



NATIONAL POLICY BOARD FOR EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION
Meeting Minutes
February 17, 2011
CCSSO Multi-Media Room
1:00-4:00

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Gene Wilhoit, chairperson, called the meeting to order.

Present were: Gene Wilhoit (CCSSO), James Cibulka (NCATE), Michelle Young (UCEA), Hanne MaWhinney (UCEA), James Berry (NCPEA), Linda LeMasters (NCPEA), Mary Harrill-McClellan (AACTE), Dick Flanary (NASSP), Rich Barbacane (NAESP), Ed Milliken (ASCD)

Guests: Joe Aguerrebere (NBPTS) and Gene Bottoms (SREB)

II. REVIEW OF THE AGENDA.

Chairperson Wilhoit reviewed the agenda and asked for any additional items. He explained that we want to follow-up on several themes that came out of the discussions from our last meeting. At the last meeting we discussed our frustration with the quality of many educational leadership preparation programs, the emergence of on-line, fly-by-night educational leadership programs, how to get high-quality new leaders into the pipeline, and defining what a high-quality educational leadership program might look like. We discussed possible roles that could guide NPBEA's work over the next year or two and how we should be positioned to advocate for high-quality leadership preparation and practice at the policy level. We also discussed how this might impact our work with ELCC institutions and the NPBTS credentials for high level performance by practicing administrators. In this meeting, we will follow-up on those discussions and look at how high-quality leadership practice is defined through the work emerging at UCEA, the quality master's leadership preparation at NCPEA, and the transforming teacher/leadership preparation project at NCATE.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes from September 14, 2010 were approved as presented. CCSSO staff was commended on the detail of the minutes presented.

Jim Cibulka motioned to approve the minutes.

Jim Berry seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

IV. UPDATE ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF ELCC PROGRAM STANDARDS

Dick gave a report on the results of the ELCC revised standards that were submitted last October 2010 to NCATE's Specialized Area Studies Board (SASB). He reported that the ELCC revised standards (building and district-levels) were not approved by the SASB and further work was needed to bring them in line with SASB guidelines. As a result, the ELCC Standards Revision Steering Committee convened a special follow-up meeting in December with the SASB chair, NCATE staff, and Chairperson Wilhoit to discuss SASB concerns in the areas of research, evaluation rubrics, pedagogy, differentiation between building and district levels, and ELCC Standard Eight. At that meeting, the Steering Committee was pleased to be informed that the SASB had approved ELCC's request to drop ELCC Standard Eight with the understanding that content knowledge wording would be added to the prefix of every standard. We were told that the integration of educational leadership content knowledge with professional skills in the other seven standards was acceptable. ELCC Steering committee members (Dick, Linda, Hanne) all expressed their deep gratitude to Jim Cibulka for his intervention with the SASB on this issue.

Dick told the group that the ELCC Standards Revision Steering Committee had several meetings planned over the next few months to address the issues outlined by the SASB in the December 2010 meeting. Margie Crutchfield at NCATE told the committee that once the standards are resubmitted to NCATE staff, they will submit them to SASB members for a second review and consideration. This will take at least a month. Gene Wilhoit indicated that there was general agreement at the December meeting about what needed to be done to redesign the standards to meet SASB requirements and that the SASB acknowledged the extensive research base created by UCEA researchers to supplement the new standards. He commended the hard work and dedication that Michelle's UCEA research panel had done to provide research citations and extensive research notes on each ELCC standard element. A group of NCPEA professors were also involved in the review and update of the research knowledge base. This research was a supplement to the content knowledge research that was completed for the *ISLLC 2008 Policy Standards* in 2007.

Gene Wilhoit asked when the new standards might become effective and Jim Cibulka confirmed that once the standards are approved by SASB, they would be implemented for the first time in fall, 2011. He indicated that institutional programs will then have up to 18 months in which to adapt and align their programs to the new ELCC program standards.

Michelle Young asked Jim Cibulka about strategies other specialized professional associations (SPAs) have used to roll-out their new standards. Are there things we should plan to do to roll-out the newly revised standards? Jim Cibulka indicated that he will ask Margie Crutchfield to provide some best practices gleaned from other SPA organizations. He also mentioned that NCATE will post the new standards on their website and notify NCATE coordinators about the new standards. Honor Fede told the group that she will

work with Margie Crutchfield to develop a webinar training session on the new standards that will be posted on the NCATE and NPBEA websites. Linda LeMasters told the group that at the last NCPEA annual conference a special forum was held on the new standards that was very informative and well received. She indicated that holding a forum at next year's NCPEA and UCEA conventions could also be advantageous to disseminating the new standards.

V. DEFINING HIGH QUALITY LEADERSHIP PRACTICE

a. Guidelines Development for Model University Leadership

Michelle Young gave the group an overview from the last meeting on UCEA efforts through a Wallace Foundation grant to research our collective understanding of what quality leadership preparation looks like and how that might be leveraged among UCEA institutions. Part of the challenge felt was that leveraging among UCEA institutions is one challenge, but UCEA only represents a small number of university and college leadership preparation programs. While there are over 90 UCEA institutions that prepare school leaders, there are still about 500 university-based preparation programs across the country. In addition, there are a number of non-university-based preparation programs that have the ability to certify new leaders. While it is difficult to get a handle on these non-university based institutions, Michelle's group estimates it to be about 200 programs/institutions across the country and that number continues to grow significantly. As more local education agencies and non-profit and for-profit institutions that are non-university-based open up programs to prepare leaders – it is a moving target to determine their number. Sometime they are nationally franchised and sometimes they are individually franchised within a state but it is difficult to say how many of them are out there. She expressed her concern about how accountable these programs and institutions may be for providing high-quality training and ensure that candidates know and are able to do the job of educational leaders. Except for the ISLLC and ELCC standards there does not appear to be any national system of accountability that can ensure that candidates are prepared to adequately lead schools and districts.

Gene Wilhoit asked Michelle what would drive these non-university based institutions in a quest for quality preparation. Jim Berry says that of those 90 UCEA institutions, NCPEA's membership covers a majority of the rest of the 500 institution programs. For the other non-university based institutions it could be state licensure that drives them to seek quality in their preparation of new school leaders.

Michelle continued saying that the *ISLLC 2008 Policy Standards* (ISLLC 2008) can be thought of as NPBEA's definition for what quality leadership is and it is what we (NPBEA) have put our stamp of approval on in terms of what a quality leadership looks like. Given that, NCPEA and UCEA set up a joint taskforce to understand a variety of

things including digging down into what we know and don't know about the internship, curriculum, candidate learning experiences, intern mentoring and induction, and post preparation. On top of that, another group within UCEA has developed a set of evaluation tools to measure the impact of preparation practice. Between those three efforts, she explained, our field is beginning to have an increasingly robust knowledge base around leadership preparation at the principal level. We still don't have enough at the district-level and that will be their next major area of study. Taking that knowledge base in mind, Michelle presented two tables that showed the following:

Table one provided a comparison on Quality Program Features between the ELCC program standards, UCEA program guidelines, and SREB guidelines. This comparison shows how similar the programs are on key issues and how different on others. Taking this knowledge base, the UCEA group began reviewing the current literature noted their work in the tables.

Table two focuses on what has been identified as Quality Program Features and is supported by specific research for each of program features. Table 2 shows the common quality program features that were found. These common program features show that these institutional programs have: program theory; they are standards-based (either ELCC or state standards), have candidate recruitment and selection that are connected to their program theory; they have content that is aligned to national standards and reflects their program theory and connects it to field-based experiences; they have active adult learning-based instructional activities whether they be in the classroom or in the field; they have a high-quality internship that is lengthy that has typically a set of experiences for the individual candidate; they use cohort structures and other supportive mechanisms; in terms of program organization structure and delivery they have a high degree of coherence; candidate assessments seem to be key feature that is fed back for program evaluation purposes and candidate evaluation. Another feature of these programs is that they have knowledgeable faculty and experienced practitioners; and the number of full-time faculty does make a huge difference. Faculty professional development in pedagogy and their ability to collaborate and form school district-university partnerships (co-defining of students, content) also has a stronger impact on candidate placement and candidate's likelihood of staying the field for a longer time.

Michelle told the group that in looking at Table 2, you will see that some program are more powerful than others – those are the one that are listed on page three – recruitment, selection, standards-based, curriculum coherence, use of adult learning theory, providing cohort structures, collaborative relationship. What the team did after they agreed on these features they provided research and what were the leverage points currently in place within states that support high quality preparation. Basically what they found was that states were all over the place in this regard. Nationally we do have the ISLLC standards and the ELCC program content standards.

So the next stage would be to think about what this might mean in terms of policy. The UCEA group went ahead and offered two suggestions to NPBEA. Michelle said that if we want to define and implement quality preparation you really can't have all the states coming up with their own leadership standards – this means that the NPBEA might consider the following actions:

1. The National Policy Board might push the ELCC standards to be the national leadership standards for the United States. Since these standards have already been adopted or adapted by over 40 out of the 50 states already, it makes sense to advocate for these being the national curriculum standards for educational leadership preparation. If we would like to see the type of consistency and coherence in curriculums across the country (university-based and non-university based) that the research supports in high quality programs, it will be important for the NPBEA to advocate a push of the use of the ELCC program standards as the national set of program content standards.
2. So that leads us to our second proposition that the NPBEA promotes a second set of the program features standards that are research-based. Now what that would mean that those would have to be, just like the ISLLC and ELCC standards, renewed on a seven year process. Jim and I have been going talking about how these would need to go through a seven year process to update the research to be sure that it is current.
3. Third, we might look at developing program evaluation that can be helpful for states but also tool for engaging programs for program improvement. The NPBEA might consider and think through developing Program Evaluation and what we might do around program evaluation, graduate assessment, and looking at graduate placement as indicators of quality. Those issues can be found on page five. Program evaluation can be helpful to get a sense to see how programs are doing but we can use it as a tool to evaluate program improvement. So while we already use the ELCC standards as a quality assurance system under NCATE accreditation, we still have a real problem in terms of ensuring program quality those programs that are not NCATE accredited. We have a variety of other organizations that prepare and certify school leaders that don't go through this quality review process. We need to figure out a way that anyone who trains and certifies new leaders has to go through the same kind of quality assurance process that we use for NCATE. Accreditation. If the ELCC was adopted nation-wide then we could have a national test instead of a variety of state tests with differentiated cut-scores. We could set a national cut-score so that only the best and brightest become administrators. If NCATE and our individual organizations could promote more strongly for adoption of the ELCC standards this could have a huge impact. Then adding to that of program features that we could support as well

then in a couple of years we might be in a much better place in terms of program quality across the country.

Jim Cibulka commended Michelle on the work that has been done in this report. This is really a great list of features. He asked her if the ELCC assessments track closely to what we know about program features. Michelle said that she is not sure. The ELCC has an internship assessment, assessment of instructional leadership, internship, and assessments of candidates ability to support student learning. Michelle said that one of things they thought would be helpful would be to develop an assessment rubric for the program features such as recruitment and selection. This would supplement the program content assessments that are built into the ELCC standards. The program features research for high quality programs outline features that are different from the ELCC program content standards but if there were a set of assessments for these features that would be complementary to the what is being by the ELCC program content standards.

This would look different than the curriculum assessments that the ELCC does with its content standards. A nice addition to NCATE, would be to have an input standard that might include these program features but if NCATE couldn't adopt these as a program input standard then the NPBEA could adopt their own program features standards and assessments to support the content piece that the ELCC standards cover. Hanne added that the ELCC standards have broken ground on one of the program features outlined in the UCEA research – a high quality internship. She indicated that ELCC Standard 7 and assessment rubric outlines specific competencies for a high quality internship program. With regard to the other program features, those other s are not covered by the ELCC standards. Dick commended Michelle's work very well done. Obviously prior to 2002, we had a number of input standards that were part of the ELCC process. We were under the assumption that NCATE would not allow us to go there. I would very much welcome a discussion with NCATE staff around this issue. Jim Cibulka responded that NCATE staff is not of one mind on the use of input standards so is unsure of NCATE's receptivity in this regard.

Gene Wilhoit asked the question on whether there might be a better place where the program features might be better promoted. Maybe NCATE is not the place that would be the driver. Dick asked Gene about the conversations that are happening on the hill around reauthorization of ESEA particularly the Senate staff committee – we are convinced that there is going to be pressure brought to bear on school districts in the reauthorization but often they raise the question on how we can impact leadership preparation – so there is some interest out there. It is an active question and Senate staffers are looking into this question. Gene Wilhoit said that we have an opportunity to leverage the national policy discussion and reauthorization discussion on this issue. We

may exert some influence over reauthorization. If we could organize them that is clear and structured, policy people can respond to our position. Hanne added that we could also have some strong presence at the state legislatures. Many of these state bodies are riding on the promise of turning around but they are recent. What is in our favor – we can show what we have done well that is research-based, but that doesn't fly as well some state bodies. We need to strategize how we can move the states to adopt our standards for curriculum and program features. How can we get them to buy into these standards? We have to show them that we have an effect and where we could show examples of exemplars that would be more powerful. Linda suggested we need a critical action piece to this for how to implement these standards and tap into those organizations that have members who can support these standards at the state level. Gene raised an important question on “How do we tap into these state groups or associations that influence them?” This is a huge political action. There was some discussion of different type of group organizations that we might tap into like the school boards or superintendents. We need to look more closely at implementation strategies and how to reach key members within states – legislative bodies, active state leadership academies.

Gene Bottoms stated that superintendents are feeling pressure to get principals who can turn around a school. Most of preparation for principals for those tough schools is done at the local level. Several large districts are recruiting and customized retraining program to fit candidates into the positions. SREB has found that superintendents feel better with graduates from state leadership academies. They find that many institutions are so strapped for resources that not many are willing to commit resources to be innovative with their leadership programs and do what it takes to improve. Jim Cibulka mentioned that they have found that the size of educational leadership programs are bigger than any other discipline and these big programs often serve as “cash cow” programs for the rest of the college or education unit. Many deans will use the funds from the educational leadership program to fund the other programs in the department. This means that the educational leadership program is often found without resources. Jim Cibulka stated that another problem is changing the fact that many candidates at university-based programs take the leadership programs but do not intend or actually go into the field after graduation. Research shows that a large number of candidates stay in the teaching field and only go through leadership preparation for the pay-scale jump it gives them within the school district. We also have a large number of programs who use adjunct faculty who may or may not have the necessary pedagogy and content knowledge to teach. However, it should be noted that many states are starting to close this loop-hole in the programs.

b. Quality Master's Leadership Preparation

Jim Berry told the group that there are about 500+ university-based programs, and other additional non-university-based institutions who certify school and district leaders. For instance, in Michigan the professional leadership association has applied for status by the state to train and certify school principals in direct competition with the university-based programs. And there are other state academies, school districts, and private providers who are getting involved with preparing school leaders at the local level. NCPEA began in 1947 to represent professors of educational administration. It predates UCEA by 10 years. NCPEA began because it wanted to represent individual professors. They now represent the largest body of educational leadership professors at university-based programs across the country.

NCPEA is currently looking at what they can do as an organization to define a quality leadership preparation. They have worked with UCEA extensively to help research this important topic. Gene Wilhoit asked if this individual membership has caused a problem with their professors not having leverage over provosts or institutional decisions. Jim Berry explained that this past year NCPEA has changed its membership to add institutional membership and they have begun to look at creating an induction system for new institutional members at the master's degree level.

In terms of where we are to date, NCPEA has been working with UCEA over the past six-eight months to look going to this institutional route and defining what quality program preparation might look like. They have a group from NCPEA and UCEA both complementary organizations that plans to send out a document representing the two organizations and providing guidelines and parameters that could be used by any program around the country.

Jim Berry explained that NCPEA agrees with the information that Michelle presented and he outlined additional areas where NCPEA suggests further discussion and possible action:

1. The role of alternative preparation programs including online that don't fall under these standards or program effectiveness parameters, including hybrid preparation models that don't fall in within the research parameters outlined in Michelle's study. NCPEA doesn't feel that the standards have changed programs as much as the assessment activities have in terms of requiring candidate seat time. It may change very much a traditional preparation program, but NPBEA needs to think more broadly about defining alternative preparation programs and getting our arms around what may be very strict standards and guidelines that may work with traditional preparation but aren't going to exactly fit what is emerging out of alternative programs. So this is part of what NCPEA has talked about that needs to be addressed.

2. A second thought NCPEA has talked about is looking at developing standards for teacher leadership and the emerging role of teacher leaders. With all that is out there that is focused on decentralized leadership it makes sense to expand leadership preparation to include teacher leadership. It is not all about principal preparation. We have been advised to look at what the faculty do in terms of delivery, what is the motivation for that type of student, we want to understand the content of this type of leadership curriculum. So those are some of the things that NCPEA in partnership with UCEA is going to be looking at in the near future.

Jim Berry told the group that NCPEA is the key organization that represents the “scholar practitioner” – many NCPEA members are professors who have a background as leaders either at the school or district level. NCPEA has felt that they represent this group. They plan to aim this at policy-makers, school leaders, professors of educational administration, and all educational organizations. Michelle and Jim met to look at putting something together – guidelines and parameters – that can guide leadership preparation over the next seven years. He said that if we could put together some sort of National Guideline’s document that NPBEA members could all endorse - this might be able to address some of the larger issues and move us forward on the national policy front. It would also give NPBEA visibility and would place the organization as the authority for high quality leadership preparation. It would be a group collective work that all members could endorse and buy into.

Gene Wilhoit summarized Jim’s presentation by saying that it is obvious that both organizations have had good conversations on these issues maybe with different viewpoints and both organizations are feeling the need for greater standardization and practice.

Jim Berry went further to explain that many institutions have been looking for guidance on making their programs better and with many smaller institutions who graduate a large number of leadership candidates we are not sure they are getting the kind of support and guidance for making their programs better. NCPEA is for them the only game in town for those programs.

Gene Bottom described that states that have alternative programs are changing the way new principals get licensed and are starting their own academies. He doesn’t think that they are totally invested in alterative programs but that it is a case that they given up on changing higher education preparation. A number of folks are feeling that higher education is not changing to meet the needs of today’s leaders. Jim Berry told the group that there is an attitude and belief that alternative programs are quality programs and they create competition with university and college-based leadership

programs. He said that what is really happening is that the field of educational leadership has become intensely competitive for student enrollments and some programs are lowering their standards so much just to entice more candidates into their programs. There is the wrong belief out there that the market will determine quality programs but that is not what is happening.

Michelle added that there is not a system in place out there to ensure that preparation programs that are doing a shoddy job are closed down and those that are doing a good job are highlighted whether they are university-based or not. If the NPBEA body was able to create a system that either pushing accreditation for all organizations, or pushing ELCC standards as the national leadership program standards for all institutions, and then we came to agreement around a set of high-quality program features - it would do a lot for ensuring high-quality preparation programs in all types of training program. If you compare what SREB has done, to what UCEA has done, and what research has shown there is a lot of complementary features; but there is also some differences. For instance, there is not a lot of research that looks at institutional capacity and yet both UCEA and SREB have those as key program features for quality but the research is not there yet. But we all agree that that is an important part and so if a program is enrolling a large number of candidates who are not getting jobs but is using it as a “cash cow” then we agree that it won’t probably be a high-quality program.

Dick Flanary added that non-traditional entities are growing and is of huge concern to NASSP. They have been hard on the feds around this whole issue of reporting transformation principals. They feel that when the feds depend on only one person for turning around schools – this becomes problematic versus using a leadership team approach which is what they are seeing – through the use of teacher leaders and building leadership teams. But there are people out there chasing the money and NASSP has been approached by private companies around this issue of preparing turn-around principals and it’s scary.

Hanne MaWhinney suggested that NPBEA look at what we know about good preparation and use this as a benchmark to disseminate to state and national policy-makers for their use in regulation. She indicated that it might be a useful discussion for leveraging the king of change we want to see in preparation programs. This is a great opportunity for NPBEA to be a powerful voice that regulatory bodies might consider on this issue of defining high-quality leadership preparation.

c. Transforming Teacher/Leader Preparation through Clinical Practice

Jim Cibulka explained that NCATE's work on the Transforming Teacher Preparation is a national project to profile what high-quality preparation of teachers looks like and is very parallel to what we were discussing about leadership preparation and what you feel is missing in high-quality leadership preparation. So this report was released in November at the National Press Club. Secretary Duncan came and praised the research as it turns teacher preparation upside down and underscores fundamental transformation of teacher preparation. The two main differences found in the study are that we need to focus much more closely on critical components that are weaved throughout teacher preparation programs giving teacher candidates an opportunity to learn their practice which is what is done in other fields like architecture, medicine, law and nursing and secondly we need to develop much stronger partnerships with schools in the selection of the candidates, the design of the program, etc. - very similar things to what program features Michelle Young discussed earlier for leadership preparation. Many of the components outlined in this project that we say must be part of high-quality teacher preparation programs, which is often missing at the present time, includes the diversity of the candidate pool, preparing candidates who can use data to inform instruction, much better use of technology, and a focus on the needs of diverse learners in high needs schools. The study does not say there is any one best way to do these things but has 10 design principles of which we believe can guide the transformation of preparation programs. The report has recommendations that fall into five different areas. Rather than have this be another report that sits on a shelf we are working with a group of states to identify an NCATE alliance on teacher preparation and they are committing themselves to redesign their programs in the following ways:

1. to build and test prototypes of clinically based programs in partnerships with school districts;
2. to build an evidentiary base about the effectiveness of the graduates of these programs and the quality of the programs;
3. to identify and remove the policy barriers that exist to innovation which allow for this transformation and those policy barriers are sometimes at the state level, local level, collective bargaining, and many are at the higher education policy and practices. All of those need to be addressed.
4. to work to scale up these prototypes so that they are system-wide.

There are eight states who will be working on these prototypes and another group that wants to join.

As Jim Cibulka thought about the implications of this for leadership preparation, he suggested that, we need to prepare principals and superintendents who can work with the kinds of teachers we want to produce. If we produce the kinds of teachers we want to produce and they go into schools that do not support the transformational image we want to prevail we will have failed. The other way of thinking is that this report could be used as a leverage for leadership preparation to piggyback onto what NCATE has been able to get as far as visibility for this report. We are very hopeful that this report is going to have a long shelf-life and lead to wide-spread change for teacher preparation. We have made a lot of changes in the way accreditation as a process works and this was the thought would be a key to a new set of standards that drive higher level of performance. The new accrediting body, CAPE, has said very clearly that they intend to raise the bar and ask more of accredited institutions and are prepared to close down institutions that have programs that don't meet these standards.

Jim Cibulka stressed that he feels that leadership preparation should come along and be right at the front of this conversation. Linda LeMasters asked how he sees that happening. Jim responded that one way NPBEA could create its own taskforce to address something analogous to the NCATE report. Or a second possibility would be for NPBEA to develop a follow-up report after getting testimony from leading people in our field about how leadership preparation coheres with teacher preparation and tracks onto the transformations that are needed – that would be a less ambitious strategy and maybe more realistic. Jim Cibulka shared the sentiment that something very dramatic is needed to send to the policy community and to the public that we are prepared to police ourselves and we have to show evidence that we are doing this. The new accrediting body is going to have more rigorous standards, more rigorous performance requirements, and report annually on the performance of the institutions at the aggregate level, and give feedback to institutions on their performance relative to their peers.

NCATE is beginning to work with eight states and every preparatory institution within those states to build prototypes of clinically based practice in Maryland, New York, Tennessee, Louisiana, Ohio, Colorado, Oregon, and California. One of the discussions NCATE is having now with these states is how do we identify prototypes of clinically-based programs. We know there are strong clinically-based programs out there who probably have some of the characteristics identified in these 10 design principles but it's unlikely that they have them all. NCATE is also discussing conducting an environmental scan to pick up exemplars that might be used as the basis for prototype – the question is how common would this prototype in Maryland, New York, versus Tennessee. The states are all at different places on this – Tennessee already one model prototype developed. Jim Berry asked if NCATE envisions whether we are talking about working with large

institutions that have all 21 SPAs or just one or two programs out of each institution to develop these prototypes. Jim Cibulka indicated that the latter was probably more realistic. NCATE will select major programs that have comparability across the prototypes; they probably need to be in urban and rural areas in order to have a diverse group. Jim Berry asked if the ELCC was slated to be in the prototype study. Jim Cibulka answered that he was here to talk about possible connections we might leverage. As the new chairperson to the NPBEA, Jim stated that there might be a special opportunity to leverage this in a way that another SPA doesn't. Jim Berry thinks there could be great synergy on this if NCPEA and UCEA could come together on this.

Michelle Young said that this goes beyond our groups and could be larger. Maybe we could use this NCATE project to give us visibility with the development of a policy paper conversation with legislators about high-quality leadership preparation. Jim Cibulka mentioned that they had to create a blue ribbon panel with a wide-range of stakeholders including alternative providers which gave the report a lot of credibility and legitimacy. Overall it got good press and that became a leverage for having important policy conversations and created buy-in from political players. Jim Cibulka feels that we need something to create visibility on this issue.

Jim Berry suggested that the NPBEA may want to think about going out and identifying a group of ELCC programs that might be open to participating in the development of an ELCC prototype. Jim Cibulka cautioned that we would need to make sure the states were open to the idea but he thought it would be good and that we could make the argument that these two are so complementary and that you can't succeed in teacher transformation without also transforming leadership preparation. Hanne mentioned that Maryland is already redesigning their leadership programs so we are not in a vacuum in this. We are in a great position for change and leading guiding transformation on leadership preparation.

Gene Wilhoit summarized the discussion and said that it seems that all of us see a need for action in a number of areas that would correct what all of us perceive as major issues around leadership identification and support. Just to pick up on a phrase we are going to have to accelerate attention to this and provide some solutions. Someone is going to have to deal with the issue and it seemed to him that there were a lot of issues that are being done, but not sure that anyone has woven this into a resource base that would be helpful to the field. He didn't know if the UCEA group could do some of this and capture all of these various resources in a way that gives peoples a conceptual framework for what's exists right now or what's possible. We need to weave these activities together to rally support. But among our resources we do now have agreement around the use of the ISLLC 2008 policy standards to guide policy and state licensure and we have the new ELCC program standards to define program content - we now have an opportunity to declare that we are in agreement on a set of national content standards that could be

promoted widely and endorsed by all of our associations - that would be a powerful statement for the country. Secondly we agreed that it would be very helpful for the country if we had some form of university evaluation laid out in some way that includes benchmarking against quality assurances for the profession and training for the profession. That needs to be presented in a way that differentiates novice candidate from mastery of practice candidates, maybe with a set of criteria or matrices around those to help us clarify what we mean by the differences in those programs. . With the top of that being professional practice at the national board but again quality practices being identified as well. All of these have been put on the table and we will try to capture them for your consideration at the next meeting.

What we have sort of skirted around is a set of actions that if all of these things are done, may still leave us with a policy environment that doesn't support this quality work. We have talked about differentiation in the quality of programs and the lack of rigor at the state level in terms of oversight so it seems to me that to complement those kind of changes in practices, standards, and preparation we have got to have a set of strategies around influencing state collective actions. We haven't gotten into that yet but it is something that we need to address to get teeth into this in order to bring them along.

We have now a model on the table that might help us cut a path through all of these issues and that is what Jim Cibulka has presented. We could advocate for the fundamental difference, laying out the basic components, engaging a group of well known and represented individuals who could be a part of making the final determination and going public with it, and identification of some pioneers collective action with the state context. All of those things could be some possibilities for us to consider. We will all need to determine who among us can do what.

Clearly collective voices will be critical in our future efforts. One of us can't do what all of us can do together in this area. However, there may be certain roles for NPBEA and individual roles for various actors in this room, but most of us are in agreement that these actions need to be taken to get high-quality school and district leaders. It will be critical that all of our voices are heard collectively. On state collective action, the lever there is that if we buy the concept that there are going to be multiple pathways to the profession the only way you are going to guarantee high-quality is for states to set those entry-level criteria. If they don't do that then you are going to get the low-common denominator which brings in the questions about quality control. Gene said he would like to explore some more about what kind of delivery system are we going to need and do we have such different roles in leadership that we are going to have further differentiates the programs for training. Can you prepare a person in a building level position in the same way as the central office? Our ELCC standards say not. We may need to say something about who does the training, credentialing, and the type of university/college program. We know that some institutions should not be in this profession, we have other institutions who are

good at preparing practitioners, and others who are good at conducting research. We need to look at institutions and a differentiation of their roles in leadership preparation.

Gene Bottoms asked what should a principal know on instructional leadership and supporting teachers in math. These are issues that the country is struggling with leadership turnover. Michelle said that the research on leadership turnover shows that if you stick a new principal in an urban environment, they don't have good track record of staying. So we know it is not a good idea to place a novice principal in an urban high school setting. This is one area that the NPBEA might consider working on a policy on "leadership progression" with research to support each stage of the progression. Since the NPBEA is interested in leadership development, we should consider supporting the development of a platform statement about "leadership progression" (succession planning) and that there certain levels of development of which one would be an induction program that is focused on the practical particulars for an entry-level novice administrator - this would go beyond the ELCC standards and what is taught and learned in a principal preparation program.

Hanne MaWhinney explained that she had a doctoral student who studied instructional leadership with a mentor in a district focusing on supporting teacher professional development, integrating technology. We found that the principal of the urban school was not involved in these areas. When we looked closer the principal was concerned about putting the right person in the job. We are seeing a huge demographic shift and schools are experiencing a large number of people in principal positions with only one or two years of experience.

Gene Bottoms said that we need to address succession planning in schools in a more meaningful way. Gene Bottom said that SREB has found that their work is mostly with high school principals and working as a team to give ownership to the group. Principals need to be able to engage the team through distributed leadership where you have a community of people who are engaged in professional learning communities. The training of principals has to include the training of teams within schools – leaders need to know how to work as part of a team. Principals are not well trained to create a high school organization structure where you have communities working together for student achievement. This is what we are looking at with Race-to-the-Top proposal.

VI. WHAT'S NEXT?

Gene Wilhoit told the group that at the next meeting we will be prepared to lay out a scope of work for the NPBEA's role based on our discussions at this meeting.

VII. NPBEA BUSINESS UPDATE

- A. **Vote on Treasurer:** Gene Wilhoit asked for nominations for a new NPBEA treasurer as Michelle Young's term is due to expire. Rich Barbacane asked for a motion to nominate Gail Connelly at NAESP for the Treasurer position. Michelle Young seconded the motion. The motion was passed unanimously.

- B. **Resolution to NPBEA Bank of America Account:** Honor Fede asked for a resolution to open a NPBEA bank account at Bank of America and transfer our NPBEA money from the local bank in Missouri to the Bank of America account. The reason for this request is ease of access. A motion was made by Michelle Young and seconded by Gene Wilhoit to accept this resolution. The motion was passed unanimously.

- C. **Website Update and May Meeting:** Honor Fede told the group that the NPBEA website had been successfully transferred from UCEA to an outside website provider called "Network Solutions". This group will provide us with 24/7 technical support and a Microsoft platform that will make it easy for updating resources on the NPBEA website and it has greater flexibility and capability for future growth in NPBEA activities. In addition, for a low maintenance fee per year, the NPBEA will not need to depend on the technical capacity of one of our member associations.

The next NPBEA meeting was scheduled for May 10, 2011 at CCSSO headquarters.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Gene Wilhoit adjourned the meeting at 4:15 p.m.