired principals staying at the same school for selected numbers of years.
 - The percentage of principals leaving a school after one year by school level and performance.

- The percentage of principals remaining in principalship after one year by school level and experience as an assistant principal.
- The percentage of beginning principals remaining in the principalship after five years by school level and experience as an assistant principal.
- Where principals go after they leave their current school.
- The factors associated with principal retention of 5 years or more.
- The factors associated with elementary principals staying at the same school for two years.
- The factors associated with elementary principals staying at the same school for two years.
- The percentage of principals with at least three years of assistant principal experience remaining at the same school by initial school performance level.
- The percentage of principals with at least three years of asst principal experience remaining at the same school by initial school performance.
- The causes of principal turnover.
- The potential solutions for principal turnover.

Upon completion of the presentation, Ed Fuller fielded questions and received comments.

Crawford stated that many districts ask leaders to move after a certain amount of years, wanting them to take other jobs within the district.

Carter asked if these people are leaving the field of education or are they staying in the district? Carter felt this was an important variable to consider when addressing this issue.

Young said we really need to recognize this is a serious issue that we need to be focusing on as a profession especially because of the types of reforms principals are being asked to implement.

Gerry Tirozzi asked if Fuller looked at people who have come through the alternate certification route. Tirozzi stated he would guess that you would see the same type of situation regarding retention.

At this point in the meeting, Richard Laine, Director of Education, The Wallace Foundation, joined the meeting.

Laine asked if takes into consideration programs like the NYC Leadership Academy that specifically trains leaders to go into low-performing schools.

Young commented that most of the DOE grants were focused on higher education by creating partnerships with local school districts. Young thought that in a few years we will be able to talk about this with more clarity

Laine stated that EDC will be doing a research piece on district partnerships.

Wilhoit referenced the Kinsey study showing poor working conditions for those people who are leaving their positions.

Cibulka added a final question asking about to what extent is this a talent pool problem. Willhoit, moving on to next agenda point, asked Laine where we can begin from what you've learned with states districts and research.

Laine addressed working conditions – Wallace says its training of people and conditions that we put them into, changing how teachers are trained but putting them into the same system...system will win.

Carter asked if it takes into account the appropriate support mechanism or does it provide autonomy for the principal in those sets of parameters?

Laine expressed that the districts they are seeing this with the focus on instructional strategies. He referenced the RAND study and how districts address state and district collaboration. Laine then referenced the University of Washington study about what districts can do to support.

Willhoit stated we could probably identify state district and school policies roles and responsibilities, as well as supports that might begin to provide some guidance of training and conditions.

Willhoit said that in terms of training, learning more about high quality programs would be beneficial and in terms of working conditions, there is a need for quality experiences.

Tirozzi asked how we could get the study in Texas to happen in other states. He thought there is a real need, in light of new policies like turnaround and he wondered where we are going to get all of these people.

Willhoit said that we need to collect this information if we are going to have a voice.

Tirozzi expressed that 75% of all principals come from the assistant principalship; if they are not trained then they won't be successful.

Gale Connelly referenced a ten-year study on principalship. She said that their findings don't necessarily mesh with Ed Fuller's because many of their members don't come from low-performing programs. She stated that 89% of respondents said if they had to choose to be a principal again they said they would do it. She added that the principalship is a calling and there is a piece of what they do that is lost in the accountability talk.

V. REVIEW OF WHITE PAPER AND DISCUSSION

Willhoit moved on with the meeting by referencing the white paper. He stated that there are two questions:

1. Is there a desire on our part to come together to address these issues; and,
2. if so, how do we?

Wilhoit said he would like to know what the interest is?

Cibulka said that the conversation today underscored that there is a systemic problem; a problem across the policy continuum. Cibulka added we could play a unique role by embracing the profession broadly. He urged us not to just study, but to look at pilot states where we can begin to look at solutions with them.

Young said that UCEA and the deans are very committed to working with this group. She added that NPBEA has a really important role it could play if everyone was willing to come to the table and collaborate in a meaningful way.

Tirozzi added that 7 years ago we had this conversation and at the time we decided to get behind national principal certification. He said we need to have a group, but unless we have a focused agenda I'm not sure what we do.

Wilhoit asked what caused the lack of direction.

Carter explained that the NPBEA continued to struggle with what "we want to be when we grow up" and there is still a heightened sense of competitiveness that impedes a structure that is good for the all of us. He continued stating that 7 years ago we had a "come to Jesus" conversation and we were still sitting around the table having the same conversation. He said that most are not willing to ante up resources without having a direction and specificity. He added that he's been absent around this table because it's more of the same and we are all leaders and we like to talk; but when time comes for action we all duck. If it's a more elaborate conversation about no movement, then he's "outta here".

Berry said that he sees the potential of this group and would like to think about the issues and concerns and would like to think there is enough commitment on the part of the people that we can use our leverage and use it.

Carter said he tends to agree, but is not sure that our colleagues really know what we do here. He talks with a broad cross-section of our colleagues and there seems to be a disconnect between what they think is going on vs. what they would like to go on.

Brown stated that he saw this morning as the fruits of one of the projects that we started, the principals' certification. He added that we have ELCC and he would hope that we could find another such project that was meaningful; perhaps based upon some of the research we heard today.

Carter added that we are slowly losing major players who would be vitally important to pulling of something of a great magnitude. He continued that there has been a lack of that something that they can wrap their arms around and that we don't stand a chance of bringing those organizations back to the table if we lack the "something".

Flanary said that competition has been a factor, but conceptually this group makes sense. He felt that if it goes away it looks badly as a profession and that we need to find a voice; there are things out there and he I thinks there is an opportunity.

Connelly stated that her organization would be really supportive of rolling up our sleeves to help this group move forward. She said that we are viewed as defenders of the status quo and that this group has to figure out how to say “you have us pegged wrong”.

Laine said that what he’s heard is that no one wants to sit around the table just for talking sake. He added that maybe we should think about something other than national commission; something alternative to think about how to get to front of parade and to figure out what direction the parade is going. He asked about not talking about the fed level, but look at the 6 states that will win RTT to drive reform from the state level.

Carter answered that from an individual organization that’s exactly what we are trying to do.

Tirozzi said that we need to look backward then maybe forward. He continued that we talked about history of what we’ve done (ISLLC, ELCC and National standards) and it’s nice to get together, but without focus...what are we. He stated that if we can focus, he will stay on board; however, if not he’ll disband.

Carter added that important questions were on the table:

1. What is the “it”; the it that needs to be done immediately and is this may not be a commission, it may be something that we can produce more quickly. 3 or 4 areas where we could help: (1) template for states to help with RTT,

Cibulka said we need an action component.

Young referenced Connelly’s comments about overlap. She said that maybe it’s an issue of mapping, so that we can collaborate and not compete.

Carter said what bothers him, in so many of the instances, is that so much of the focus is driven by academic performance, but there are many contributing factors that need to be addressed.

Flanary mentioned the Secretary’s talk about leadership and how he talked about how paltry the contribution toward leadership was in actuality.

Crawford said the amount of money and years that they’ve put in, someone needs to look at their studies and say, “what three things come out from these studies”

Fuller added that studying the state of what’s been put out then looking at the levers needed to focus on leadership.

Flanary asked the possibilities are of getting other groups back on board.

Wilhoit said that he thinks we can, but will need to have something that is actionable

Berry stated that maybe we need to do a meta-analysis then make some larger statements.

VI. NEXT STEPS

Gene Carter stated that what he was hearing was that we are not committed to more studies and the best thing for him to do is summarize what he just said, put it in writing, embellish it in a way that it can be put in a descriptor, and then we can decide upon actions. He added that we need to focus energies on how to help those who will be garnering monies from the RTT initiative.

Cibulka asked if he would be in a position to share this boiler plate.

Carter said that he thinks we would create it. He questioned what would be the two or three leverage points to support leadership; what would they be. He thought each group needs to be able to answer this.

Tirozzi said that he would also like to have a conversation with Joe Aguerrebere about what role this group can play.

Carter asked if a group of us would want to go see Joe.

Tirozzi motioned going to see Joe A.

Berry 2nd the motion.

All voted for it unanimously.

Connelly said that he thinks sometimes there is this notion that testing rules out the possibility and that it has to be an either or. He continued that research now shows if you take care of the social/emotional issues, test scores begin to go up.

Cibulka said that messaging will be really critical because the department has a deaf ear to anything other than testing.

Crawford said she thinks the administration came in frustrated; she's frustrated too and they are saying at least let's do something.

Wilhoit said someone needs to go see Dan and Ann to ask them to come back.

VII. ELCC UPDATE

Flanary said that in December of 2008 this group approved ISLLC standards. We are now updating our own standards. He continued that at our next meeting in June we will come to this group with a new set of standards.

Wilhoit asked if there are any major issues.

Flanary answered “not really”, but if anything there was more affirmation than disagreement.

**to be brought back in June

VIII. AUDIT REPORT

Young pointed out there should be the development of a treasurer position because before it was the chair. She added that what we agreed to do was a process where the president/chair would work with a treasurer.

Wilhoit asked for a motion to accept the audit.

Cibulka motioned.

Connelly 2nd the motion.

Cibulka asked about 990 updates.

Young agreed to follow up on 990 issue.

• Budget

Wilhoit asked about next year’s budget.

Young showed the cash balance of where we are and showed the three institutions that haven’t paid their dues. She also showed that we do have seed money for new initiatives.

Flanary said we will have ELCC budget to the group in June.

VIII. MEETING DATES FOR THE NEXT SIX MONTHS

Cindy Patterson stated she will be calling everyone’s offices to make sure we can get everyone possible to next meeting.

Wilhoit adjourned meeting.

