



# ***National Policy Board for Educational Administration***

## **OFFICIAL MEETING MINUTES**

December 8, 2008, 12:00-4:00 pm

NAESP Headquarters

### **1. Welcome And Introductions**

Young welcomed participants, called the roll of member organizations, and introduced guests.

**In Attendance:** Sandy Harris, NCEA; James Cibulka, NCATE; Jane West, AACTE; Lois Adams Rogers, CCSO; Richard Flanary, NASSP; Agnes Crawford, ASCD; Honor Fede, ELCC; Fred Brown, NAESP; Michelle Young, UCEA; Bradley Carpenter, UCEA; Richard Schwab, CADREI; M. Terry Orr, UCEA Evaluation Research Taskforce.

**Not Represented:** NSBA, AASA

### **2. Review Of The Agenda**

Young reviewed the agenda and asked members if they have any additional items for consideration. No additional items were suggested.

### **3. Approval Of The Minutes**

Young asked the members to review and approve the minutes of the August 2008 meeting.

Cibulka mentioned that the minutes were the most complete set of minutes he had ever read. Adams Rogers requested that the minutes be distributed prior to the meeting for review.

Cibulka moved to approve

Jane West provided a 2<sup>nd</sup>

Young asked if there were any questions or additions. Lois had a correction to **page 14**... "Wilhoit suggested" Odden and Jim Kelley (HR commission). Fede listed correction on **page 14** Honor said standards would be ready fall 2010.

All in favor - Unanimous

### **4. Supporting Systematic Change In The Preparation Of Educational Leaders**

Young introduced the conversation with Dean Richard Schwab, U. Connecticut and current president of CADREI-the Council of Deans from Research Education Institutions. She noted that during the previous NPBEA meeting that it was suggested that we should work with deans organizations to better understand college of education and faculty capacity for change and that Deans should be represented at this table.

Topic one: is educational leadership on the agenda for deans?

Schwab mentioned that while at one time ed ad deans were standard, that today not too many edad deans are left.

Cibulka said that perhaps less than 20% were EDAD deans

Schwab worked with his faculty to review all of UCONN's programs, purposes of programs, and the hallmark of their programs are quality and selection. For example, in teacher education all candidates are rigorously front end selected...students don't get in until end of 2<sup>nd</sup> year, 800 kids apply to get in for 130 seats. Schwab emphasized the

importance of clinical experiences (teachers have 210 days). Another hallmark of the UCONN program's is their emphasis on outcomes. For example, the admin prep program follows masters required state degree with a 6<sup>th</sup> year program offering a cert for the principalship. Many of their former teacher candidates return to UCONN for principal cert program. Their EdD has also been redesigned through the CPED initiative being led by David Imig and Carnegie. The EdD is now focused on preparing candidates for practice.

Unfortunately, this level of attention to program redesign is not standard among Deans. Although, he doesn't think there is a dean out there that doesn't think EDAD is important, their focus is more likely to be teacher education. The CADREI research deans group thinks edad programs are important and that they have improved over the last ten years, but many feel these programs still have work to do, particularly around their clinical experiences. Resources are an issue. Programs need to have mentorship in place, but funding cuts will make this difficult, not just in public institutions, also happening at private institutions. He asserted that changes will be intense over the next couple of years, worries about revenue over quality.

West asked if there were any groups that looked at research in area of alternate routes.

Schwab indicated that he did not know, and pulled out the study in NPBEA packets by Hammond et al (leaders for a changing world) which he pointed out is an excellent resource as it identifies the features of preparation programs that are linked to quality performance.

Young noted that there is not as much published research on alternative options as there currently is focused on university based programs, mainly because they are fairly recent developments. She gave example of New Leaders, which is just now getting enough data info to disaggregate.

Young referenced Wilhoit comment from the last NPBEA meeting, in which he expressed the need for the NPBEA to we send a powerful message to the field. There are 505 university based masters programs that prepare leaders, even more cert only programs both in and out of the university.

Schwab asked how many of the 505 are approved

Fede says this number fluctuates e to state alliances...Fede said they see about 250

Cibulka, said this is part of the problem, but current pressure around teacher prep is so intense that it has crowded out attention to leadership reform

Schwab noted that the best way to change this situation is to provide seed money. Imig and Carnegie, for example, helped bring the EdD to the action stage, by finding resources to study the issue and to bring major insitutions together to change their programs. Not all of the programs look the same, either. They have taken best practice and made it work in their contexts. He noted that he would have not changed the UCONN edd program were it not for this opportunity... "if your going to do something you have to think of how dean can delegate to get it done"

Cibulka wondered if Schwab thought NPBEA could reengage the deans around this issue, seems like maybe 8 years or so ago there was a great deal of frustration...could we reengage the research deans it could be a very powerful driver..

Schwab said yes and noted that he is more optimistic than ever, the new faculty he has hired are awesome, their work is school based, they know how to build coalition, excited that many need clinical experience, but have recognized they need two tiers of professors, academics and clinical...also challenged to group to look at the teacher reform movement...

Orr asked schwab to speak to the mentorship of new deans....deanship is revolving door much like the superintendent.

Schwab and West noted AACTE's new dean workshop and Schwab noted that he has worked hard at UCONN to develop leadership capacity from within...working on how to mentor new deans, there are thoughts that deans don't need support but this isn't the case.

Flanary, mentioned the clayton book on disrupting class, which is about online learning. He asked Schwab for his opinion.

Schwab asserted that some information you can get online, but effective leadership training is not a good candidate. You wouldn't get far with online internship or team building support. Candidates need real individual support, UCONN developed a blend of online and in person support. He mentioned there are other deans at major institutions that are doing online successful

Honor asked NCATE, are you getting more and more online programs?

Cibulka mentioned that there are a separate set of expectations for online learning and finding that policies they have are not sufficiently current for rapidly changing phenomena. He noted that he had no objection to online as long as it is used appropriately. It is just a medium, were going to look at it right away there is great concern...

Topic Two: ELCC

Young, mentioned that ELCC area has a low pass rate compared to other SPAS and that this is another reason for asking him to join us. He had mentioned mentorship, assessments, how to put those things into format that reviewers can digest..we are finding that this is initially tough for colleges to grasp the ELCC expectations...we were hoping to get a sense of how we get that moving a bit....how do we build capacity.

Fede, referenced NCATE's orientation meetings are very helpful...but so often EDAD people are not there, all money is spent on teacher prep so that's who comes, the idea is that it will trickle down, but it doesn't.

Schwab agreed that even at UNCoNN training is most often attended by teacher leadership, if one of my teacher prep programs doesn't cut muster I'm under fire, but not the same with edad.

Crawford noted that the ELCCs approach has a greater emphasis on the application of skills vs. research, the need for leaders to be practically oriented vs. research oriented. There seems to be a lack of understanding of what performance assessment are.

Cibulka, ncate has moved towards candidate performance, at the SPA level assessment of outcomes dominates with little ability to link outcomes back to inputs...online learning is an example of this...there is a problem in the way we have structured our inquiries...our advanced programs for teachers have not received attention, we are not responding to the needs of our most experienced professionals in the field, the lack of opportunities for teachers are forcing them to go into these leadership programs. In our traditional programs we don't look at cost versus actual placement and costs of what is produced at all, traditional institutions haven't looked at it this way...NLNS is trying to show the relationship between costs and production...do we have enough data on how effective they are we don't know...our traditional programs may need to be smaller and some shut down.

Flanary, also noted that the pushback has been enormous around the clinical experience expectations.

Orr added that the internship issue is two pronged problem...quality internship makes a difference...finding internships models that people will fund...there are federal funding mechanisms...but people are not using them in a way that is wholesale rather than retail...we do need to think about how to enter in a way that we can address systemic change....research does show that better internships lead to better outcomes.

Schwab, Richard always thought that money is wasted on teacher prep where we oversupply...need to prepare teacher that can stay, feel same way about leadership programs...Maybe we don't need to prepare 5000 for 200 jobs just because they provide for tuition revenue...maybe we add things like placement and retention data. He referenced the work that Young did with Orr and Baker that demonstrates that 2/3 of states overproduce...



Flanary, last 5 years foundation world has looked at leadership...always surprised at how much funding New Leaders gets...they have been there 4 years...and have produced 400 people...what does this say  
Schwab-it says that resources matter. He reiterated an earlier point, that clinical experiences, done well, are expensive. If you give top institutions the same kind of resources, he would bet that they would prepare an excellent cadre of leaders rivaling or exceeding New Leaders. In fact, many currently do, even without extra funding.

Topic Three: COE Resources for Edad

Young inquired about COE funding. what is the typical relationship with program hours and resources that are coming back into the college of ed? And are COE deans in a position to influence that?

Schwab, said at one U you got to keep what you make, one none, one hybrid...just is very differentiated by U. Rookie deans get their clocks cleaned on these issues. U's have put in incentive for online programs because of space, resources, etc. Actually thinks that online learning is not much more cost effective than face-to-face.

Coming back to the issue of how to put edad on a provosts radar, what gets put on provosts screen is what you put on there. At UCoNN we narrowed our focus for both teachers and principals...fortunately provost and president bought this argument and because of our ranking its now on presidents agenda...data has swayed both pres and provost to protect education

Young, what advice would you have for colleagues...

Schwab: make your programs the best programs on campus, make them rigorous, have data that supports the fact your principals are being selected and stay. You also have to make the case that better quality is more important than large quantities.

Young, our assumption at the last meeting is that Deans have leverage to support effective change in leadership prep programs, I'm wondering what is it that you have done is possible at other institutions?

Schwab, Richard, the things you can do is make sure all of your programs are outcome based, have data that supports your programs, show where you students stack up as compared with the other students at the institution. Biggest attention getter was landing the gift from Raymond Neag...if ed schools can raise this kind of money than they are important part of what we do.

Cibulka, the institutional contexts vary greatly, deans wherever they are have a lot of leverage to execute reform...I begin from the assumption that if deans were given more attention to this than we would get a lot more change

Schwab, the question is how do we get on our agenda? When is the last big report that you could put in front of deans for leverage. How do we get these reports in front of deans groups. Can you finding funding so that you we do that David G. IMIG did for EDDs? The letter NPBEA drafted is a good idea, but it probably wont help much. You need a different approach to get and keep the attention of the deans. If you came up with a report that NECTAF "no dream denied report" if you could get some seed money to reform programs...then, you would make progress.

West, visibility is key...two thoughts...AACTE has annual meeting every year, feb 10 is in Atlanta...NPBEA could host a reception at annual meeting, dean groups meet at annual meeting, other thing is that you have a champion in a significant position [as Hammond did], there are champions of school leaders on the hill, if you could design some type of study that could inform the national research council -- the transition should be taken advantage of.

Schwab the incoming president of CADREI is Gmelch and CADREI is a good group to work with on these leadership issues. It is the 120 leading research universities...most logical place to tap the audience is AACTE agenda...but you need to figure out what you want deans to do.

Lois, this point is very important...what is the ask. Maybe the more personal interaction is a better first step.

Jane, we have a project that we are working on concerning the preparing of SPED teachers, they have put together an advisory board...maybe put together a group of deans who have an EDAD background...what would you want them to do?

Cibulka, we would have to use the deans that have leadership as a discipline that can advise the others...otherwise you are just taking to the group that knows there is a problem..

Young, then NPBEA needs to turn the focus from we won't tolerate this to help us identify a solution.

West, yes, school leaders are the solution, this is where you want to be looking, the more you tie principal and administrator issues with teacher quality, this is the key topic, tie the two together...its part of the solution.

Brown, this is a wonderful approach, less aggressive but based on research

### **5. Program Standards Committee Report and Administrative Update**

Flanary explained that the ELCC is in the midst of the revising of the ELCC program standards. They are following the same structure used during ISSLC revision. He explained the steering committee's responsibilities in regards to actual decisions. Members include: Fred Brown, Agnes Crawford, Frank Duffy, Lou Finch, Hanne Mawhny, Joe Simpson, Honor Fede and Dick Flanary. They have a tech assistance group that's working to develop a draft of the revised ELCC standards. This group includes Jim Berry, David Turner, Pam Tucker, Linda Skria, David Parks, Celeste Diem, Gail Goolich, Doris Curtis, Keith Meyer, and Raymond Harcher. Next month we would like to have a draft of elcc standards that we can share with public for commentary. We will then bring these to the NPBEA at the end of the summer. Ultimately, we must submit them to NCATE in fall of 2010. We did not prepare a revised budget for this meeting. We can put one together and send one out for distribution. With regard to the memo of understanding with honor and hood college, her MOU has been revised with NAASP that if she were to leave it would require at least a semester of notification.

Young, what happens between draft of standards and fall submission...how does the feedback from the field get used?

Fede, 1<sup>st</sup> draft gets distributed through field through NPBEA, then that information comes back to the TAC. They will use that info to form 2<sup>nd</sup> draft which would hopefully come out in late spring. At this point it would be disseminated again for a 2<sup>nd</sup> time. At that point feedback would either go to the TAC or to the steering committee, hopefully by fall of 2009 they would be able to present standards at NPBEA meeting.

Young, is part of the feedback loop to send it back to the programs that have been through ELCC review.

Honor, indicated in the affirmative through NCATE, though rather than ELCC directly.

Young, please send a detailed invoice for the revised cost.

### **6. ELCC Online Training for Programs and Reviewers**

Honor Fede went over the current ELCC pass rate statistics and explained the various categories. Pass rate on revised reports is much higher than initial. In this way the ELCC differs from NCATE that recognized with probation is not a bad thing. Honor looks at three categories together as positive. Fede noted how the numbers of programs that ELCC reviews has grown, necessitating the preparation of more reviewers. She has set up two webinar training dates and between interest and delivery, went from 21 to 16 than after the first date number went to 14. Fede explained the training: 1<sup>st</sup> day a two-hour webinar, then gave them 3 days to do a mock-review. Honor reviewed all reports than pulling out items that touched upon quality of review. Then brought the group back to have a reflective discussion, then she assigned the team another report to review. They are planning to hold several these, once in the winter and once in

spring. Final judge will be when the audit committee reviews the final product. Also have another webinar training January 8.

Brown, noted that moving this to online is a challenge. We used to bring people into DC for the training and that was a perk.

Cibulka, will there be a traditional training and webinar?

Fede, yes we will use both methods, this is an added value.

Cibulka, how about the identification of assessments that are of value.

Fede, mentioned a question at the end of the report that would have the reviewer note quality model assessments...

Cibulka, when you are doing the institutional training you would refer to this? Does ELCC have it's own website...could we pull those up on the ELCC website?

Fede, I have sample assessments on the NPBEA website now, I can't copy. It would be much better to have on NCATE website under ELCC...maybe two sections, one being performance assessments. Performance assessments is where real issue is located. Assessments are still the big issue with reviewers on reports.

Young, we mentioned these concerns during our last meeting. There is a real need to identify effective assessments that can used for accreditation review as well as to provide faculty with information that helps them make program improvements.

### **7. Evaluating the Impact of Educational Leadership Preparation**

Young introduced Terry Orr and gave a brief introduction to Terry's work with program improvement.

Orr gave history of task force and how it was formed with the purpose of developing high quality program evaluation tools that could be used to measure program impact and inform program improvement work. In the past we lacked methods, and means to do the research. Orr reviewed the importance of defining quality outcomes and determining what you want measured longitudinally. She described the development of tools and the validity and reliability testing they conducted. She also described how they worked to compliment with ELCC accreditation process and standards with these tools, as a way to enhance other performance assessments. Orr then shared what the group had learned: that there are certain program features that are tied to high quality leadership performance. Orr also noted a number of other program impact factors and program content findings.

Fede asked how many surveys is the based on?

Orr, this is based on 17 programs...we are building up as it goes live in a few months.

Flanary, noted that they held a conference call last week after honor had sent out the survey and supporting materials for a review. There was universal consensus around the quality of the work and the effort that has gone into the product. When considering it for the use as one of the assessments with ELCC, as a SPA we have never endorsed any assessment. There is a concern about specifying particular assessments to the university for a variety of reasons. We do get requests from various groups to bless assessments and we have chosen not to do that. Also, the timing of this and the development of the new standards...some committee members raised questions about how it may measure specific criteria within ELCC standards.

Cibulka asked Orr if the evaluation task force was seeking feedback about whether this might be admissible? if a program wanted to include it, would ELCC consider the survey and its findings appropriate forms of data?

Orr, yes we are looking for ways to assist programs, and when we talk to them about usig the survey for their program improvement efforts, many are concerned about whther they can include this data for their ELCC review as well.



Crawford, noted that pieces of the survey address pieces of the data we are looking for.

Orr, we are only asking that this is one piece that might be considered. We are not suggesting that the survey would replace performance assessments. Rather we want to be able to communicate to faculty how this data could be used in an ELCC review, but not be misleading them. We want to make certain that we are clear.

Crawford when we first heard about this we were thinking this was presented as a substitute not an addition. So what you are suggesting is much more acceptable. See, the key is that they are going to have to identify the three pieces of data and be clear of how this aligns to ELCC... "here is what the survey said...and what this means is \_\_\_\_\_" They would have to be clear. They can't just submit survey data, the school would have to disaggregate it and explain it.

Harris, this would be very valuable data for the university.

Cibulka added Agnes' term about complimenting is important...two advantages to considering this: 1) your outcomes are linked to programs characteristics that are effective...we need more of this and 2) while your N is small, it is a benchmarking exercise.. We are moving toward valid and reliable assessments instead of individual assessments...California is now piloting a performance assessment that would make SPA review obsolete. But in regard to other SPAs we still have individual assessments...this helps us move toward external validity.

Orr, what we did is use the new ISLLC standards to make the cross walk. What I will do is write the language in the way that makes clear that they present the data along with an explanation of how/why it is review worthy. Does that sound acceptable?

There was general agreement around the room, from NPBEA members and ELCC board members, that the survey data would be a welcome part of the ELCC review process as long as faculty made the case for its inclusion and value vis-à-vis the standards being assessed.

Harris asked that Orr do a session this summer in San Antonio for NCPEA

Young agreed with Jim that this is a move towards improvement...

## 8. NCATE Update

Cibulka, in October the NCATE executive board directed the Cibulka to come back in the spring with ideas about redesign...we have started internally to begin formulating recommendations that we will want to roll out and receive feedback on. I've set forth values and principles that I think should guide this... 1) emphasize excellence not adequacy, 2) emphasize inclusivity (alt providers, etc.), 3) third value is collegiality... 4) designing or redesigning a system perceived to have value and cost effectiveness...there are a number of things we are looking at...ex: continuous improvement could be applied at the program level...its important to emphasize that if we are talking about transformation of the p-12 system than we are talking about the transformation of our leadership prep programs...this argues for partnerships with school districts, partnerships with states, we have had some partnerships but this hasn't been as central as it needs to be.

When I came it was important to get feedback from the institutions...there was a lot of feedback that the current process is valuable but unduly burdensome...concern about program review is one of the biggest areas. This needs to be addressed. I want to emphasize too that the NCATE survey I am referring to was only asking institutions, there is tremendous criticism from outside the institutions. If anything the feedback from Universities was conservative...we have to look at transformation but in the least burdensome way.

Brown...is this concerned with SPAs? And what of the relationship with TEAC?

Cibulka, there were opportunities for them to make comments...we could tease that out if it were to be helpful.

Flanary, yes this would be helpful.

Cibulka, I have already been meeting with Frank Murray, it looks encouraging...we are now laying out an options paper that discusses a unified system...both groups want to make this a better system, not just add the two together...plan is that there would be a meeting of the design team at AACTE.

Agnes Crawford given our discussion about the PHD programs...one way of looking at this is that one group accredits research groups, and one practical kind...this may have serious ramifications about the paper you were called to write with TEAC.

#### **9. NPBEA Budget**

Young introduced the budget . Young updated the current status of AASA, and asked if we should forgive their dues for a year and invite them to continue to participate.

Flanary, asserted that we consider forgiving their dues as we have done for CCSSO in the past.

Flanary motioned for forgiveness  
Agnes Crawford 2<sup>nd</sup>  
Motion aye unanimous.

Cibulka, said that he asked Dan about rejoining and said yes, that he had planned to.

Young asked for motion to approve the budget (in NPBEA materials) which includes the ELCC standards revision and the change in ELCC administrative costs.

Cibulka moved to approve  
Flanary 2<sup>nd</sup>  
Lois asked a question about the in-kind contributions from UCEA.  
Motion aye unanimous

Young distributed the Tax returns and a copy of the NPBEA audit.

Brown moved to accept the audit.  
Flanary 2<sup>nd</sup>  
Motion aye unanimous.

#### **10. Proposed Future Agenda Items**

- a. Flanary, ask someone from the DOE to engage with us.
- b. Cibulka, suggested that we build a strategy for reaching out to the deans with specific groups dates about what we want to share.
- c. Fede will provide an update about draft ELCC standards

#### **11. Meeting Adjourned 12:30**

Agnes Crawford moved  
Lois Adams Rogers 2<sup>nd</sup>  
Aye Unanimous