

**Illinois Board of Higher Education
Commission on School Leader Preparation**

Date: October 26, 2005

Time: 10:00-2:30 p.m.

Place: Illinois Board of Higher Education

In attendance: Dianne Ashby and Dea Meyer (co-chairs), Gary Alexander, Diane Dean, John Durbin (for Randy Dunn), Allen Ellington, Stu Fagan (phone) John Haller, Ross Hodel, Lisa Hood, Erika Hunt, Cyndi Kuck (phone), Jeff Mays, Della Montgomery, Nick Osborne, Diane Rutledge, Christy England-Siegerdt, Fred Singleton, Bonnie Smith-Skripps, Nehemiah Thomas, Steve Tozer, Jenny Tripses,

Absent: Debbie Meisner-Bertauski, Randy Dunn, Alice Hayes, Jerryelyn Jones, Scott Jones, Donna Manering, Dan Montgomery, Vince Serritella, Margie Smagacz, Walt Warfield

Guests: Michelle Young, Dennis Williams, Brenda Stonecipher

I. 10:00 a.m. Welcome by Dianne Ashby and Dea Meyer

- The day was divided into two halves. In the first half of the day, Erika Hunt, Christy England-Siegerdt, and Lisa Hood presented the six problem areas identified by Arthur Levine and compared these problems with data collected in Illinois on principal preparation and administrator preparation programs. After this presentation, Michelle Young, from UCEA, presented a critique of the Levine study, and her association's work on administrative preparation programs around the country.
- In the second half of the day, the topic centered on one of the areas of interest for this commission which is state processes and structures for the review and approval of administrator preparation programs. IBHE representative, Gary Alexander, and ISBE representatives, Dennis Williams and Brenda Stonecipher presented their respective agency's review and approval processes of educational administrative programs.
- For upcoming meetings, the commission's scope will be narrowed into three areas:
 1. How can we articulate and streamline the state review and approval process between the two state agencies, IBHE and ISBE?
 2. What is the state's role with the administrator pipeline (e.g., recruitment, selection, and retention)?
 3. How can the state support exemplary and innovative programs?
- The first question was the topic of this meeting; the November 30 meeting will address the second topic, and the last topic will be discussed in January.

II. 10:15 a.m. Framework of Problem Presentation (Erika Hunt, Christy England-Siegerdt, and Lisa Hood).

Summary of Key Points:

- The purpose of this presentation was to address the lingering questions from the September meeting as to what is the problem with principal preparation in Illinois. First, Erika Hunt presented the six problem areas identified by Levine. Christy England-Siegerdt and Lisa Hood presented data on principal preparation and educational administration programs in Illinois as related to the Levine study to support or challenge claims that these problems are located in Illinois as well.
- Levine's Six Problem Areas as Compared to Data on Principal Preparation Programs in Illinois:

Problem 1: Principal preparation programs are characterized by an irrelevant curriculum disconnected from the tasks and responsibilities of the principalship.

Illinois: In a survey, Illinois principals indicated that the principal preparation programs in Illinois were also irrelevant to the daily, complex demands of the principalship. Only 9% of principals said that their preparation program helped them improve teaching and learning in their schools.

Problem 2: Educational administration programs have the lowest admission and graduation standards.

Illinois: Admissions standards vary from program to program around the state. The lowest undergraduate GPA required is 2.5 and the highest is 3.0. Only 2 programs specify minimum graduate examination test scores.

Problem 3: Educational administration programs spread their faculty too thin, have a poor balance between full-time and adjunct faculty, and lack connections with their K-12 districts.

Illinois: Christy England-Siegerdt is currently collecting information from educational administration programs across the state. In this project, she's asking programs to send information about faculty and what they've done to enhance faculty resources.

Problem 4: Educational administration programs offer inadequate clinical instruction.

Illinois: Only 4% of principals said their internship experiences prepared them to improve teaching and learning in their schools. 62% said that the State should pay for and require a mentoring program for first-year principals. Significant data on internship models in the state have been collected by ICPEA and discussed through IL-SAELP and may be shared with the Commission at a later meeting.

Problem 5: Educational administration programs confer inappropriate degrees to graduates, leading to a watered down Ph.D. that has no relevance to the job.

Illinois: An appropriate question to ask might be, what kind of credentialing do administrators need to be effective? This question will be one in which those who testify at a commission hearing will have the opportunity to answer.

Problem 6: The educational administration field suffers from poor research that neglects to ask important questions, is not empirical, and disconnected from practice.

Illinois: Another hearing question in which those who testify will have the opportunity to answer is, "What type of research are you and/or your faculty engaged and how is it informing the field?"

- A question was raised regarding the administrative licensure programs that are the top certificate granters. The top 5 in the state are:
 1. Aurora 369
 2. Illinois State 173 (M.A.) and 58 (M.S. & M.S. Ed.)
 3. Eastern Illinois 157
 4. National Louis 146
 5. Northern Illinois 128

- One commission member asked if there have been any studies conducted on the day-to-day job of the principal. Others in the group pointed out a couple studies including work by NASSP and Jefferson County School District in Kentucky.

***Note: A copy of the power point presentation is attached.**

III. 11:00 a.m. Presentation by Michelle Young
 “Revisioning Leadership Preparation in Higher Education

Summary of Key Points:

- Levine’s study has several flaws that include the following:
 - It ignores the variety of current reform efforts of leadership preparation programs around the country through the national standards movement, state reform efforts, and program self-assessments through NCATE.
 - Levine’s study painted all preparation programs with the same negative brush such that all programs were described as being inadequate even though realistically program quality varies.
 - Methodologically the study is flawed through its sampling of all faculty and alumni from all education schools, not only leadership programs. And despite the wealth of data collected, little of the data was presented and little reference was made to the data. This makes it hard to distinguish claims based on data from those based on opinion.
 - Levine has little grasp of the issues in the field, thus his recommendations for improving programs are not substantial enough to provide a clear roadmap for reform.
- UCEA shares many of the same concerns as Levine regarding the quality of candidates in preparation programs, quality of curricula, curricula tied to practice, and quality faculty. Other concerns of UCEA include program evaluation and improvement, institutional capacity, program approval and accreditation, and licensure.
- Dr. Young outlined the key differences between the Masters, Ed.D, and Ph.D. Essentially, the Master’s degree prepares candidates to assume leadership positions at the school level. Ed.D. programs prepare individuals to assume leadership at the district level, while the Ph.D. prepares individuals to pursue scholarly practice, research, or teaching at the university or college level.
- An analysis of program growth (education leadership programs) between 1993 to 2002 showed that there has been an overall decrease in the number of programs offered by research universities, and an explosion of growth in comprehensive and liberal arts and science higher education institutions. While all types of universities showed growth in M.Ed. degree conferrals, Research 1 institutions showed the least growth while Comprehensive 2 and Liberal Arts and Sciences 2 schools showed the most dramatic growth.
- Illinois is #5 in a list of the top 15 doctorate granting states (in 2003)
- There were recommendations for educational administration programs in regards to faculty and the selection of principal candidates.
 - Educational leadership faculty should engage with knowledge in the field.
 - Programs should hire a critical mass of full-time faculty with depth of knowledge, teaching, and service related to educational leadership.
 - Programs should have an advisory board in place involving practicing leaders who collaborate in program planning, teaching, and internships.

- Program faculty should engage with the community/districts for curriculum design, to promote diversity, and to gain access to sites for internships and applied research.
 - To improve the pool of qualified principal candidates, graduate school requirements for principal candidates should include an application that consists of materials that evidence the candidate’s purpose for applying and their teaching experience. In addition, faculty should interview candidates, observe their teaching, and put candidates through simulated situations to examine leadership potential (e.g., inbox exercises, presentation, and interviews).
- What is the commission’s vision for revising educational leadership preparation? There were several important questions to ask that centered on the types of leaders Illinois needs, how many leaders and programs we need, the quantity of resources on hand to support programs, what to do with low performing programs, how to improve programs, and how to differentiate the roles and responsibilities of Illinois universities.
- Dr. Young concluded the presentation with recommendations for programs, colleges, and states to support educational leadership programs. Recommendations for states include:
 - Develop a budget that allocates the necessary resources to prepare educational leaders.
 - Establish minimal selection criteria based on competencies related to school success for selecting and admitting students to programs.
 - Focus on quality not quantity—effectively prepare a cohort of principal candidates rather than focus on quantity.
 - Develop and revise a set of state leadership standards that guide programming, preparation, and practice.
 - Use state standards to improve programs and to close ineffective programs.
 - Strengthen state licensure policies.
 - Develop a rigorous and practical program evaluation system for leadership preparation programs.

Points of focus for the commission:

1. How many programs have come on-line in last 10 years because of demand?
2. Who is demanding these programs?
3. Who is the market?
4. In Illinois, what has been rationale for program shrinkage?

*Note: A copy of the power point presentation, and the script from Michelle Young’s presentation is attached.

IV. 1:00 p.m. “What is the State Process for the Approval and Review of Preparation Programs?”

Gary Alexander, IBHE

Dennis Williams and Brenda Stonecipher, ISBE

Presentation ISBE and IBHE, regarding program review and approval process of Education Administration (handouts provided).

Two goals to come out of this presentation:

1. Do we have a duplication of efforts in reviewing and approving educational leadership programs between the two state agencies? Where can we merge the two processes so as not to duplicate efforts?
2. Is there a duplication of efforts for reviewing and approving programs between IBHE, ISBE, and the NCATE accreditation processes?

Summary of Key Points:

IBHE Review and Approval Process

- The role of IBHE is to review programs to gauge if the program is of academic quality and meets academic standards.
- There are 4 steps in the review and approval process at IBHE. Step 1 begins with the institution submitting a notice of intent after which time there is extensive consultation between the institution and an IBHE representative to make sure all materials are completed and submitted correctly.
- After all materials have been submitted, staff review the applications work with the institution to make sure all questions and concerns are answered. After review, IBHE staff recommends those programs to the board for approval. (Only those programs that have passed the approval of the initial staff review make it to the board for approval. Those not meeting standards are not brought before the board.)
- IBHE board members review the staff recommendation and approve the program if it meets the criteria.
- For review of continuing programs in public universities, programs are on an 8 year review cycle, in which IBHE annually distributes the guidelines for report submission.
- Private institutions go through the same approval as publics, but private institutions do not have to show market need for their programs like publics do. In addition, the review/approval process for private institutions is not as systematic as it is for publics. However, private colleges/universities are held to the same rigor on academic standards.

ISBE Review and Approval Process

- In the handout, there are two processes illustrated: one is the initial recognition of new educational units and programs, and the second is the continuing accreditation of existing educational programs.
- The process is similar to IBHE's such that programs wishing to gain initial accreditation submit a notice of intent to the state superintendent after which institutions submit a preliminary report and work with ISBE staff to identify and provide further documentation and support in weaker portions of the applications.
- Unlike IBHE, ISBE conducts site visits. The site visit team reviews the applications and materials and visits the institution. The site team produces its findings and submits them to the certification board, who then drafts their recommendations, and sends them on to the state board for final recommendation of approval. At this time the program can begin operation, and then enters the cycle of continuing accreditation (a 7 year cycle).
- The process is somewhat different for existing programs. Institutions submit their reports to ISBE at which time it is turned over to a panel or to the appropriate SPA (e.g. education) for content review. If there is no SPA for a particular field (e.g., agriculture), then the program report is reviewed by a panel of field experts for review.
- The institutional report is reviewed by the on-site visit team, and the site visit is conducted. The site visit team submits their findings to the certification board. The certification board makes their recommendations and submits them to the state board for a final decision.
- Important notes: the program reports are performance-based. Programs have to provide evidence that they are meeting the standards (e.g. NCATE standard 1: demonstrating that educational leadership students have demonstrated mastery of content to help their students achieve. One measure: at least 80% of students completed the program or passed the certification exam.)

Points of focus for the commission:

- How can we streamline the review/approval process for the educational institutions and state agencies?
 - What types of information/documentation do the agencies require from programs? Are there some overlaps that might facilitate the development of a standard application/report that would fulfill the needs for both agencies?
 - Where are the redundancies in the processes? Could there be a sharing or a splitting of some roles and responsibilities among the two agencies?
- What standards does each agency use, are they the same standards, different standards? Could the two agencies agree to use the same standards which would facilitate the coordination of the processes between the two agencies?
- IBHE is on an 8 year review cycle; ISBE in on a 7 year review cycle.
 - Could the two agencies coordinate their cycles so that programs are reviewed by both agencies in the same year?

*Note: Notes were taken from the taped presentation and are attached to these minutes.

V. After the presentations, members were asked to reflect on recommendations we should take forward, including the following:

- The need to focus on things that should be changed and make a priority list of these things.
- The opportunity to look at the student-faculty ratio and cost-analysis to determine how expensive these programs are and which ones are cash cows.
- The similarity between what this Commission is doing and what the medical field has done to review and revise medical education/schools.
- The link between K-12 schools and colleges and the need for programs to reflect the needs of district when preparing principal candidates.
- The need to examine new programs and those programs that have greater increased capacity in the last couple of years, especially liberal arts colleges and private institutions.
- The option of developing a core curriculum and more specialized courses from which aspiring administrators could choose.
- The need for better articulation in the review and approval process between ISBE and IBHE.
- The need to examine the quality of programs and the relationship between preparation programs and the effectiveness of practicing administrators.
- Consideration of a screening process for who is admitted to preparation programs.
- Consideration of what influences a more diverse field of administrators, including careful consideration not to put up hurdles that impact the number of administrators of color.
- The need to sharpen the purpose of leadership programs.
- The need for a tool that can be used to safeguard the quality of programs, especially programs at private universities.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.