



Meeting Minutes
Thursday, April 4, 2013
12:00-4:00 pm
CCSSO Headquarters
One Massachusetts Ave, NW, Washington, DC

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Jim Cibulka, chairperson, calls the meeting to order.

Present were: Mary Harrill-McClellan (AACTE), Ron Skinner (ASBO), Dan Domenech (AASA), Chris Minnich - Janice Poda - Mary Canole - Irv Richardson (CCSSO), James Cibulka (NCATE/CAEP), Gail Connelly – Honor Fede (NAESP/NPBEA staff), JoAnn Bartoletti - Dick Flanary (NASSP), Ronald Thorpe – Trey Clifton (NBPTS), James Berry – Cathy Shiffman (NCPEA), Michelle Young – Hanne MaWhinney (UCEA).

Guests: Josh Edelman (Gates Foundation), Jac Davis (George W. Bush Center), Cortney Rowland (NGA), Ben Fenton (New Leaders for New Schools), Joseph Murphy (Vanderbilt University), Jody Spiro (Wallace Foundation),

II. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Chairperson Cibulka reviewed the agenda and asked for additional items.

- ◆ **MOTION:** Gail Connelly proposed and Jim Berry seconded a motion to approve the agenda. The agenda was approved unanimously.

III. REVIEW and APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- ◆ **MOTION:** Michelle Young proposed and Jim Berry seconded a motion to approve the minutes. The minutes were approved unanimously.

IV. REVIEW MEETING GOALS (Cibulka - 10 minutes)

Chairperson Cibulka stated that as given the heightened expectations for educational leadership it's time to hear from other thought stakeholders in the field on whether the educational leadership standards (specifically ISLLC and ELCC) are sufficiently robust and relevant for today's leaders. What should be done if they are not?

We want to lay this out as the context for our discussion. The framework for the discussion will be centered around the following questions:

1. How appropriate are the standards for school and district leadership?
2. What is the rationale for and against the standards?
3. What is the role of standards? Are they just the touchstone to dig down to do other work? Whether the standards are designed to be aspirational or if they

are supposed to be used as drivers for performance depends on one's viewpoint.

V. BRIEF HISTORY OF NPBEA STANDARDS WORK

- **ISLLC Standards – Poda/Canole**

Janice Poda and Mary Canole briefed the NPBEA board on the background of the development of the ISLLC standards done in 2008. Janice stated that states and districts are increasingly asking for more specificity in the ISLLC standards regarding setting parameters for leadership performance. Mary gave the board a briefing on how the NPBEA and CCSSO went about the revision of the ISLCC 2008 standards. It was the NPBEA in the mid-90's that decided that something needed to be done to improve educational leadership preparation and practice. They formed the ISLLC consortium to develop standards that became the defacto standards for the field. These standards were adopted or adapted by 46 states. It was the first time that the leadership profession set and accepted a national set of standards for leaders. Joe Murphy and Neil Shipman were involved. However, as good as these standards were there was criticism that they weren't specific enough and were not tied to student learning. There was also an assumption that leadership was done by one person and there wasn't a tie to empirical research.

Based on that, in 2007 we repositioned the standards to developed performance expectations and at the same time that NPBEA was working on the update of ISLLC 2008 – these documents became companion documents. Dick Flanary and Joe Simpson were involved in the development of the ISLLC 2008 standards. The process included an expert panel – practitioners and researchers to give feedback and they cited leadership performance indicators tied to best practice and empirical research. Many states still use both documents together – both give specificity. However, neither NPBEA nor CCSSO did a sufficient job of promoting the standards to states and districts. States put the standards on a shelf and didn't use them to drive certification or drive the whole continuum of practice – including induction or principal evaluation. Things were disjointed – all aspects of the work were not informed by the leadership standards. Most recently we have seen many changes in NCLB and Race to the Top states adopting more rigorous standards for teaching. These new things change the relevancy of the ISLLC 2008 standards. School leaders now must leave the full implementation of the CCSS, continuous improvement, and make sure that it all impacts instructional practice.

In 2012, CCSSO has written their call to action to ensure classroom ready teachers and school ready leaders. When you look at all of this including

the Wallace pipeline project Mary stated that CCSSO has seen new things that the standards didn't address with regard to effective leadership behaviors. CCSSO surveyed the pipeline districts and held focus group of districts to learn valuable lessons for redesigning the ISLLC standards. They found the job of the principal has changed so much. These groups want to use the ISLLC standards to drive everything in the continuum of leadership practice (induction, development, preparation, etc.). Mary continued to say that when they through the lens of that type of focus, they found significant discrepancies in the ISLLC 2008 standards.

- **ELCC Standards – Cibulka/Young**

Jim Cibulka and Michelle Young gave an outline of the history of the ELCC standards since 1996. The ELCC has been a national force in shaping leadership preparation at colleges and universities since 1996 through NCATE accreditation and the ELCC program review process. In Michelle's estimation there are around 700-800 leadership preparation programs nationwide. However, not all of the institutions that prepare leaders are required to be accredited by NCATE so consequently the ELCC only has reviews programs in about 24 states. It don't review every program. In addition, some states don't use the ELCC standards. All NCATE has been able to do is ask for alignment. The ELCC's work has been subordinate to the ISLLC standards in terms of having a national impact on preparation of new leaders.

The NPBEA just finished the second round of revisions to the 2011 ELCC program standards. They mirror the 2008 ISLLC policy standards. Michelle outlined the work of the ELCC revision taskforce in redesigning the 2011 ELCC standards. She stated that the group had difficulties passing the NCATE process due to fact that the ISLLC standards were aspirational and there was not a lot of sound research to back up the standards. So they had a problem with developing the research base. After much work by UCEA and NCPEA professors over the course of a year, the taskforce was able to anchor each standard to research. But it was harder with the superintendent standards as the knowledge base is not that well defined. The ELCC standards have had a significant impact on the higher education preparation community. Michelle concluded that we now need to focus on what has changed in the field and to make sure the ELCC standards reflect current practice and mirror changes to the ISLLC standards. Plus we need to circle on program features beyond content standards alone. Dick Flanary gave an outline of the work of the ELCC Audit Committee in reviewing every program. He stated that we have seen more programs getting national recognition status since 1996 when the standards were first introduced.

- **NBPTS Certification – Thorpe (15 minutes)**
Ron Thorp gave the board an outline of where NBPTS certification is with regard to principal certification. He stated that NBPTS has had some challenges with the implementation of the advanced certification for leaders. NBPTS has created with the help of the profession a wonderful set of advanced core standards; however, the certification process costs \$4500. Also, the scoring takes twice as much time for a principal versus a teacher. The process takes too much time and costs too much. NBPTS is working now with other organizations in the hope that we can learn some lessons that can be distilled and shared with the profession.

VI. CONVERSATIONS NPBEA HAS HELD AROUND CURRENT STANDARDS – (Poda/Canole)

Janice and Mary convened a team to look what principals said that being an instructional leader in today's is a full time job. Then we looked at the other responsibilities including the raising student achievement. The role of the principal is not a doable job. We have to step back and define what is leadership really is and we mean by the standards. Do we need an umbrella set of standards and then under that role specific standards? I hope we can define what it means to be a co-principal, a teacher leader, and a superintendent. Now the standards are too broad to cover all the positions, and the standards doesn't help up get to all of the roles of these other positions. As we have talked to people in the states, most want to develop principle evaluation systems that are based on the ISLCC standards but the standards don't adequately define the role of specific positions. The standards should be able to define expectations what we expect in the knowledge and skills so we can hold leaders accountable to reasonable expectations. The role of leaders has changed. Articulating what we mean to the profession on what the knowledge and skills of specific leadership positions will go a long way in defining the role of principals and superintendents. It bothers me that we can't be more nimble and learn from practice and make changes to the standards quickly. What does the role of principals need to be to affect student achievement?

VII. INPUT FROM KEY STAKEHOLDERS

- **Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation – Josh Edelman**
Josh Edelman stated that they have learned much from their work on teacher effectiveness on ways to support teacher effectiveness. It is our goal is to build a community of practice in 11 sites across the country. We want to build principal effectiveness. It is his view that we need to broaden the definition of instructional leadership teams to include the principal as a distributive leader. How do engender teacher leadership and what roles teacher leaders to add value to teacher leadership. Educational leaders need to be change managers especially with the common core. More leaders can be change managers but they don't know where to start. Lastly, we are spending a lot of time on supporting principals, however it

is unclear still if we are expecting principals to be coaches of teachers then who is supporting the principals? Can we focus resources on central office as a unit to change their time? He thinks that we need to look at the role of an instructional leadership director and look at their role differently. We need to define clearer roles of each of these positions.

- **Vanderbilt University – Joe Murphy**

Joe Murphy gave the board some background of his work on the ISLLC standards and the purpose of those standards as they were originally designed. He stated that if we drill down the standards, they will be inadequate. The standards were not intended to define every leadership position but to be used as a foundation for defining policy on leadership standards. We developed them to be used as stake in the ground to define essential critical knowledge and skills for leadership. Once the foundation is laid, different groups can then use them drill down and set more specific criteria for defining specific leadership roles depending on different settings. The ISLLC standards can't possibly define every single leadership position in every setting. I think if you look at Janice's point it really is a set of overall stake in the ground. By definition they don't drill down enough. I don't think we need to change the ISLLC standards. I think we should bring the standards to life around the roles. If different states and districts want to use the ISLLC standards as a foundation they can then drill down and build specific criteria for different leadership roles for evaluation purposes but NPBEA should keep the policy standards as a foundation for all groups to use to focus this development. NPBEA is the keeper for the leadership profession for what educational leadership should know and be able to do.

- **George W. Bush Center – Jac Davis**

Jac Davis gave the board an outline of the Bush Center's work change school leadership. They are in their second year as an entity and are trying to empower principals to affect change for students. Their mission is to improve school leaders and how they are prepared. They have four initiatives; one of which is focused on the principalship. They are concerned about principal preparation and intend to focus on the quality of principal preparation. They have 20 programs in the initiative. In general they agree with the knowledge and skill indicators found in the ISLLC standards as a foundation but they are not sure the ISLLC are precise enough and they don't give enough direction for leadership improvement. Every one of their programs has said that they needed to train leaders on school culture. But what does that mean – how should it be taught? We get widely different answers. The NPBEA should look more closely at the how the standards are being implemented in the preparation programs. We have found preparation programs are very different in terms of how they teach the standards which is problematic. What are the actions and practices that we know needs to be taught – we grapple at that level. We

have found that human capital management is missing from the standards as well as recruiting, developing, and evaluating of teachers. There is also not enough focus on changing culture around high expectations. ISLLC Standard six is of the most concern. We often see principals just working with parents and not having enough political knowledge for dealing with media and other groups. If don't teach principals to be distributed leaders we are going to have many of them burn out. Not sure the standards really address this area. We question whether the standards should instead be written for leadership teams not to specific leadership roles. We need to some changes to the standards to address these areas; however, I don't believe we need to change the ISLLC standards altogether but use them as a foundation. The NPBEA might want to focus its work on making some modifications to the standards but then develop companion documents and tools that are really helpful to states and districts – that could be very powerful. We also don't want to see two years of revision. NPBEA needs to create better meaning for implementing the ISLLC standards and how to do it through the companion and tools it creates from the standards.

- **National Governors Association – Cortney Rowland**

Cortney Rowland stated that school leadership has always been a policy focus for NGA. They have tried to convene thinking about leaders and teachers and their role as human capital managers. Resources need to be developed around this area. They feel that leaders should show how they manage teachers, connect with teachers, recruitment, and evaluate teachers. They should be empowering teachers, delegating to teachers etc. That is a piece that we need. Want to see conversation around what CCSS and college and career ready and what that means for principals role. We need to also think about the standards as a catalyst for change and how we can be a catalyst around leadership preparation. Lastly, tools and documents need to be developed for use by states, districts, and preparation programs aligned to the standards. This is where the real work happens.

- **New Leaders for New Schools – Ben Fenton**

Ben Fenton agreed that we need to think about the level of specificity of the standards but we also need to have tools based on application of the standards. Standard 2 should include content on talent management. More focus needs to be on building a leadership team. Even our principles didn't see this as a place of focus. The other piece we wrestled with was Standards 6 in terms of what it means in leadership practice on a daily basis. The leadership profession all needs to come together around a set of national standards and frame tools and resources for the profession. The NPBEA should look at revising the building level ELCC standards for more specificity for preparing assistant principals and principal roles.

VIII. DISCUSSION (Cibulka)

- **SUMMARY OF THEMES**

Jim Cibulka summarized the feedback from the different stakeholders by stating that in general all groups find that overall there is adequacy in the standards, however, we should look to update them in certain areas. Specifically, it is not clear if the standards are specific enough with regard to leadership skills with regard to school/district culture, setting high expectations, innovation, leaders as change managers, human capital management, common core, evaluation, fostering student learning, the notion of distributive leadership and role differentiation in terms of ways we are configuring leadership roles. We've learned things recently and we need to decide if the standards have kept pace with recent policy changes affecting leaders. There seems to be general consensus that the standards could be modified to include these areas and then used as foundational standards. But we also need to look at role specific standards that can be built based on these revisions. Janice stated that CCSSO could agree to using the ISLLC as a foundation document if we then could build out role specific standards. Same with the ELCC standards – they could be updated and modified but there is a component that should be more specific to preparation of specific positions. The consensus is that we need to do something with revising the standards that we are not doing now. What we talked about is what our implementation strategy is with regard to a revision of the standards and then taking these pieces into more development of guidance and tool documents.

- **GENERAL DISCUSSION**

The NPBEA board spent the next 30 minutes discussing the pros and cons of revising the ISLLC and ELCC standards as well as the feedback from the different stakeholders.

Dick Flanary– The ISLLC standards have always been intended for the beginning as a foundational document not role specific. We need to be clear on what the standards are intended for and what they are not.

Ron Thorpe– we need to look at the standards against the assessments (CCSSO). We have to address that. Peer reviewed process. While we need to ensure that the standards can be changed, when also need to take care that they are not changed as a result of political expediency. Politics change and the standards need to stand against the test of time. Maybe we should look at what's happening in schools where board certified teachers have become principals. They might have a fundamentally different vision for teacher management.

Janice Poda – The INTASC standards were set out to be a reform document signaling to the profession that teaching was changing. Whatever we produce or change or steps have to be leading the profession

should not just follow current trends. I just don't think the role of principals is sustainable as it is currently. I like the idea of an instructional team and moving the field to create those kind of leadership structures and looking at defining the roles for principals and assistant principals. That is what we should do to contribute to the field. Right now, because our profession is not clear on those roles, the standards can't be specific for any role. We either need to say they are only for principals or we need to develop different sets of standards for different role positions. I don't know the best way. If you have many standards you can't always define all roles – we want them to be broad enough to handle new roles.

Dan Domenech – This is my first time of in this meeting. As I look at the standards they are analogous to the common core. The standards can be applied to all of the changes that have taken place. It is the curriculum and the lesson plans that have to change in a different environment. We need to be looking at the practices needed for change relative to the standards.

Joe Murphy – We don't want the standards to have to change all of the time. If we need to change something – lets change the tools that are aligned to the standards. However, the essential standard buckets stay the same. That will evolve the field into more specific tools that can change quickly as needed. I do agree that we need to do a better job of aligning the standards to research – we had added that in the last revision but not as strongly as we could have done.

JoAnn Bartoletti – When I worked in New Jersey, nobody in the district really knew about the ISLLC standards or used them in any way. We really need to think about a public relations campaign or communications plan for the end user of the standards. We have a big implementation problem – states don't know about them and aren't using them when they revise their state standards and policies. We need to refocus on the communications and implementation piece of the standards.

Mary Canole – We have an opportunity here if we took this document and did a second edit and do a spin off on new context to help states and schools and give them some tools with which to think deeper on how the standards behave in various job roles. We could look at designing a “Call to Action” and step from there to talk about how these are policy standards and then get more specific standards for different roles. We asked them what tools they need – and then develop them around the standards

Dan – I agree with that we should adapt it to our current cultural context but keep the standards as a foundational document.

Gail – I’m hearing several things that describe the struggle that principals feel –we need to understand and build in the process the level of performance expectations. May be it is a matter of fine-tuning the standards and then work on the tools for implementation.

Hanne – Our experience in reconstructing the research base was intended as aspirational – it was challenging. We thought how can you look at the research to support the standrds? What we found much activity that is funded – mish mash – it’s not enough meda analysis – we need systematic well developed programs of research that goes beyond contexts athat reaches across school contexts. Then we would have the foundation to make judgements on the standards and make decisions around aspiration deicions. That what we might want to think about doing. Not just go off on divergent – set up key tensions to go forward – so the deicions are grounded in systematic thoughtful review. We really need to look at the different context and the connections between them.

Ben – what does it mean that the standrs are in use. Visiting a couple of states. Trying to think about coherence about the pipelines to do at a deeper level that we are all talking at the same level across the profession. Consistency about a set of descrptions and share language acrss the profession. If we could study these systems and figure out “in use” means. The use piece is a lot more important. It helps to look at tools across states and districts. Put outa stronger vision. It would have to be around particular roles not just broadly design. Does feel harder to which level of the tool dev whe go – not sure district leader would fit.

JimC – is this a problem of context. In some cases we all called it the same thing but we are all doing things differently – practice different. Then there were those things didn’t have languge – like time management. The best principal does define the language – shared language – see a vision of good practice.

BREAK – (5 minutes)

IX. EXECUTIVE SESSION

- **Resolution on Standards Discussion** – (Cibulka- 40 minutes)

We’ve had the perception that we need to do something about the standards. The discussion was around that the standards are good – it appears to be three options we can choose for revising the ISLLC and ELCC standards:

1. Revise the ISLLC and ELCC standards based on input from the states to make them much more role specific.

2. There is evidence that the standards are credible as they are but they need to be updated and tweaked to fit the current educational context – basically they need to be brought up to date with current leadership realities but not substantively changed.
3. There are fine as is, but the NPBEA needs to develop a set of guidance documents including tools for implementation instead.

We also need to look at rebranding the standards. A new name and then tweak them and can't give the house and we can give you the blueprint and common language set of things that we are all going and talk to.

MOTION to revise the ISLLC/ELCC standards.

Michelle Young proposed and Gail Connelly seconded a motion to adapt 2 and 3 options above and convene a small subcommittee to develop a process for bringing the ISLLC and ELCC standards up to date and developing a set of guidance documents to support the standards. The motion further empowers the chair to create subgroup to flesh out the specifics for developing the proposals for possible funding. The motion was passed unanimously.

- **NBPTS Discussion** – (Thorpe)
Ron Thorpe shared the struggles that NBPTS has gone through with implementing the Principal Certification exam. Their organization has found cost and time issues with getting the first two pilots completed. He suggested been working with Gail and Joanne and Dick we need to regroup the certify accomplished principals. We came out with something that is unmanageable.
- **TREASURERS REPORT** – (Connelly)
Gail passed out a proposal for FY 2013 Operating Budget and also provided an outline of the current year's FY2012-13 expenses. Connelly stated that the NPBEA is scheduled to end up with a surplus due to good management. She commended NPBEA staff for their diligence in ensuring that the FY2012 budget didn't exceed our revenue.

MOTION to approve FY2013 Budget

JoAnn Bartoletti proposed and Dan Domenech seconded a motion to approve the NPBEA FY2013 Operating Budget. The motion was passed unanimously.

○
X. ADJOURN