From the Director:

The Politics and Ethics of Professional Responsibility in the Educational Leadership Professoriate

Michelle D. Young

Our current economic condition has been frequently compared to that of the Great Depression, which was described in a 1933 edition of The Nation (“Mr. Roosevelt Must Lead,” 1933/2009) as a time when “effective leadership and prompt and vigorous action [had never] been more imperative,” and “where the problems had never been more complex and difficult.” It seems that historical moment has met its match. And like that earlier period, we are fortunate to have leaders with vision, courage, and an ability to inspire hope in the face of much despair.

However, we cannot wait for the President, our legislators, state governors, mayors, superintendents, principals, deans, department chairs, activist groups, or anyone else to make change for us. We have to be part of the change process. In his inaugural speech, President Obama (2009) identified “hard work and honesty, courage and fair play, tolerance and curiosity, loyalty and patriotism” as the values upon which our success depends, referring to these values and practices as “the quiet force of progress throughout our history.”

During the past two decades, the debate over American public education has taken place within a context of intense partisan rhetoric. Private sector economic motives have become increasingly prominent, as has the use of education as a wedge issue to further broad, unrelated policy agendas (Krugman, 2007; Shaker & Heilman, 2004).

Paul Krugman (2007), in his book, The Conscience of a Liberal, described such matters as the result of “Movement Conservatism,” a well-organized machine of media organizations, think tanks, and political organizations fueled by economic interests, which has as its primary purpose the reversal of New Deal and related social policies.

In surface-level critiques of education, critics have asserted that the public education system should be brought under the control of effective central authorities. Mayoral control, standards, and high-stakes testing movements are obvious cases in point, exemplifying a troublingly popular definition of reform.

States have experimented with professional preparation, inviting a wide range of alternate providers subject to varying quality control and accountability. For-profit ventures have been invited to provide alternative certification in the interest of quality and efficiency. Meanwhile, state department leaders are being influenced not by research but by interest groups, foundations, and think tanks to adopt canned notions of leadership, preparation, and evaluation; to assess leaders and preparatory programs through such lenses; and to punish those individuals and organizations that do not fit. This is occurring at the same time that state leaders are engaging in a deregulatory ideology promoting the removal or reduction of professional certification and accreditation requirements. Even the definition and legitimation of educational research has been impacted—by limiting funding to projects that stem primarily from certain scientific paradigms (Shaker & Heilman, 2004).

The perversiveness of television, radio, and the Internet in our lives makes frequent reports of such politicized educational news available to most of the population (Birkland, 2001). With every passing day there seems to be a new way to share news in smaller, faster, and ever more persistent bites.

We have to be aware of the consequences for ideology, action, and quiescence flowing from the politicization of educational news. The pictures constituted by news reporting, and repeated by critics in speeches, blogs, and other forms of media, continuously construct and reconstruct educational problems, crises, enemies—even Linda Darling-Hammond has been portrayed as an enemy of education—as well as leaders and saviors, creating a succession of threats and reassurances (Shaker & Heilman, 2004). We have been told
Harnessing Opportunities

Generally in our profession, both individuals and organizations have responded to the many critiques, initiatives, and contextual changes in a rational, if piecemeal, fashion. Through our educational journals, newsletters, magazines, and white papers, we analyze the details of critiques, proposals, legislation, and challenges (Shaker & Heilman, 2004). At our annual meetings and conferences, our themes often reflect such critiques and ideas—accountability and standards are two good examples.

We have been civil. We have been thoughtful. We have operated under the assumption that our critics have been acting in good faith and that they, like us, at least believe that they have the best interests of education and our nation’s children in mind. We have acknowledged no critical need nor made any significant attempts to band together—our work tends to be done alone or through tight collaborations. As a result, our rejoinders have been civil and powerful in thought but wanting in impact. We must accept that this debate cannot be properly joined in a fragmented, didactic manner.

Throughout his campaign for president, then-Senator Barack Obama stressed the importance of education to the future of the nation, consistently listing it, along with healthcare and energy independence, as among his top three priorities. Obama (2008) stated, “Our kids and our country can’t afford four more years of neglect and indifference. At this defining moment in our history, America faces few more urgent challenges than preparing our children to compete in a global economy. The decisions our leaders make about education in the coming years will shape our future for generations to come. They will help determine not only whether our children have the chance to fulfill their God-given potential, or whether our workers have the chance to build a better life for their families, but whether we, as a nation, will remain in the 21st century the kind of global economic leader that we were in the 20th century.”

I suggest that we carefully consider the opportunity that is offered by the Obama Administration to offer not only a thoughtful and powerful message about educational leadership, but also an impactful one. It is time to proclaim an end to the “recriminations and worn out dogmas that for too long have strangled” our education system and to work for progressive change (Obama, 2009).

How, though? How do we express the courage of our convictions? How do we begin? Are we capable of building, implementing, and sustaining an unabashed progressive agenda for our nation’s schools, one that is powerful enough to oppose and unmake Movement Conservatism—a New Deal for education (or in the words of Steve Gross and Joan Shapiro of Temple University, a new DEEL, or Democratic Ethical Educational Leadership).

How can we, university professors of educational leadership, participate? The UCEA mission and values statements suggest that we engage in collaborative partnerships, systematic inquiry, open dialogue, thoughtful critique, and responsible participation in change, based on research rather than on rhetoric and with the benefit of all children in mind.

When I dialogue with my colleagues, when I read their work, when I see them teach and mentor, I am convinced they are contributing to our ability to ensure that all children have an opportunity for excellent education and to fulfill their potential. Moreover, I trust that we, as a community of scholars, know the kind of leadership our school communities and our children need and deserve. Thus, one very important way to capitalize on this extraordinary time of hope is to remake the image of leadership and to generate and share our own, authentic construction.

Articulating Leadership

We know leadership matters. In fact, we have a growing body of evidence indicating that leadership is second only to classroom instruction among all school-related factors that contribute to what students learn at school (Leithwood, Seashore Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004). This evidence supports the present widespread interest in improving leadership. Even our new Secretary of Education, Arne Duncan, noted during his Senate confirmation hearing, “School leadership matters.” He explained that leadership is essential to teacher retention and teacher quality. He noted that any good school in Chicago has a great principal, and if a school does not
have a good leadership succession plan in place, the schools’ successes will soon fall apart (“New Secretary of Education,” 2009, p. 3). This is a change, as the last administration had very little to say about leadership.

We know good leaders when we see them. We recognize effective practice, and we can articulate the characteristics of accomplished leaders. In 1997, our field was given the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards, and we since have witnessed their widespread adoption by states and leadership programs. This has significantly changed leadership preparation, moving the field toward a common curriculum. However, few view these standards as signifiers of excellence. Generally, we view them as minimal standards to ensure a level of readiness in new leaders. Our programs should be driven by more powerful articulations of leadership.

**Embracing Responsibility**

Once we have clearly and satisfactorily articulated the kind of quality educational leadership that we are willing to stand behind, we must recognize and embrace our responsibilities in developing and supporting such leaders. The first set of responsibilities involves knowing how to develop such leaders, obtaining the necessary resources to prepare them, and providing the learning experiences that will support their development.

The question of whether educational leadership preparation matters has been answered: It most certainly does matter. Current research on leadership preparation suggests that highly effective leadership preparation programs are distinguishable by their features and by their influence on their graduates’ learning and career advancement (Orr & Pounder, 2007). And this influence is independent of candidates’ prior experience and initial aspirations. This research examines the impact of leadership preparation on a variety of leader practices and the influence of those practices on important school-level factors (such as teacher quality and organizational culture). This research (Darling-Hammond, Meyerson, LaPointe, & Orr, 2007; Orr & Pounder, 2007) has indicated that the following program characteristics are strongly correlated with effective leader practices among program graduates: (a) thoughtful recruitment and selection of program graduates; (b) a coherent, research-based, and well-defined curriculum with a leadership-for-learning focus; (c) adult-centered instructional practices, including reflection on and engagement with problems of practice; (d) a competent faculty; (e) a cohort structure; (f) supportive organizational structures; and (g) well-planned, substantive, and lengthy internships.

Thus, our responsibility includes ensuring that we, our colleagues, our programs, and our institutions reflect these features, and that they are organized and operating in such a way that we are able to provide aspiring and practicing leaders with the preparation and direction they need. For many programs this will mean change, and for some programs and faculty this will mean a lot of hard work, including program redesign, garnering or redistributing resources, expanding pedagogical knowledge, and building partnerships, among other things. Unfortunately, curriculum and program design is not typically part of one’s doctoral training. As a result, we have to look to our colleagues and to UCEA for ideas and assistance as we engage in this important work.

Now, once we have seen to these things, are we off the hook? Is that where our responsibility ends? If our house is in order, is our work done? Certainly, in some (perhaps many) organizations, just getting our house in order will be difficult enough. Think for a moment, however, about the programs you know of that are not developing the kinds of leaders our schools need. Are they beyond our reach and responsibility?

Over the last decade we have witnessed an explosion of educational leadership programs both within and outside the university community, and they are not of equal quality (Baker, Orr, & Young, 2007). In most states we have huge pools of certified but not necessarily qualified candidates. Many will never take a leadership position, but some will. Are we implicated, when any program graduates a person and certifies their readiness to lead, when that person is not ready to lead a school? Certainly, to some degree, we are.

If we, members of the educational leadership professoriate, consider ourselves to be Democratic Ethical Educational Leaders, scholars, and practitioners who are shaping a progressive agenda for educational leadership, how can we not hold ourselves responsible for the damage that poorly prepared leaders do within schools? If we are interested in offering an educational New DEEL, and if our foremost concern is ensuring leaders are effectively prepared to support the learning and development of all children, then what do we do with the knowledge that quality preparation is not universally provided? What is our responsibility? What can we do? What must we do? And what does the current context enable?

In his inaugural address, President Obama (2009) alluded to such responsibility:

> Everywhere we look, there is work to be done. …Our challenges may be new. The instruments with which we meet them may be new. …What is required of us now is a new era of responsibility—a recognition, on the part of every American, that we have duties to ourselves, our nation, and the world, duties that we do not grudgingly accept but rather seize gladly, firm in the knowledge that there is nothing so satisfying to the spirit, so defining of our character, than giving our all to a difficult task.

**Getting Involved**

The current context enables action. I see a refreshing, encouraging mood for education in the new administration. I see an opportunity here to lead. We are not without knowledge, and we are not without tools. We understand the kind of leaders we want to see in our schools. We also have a research-based set of program characteristics that are highly correlated with quality leadership. What we must garner is the necessary courage to act with a common purpose. It is time to advocate on behalf of our profession; to advance our profession as a whole; and to move not just from thought to action, but also back and forth between thoughtfulness and informed, purposeful action.

We know a good program and good practice when we see it—we know it because we study it, we know it because we do it. It is time for us to make this knowledge more broadly shared, understood, and put to use. It is time that we, university faculty and school and district leaders, together advocate on behalf of education, educational leaders, and the integrity of our profession. For too long, we have been plagued by the politics of fear and critique (Young & Brewer, 2008). For too long, a climate of timidity has reigned. Leaders and leadership faculty are not powerless. Though in the past we have tended neither to access the power we have nor
to use it on behalf our profession, we no longer can be content with inaction. In the words of President Obama (2009), “our time of standing pat, of protecting narrow interests and putting off unpleasant decisions—that time has surely passed. Starting today, we must pick ourselves up, dust ourselves off, and begin again the work of remaking America.”

Starting today we must harness opportunities to support our work. We must be clear about what we want, the kinds of leaders our schools and children need, and we must recognize and embrace our responsibilities. Finally, we must move between the world of thought and the world of action in our efforts to build strong leadership for our schools.

Although there is no recipe or perfectly planned way forward, we must take a stand—we must be willing to define problems and explore their causes and sources, but we cannot stop there. We also must identify who can make change. We must identify who needs information and what information they need, learn how to access these people, be able to communicate a sense of the importance and urgency of the situation, provide information on effective and ineffective practices or trends, and follow up. We must build and extend our networks of information and support. Professors and educators in general are not used to doing these kinds of things. But we must learn, because the time is now for us to get involved.

President Obama and the millions of supporters who sent him to the White House have opened a door for us to enact democratic and ethical leadership in education. Let’s go through that door together.
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The Case for Racial Literacy in Educational Leadership: Lessons Learned From Superintendent Reflections on Desegregation
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Contemporary debates between those who laud the promise of school integration and others who question its ability to advance educational equity have important implications for practicing and aspiring educational leaders. Steps have been taken to integrate formerly racially segregated schools with desegregation policies and programs, such as busing, magnet schools, and creative zoning and assignment plans. However, U.S. public schools and districts still suffer from racialized gaps and disparities in funding, resources, teacher quality, curricular and extracurricular opportunities, and achievement. The U.S Supreme Court’s decision in Parents Involved in Community Schools v. Seattle School District No. 1, et al. (2007) further challenged the work of educational administrators who believe that a colorblind interpretation of school assignment and administrative policies limits their ability to slow the trend toward resegregation and racial isolation in their school communities. The U.S. Supreme Court deemed unconstitutional the use of race as a factor in a K–12 school assignment plan, arguing that “the way to stop discrimination on the basis of race is to stop discriminating on the basis of race” (p. 40).

School Desegregation: A Mixed Legacy

Today, we more readily acknowledge what former civil rights attorney and legal scholar Derrick Bell (2004, p. 4) described as the “mixed legacy” of Brown v. Board of Education. In light of the educational disparities that persist along lines of race, class, and geography, Bell likened the landmark decision to a “noble image dulled by resistance” and a “magnificent mirage” (p. 4). Declarations of educational progress in the areas of access, equality, opportunity, and diversity are often translated into perceptions of Black progress and inclusion. However, research on the education of Black or minority children has documented their continued overidentification in special education (Artiles, Klinger, & Tate, 2006) and for discipline issues (Gordon, 2004; Ingersoll, 2005). The use of race as a factor in a K–12 school assignment plan, arguing that “the way to stop discrimination on the basis of race is to stop discriminating on the basis of race” (p. 40).

Research Methods and Design

Using a critical race methodology, which values the experiential knowledge of people of color and recognizes the historical, legal, and political contexts of race and racism in U.S. education (Solórzano & Yosso, 2002), I aimed to give voice to Black educational leaders, whose voices are often missing in the literature. In fact, few scholars have studied the Black school superintendent (Alston, 2005; Horsford & McKenzie, 2008; Hunter & Donahoo, 2005; Moody, 1971; Scott, 1980), although their wisdom of practice as school system leaders offers a system-wide perspective on matters of race, power, and education. (See Horsford, 2007, for a complete description of methods used in the larger qualitative study.)

Data were collected over 3 months through eight one-on-one, in-person interviews, each lasting 1.0–2.5 hours, during which I asked participants about their experiences as students in segregated schools and superintendents of desegregated school systems. Questions focused on their memories of the Brown decision, the types of educational choices available to them pre- and post-Brown, how segregation and desegregation shaped their identity and work as educational leaders, and whether or not they believed Black and other historically marginalized students today enjoy the Brown decision’s promise of equal educational access and opportunity. Other data sources included professional biographies and curriculum vitae provided by participants, biographical profiles and feature stories about the participants, articles and position papers authored by the participants, and electronic newspaper articles describing and chronicling their work as educational leaders.

Trustworthiness was achieved using the triangulation of interview responses, participant biographical information and news reports, researcher field notes and journal, and related research (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Member checks (Glesne, 1999) via e-mail correspondence gave participants the chance to respond to the data analysis and construction of key themes to ensure the analysis and report reflected their intended meaning (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Checks revealed one word change, which was incorrectly transcribed from the tape and a request from one participant to remove “you knows” from the interview responses.

Participants: The Black School Superintendent

The study included 8 participants selected through network sampling who satisfied three criteria: (a) self-identified as Black or African American, (b) achieved the superintendentcy, and (c) were able to recall personal experiences as K–12 students attending segregated schools. The 4 females and 4 males were born between 1932 and 1957; grew up in segregated communities in the Midwest, Mid-Atlantic and Southern regions of the United States; and graduated high school between 1950 and 1965. Of the 8 superintendents, 7 earned an undergraduate degree at segregated or Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), 2 earned master’s degrees at HBCUs, and all received doctorates at predominately White institutions. As superintendents, they were responsible for districts located in various regions of the country representing the Southwest, Midwest, Mid-Atlantic, Northeast, and Southeast.
School Desegregation and Racial Liberalism

Study findings support the growing body of literature by Black researchers, scholars, and educators concerning the unintended consequences of school desegregation on Black education (Bell, 2004; Ladson-Billings, 2004; E. Morris, 2008; V. G. Morris & Morris, 2002; Shuja, 1996; Tillman, 2004) and the notion that we never truly integrated at all (Bell, 2005; Foster, 1997; Horsford, 2007; Shuja, 1996). Using critical race theory's critique of racial liberalism as an analytical framework, the following section presents selected reflections and perceptions of Black superintendents on desegregation to illustrate the “magnificent mirage” (Bell, 2004, p. 4) that is the Brown decision, the staunch resistance that met school desegregation efforts, and the embedded nature of these racial realities. I employ Guinier’s (2004) conception of racial liberalism as an ideological frame that emphasizes “the corrosive effect of individual prejudice and the importance of interracial contact in promoting tolerance” rather than the systemic nature of racialized hierarchies and institutional racism (p. 95). As such, racial liberalism’s focus on the ideals of colorblindness (color or race does not matter), meritocracy (access and achievement are based on individual worthiness), and neutrality (color or race does not matter), meritocracy (access and achievement are based on individual worthiness), and neutrality (people are said to be equal) overburdened the claim that Brown addressed the systemic nature of institutional racism.

Unpacking the “Magnificent Mirage” of Brown

Examples of the “magnificent mirage” of Brown (Bell, 2004, p. 4) are the types of resegregation that took place in classrooms, cafeterias, and the very buses that transported students to their “desegregated” schools. Eyler, Cook, and Ward (1983) defined this form of resegregation as a process where students are grouped and isolated by race and ethnicity within desegregated schools.

Dr. Lewis recalled working as a central office administrator in a Midwestern school district where officials employed tactics to ensure the undersubscribed White schools were not closed as a result of the district’s desegregation plan. The Black schools, because of their containment, were oversubscribed, so they did what they could to busing, which means when you get to the White school, you go to your own separate classroom, and you are segregated there. You have a separate recess where you’re segregated there. You have a separate lunch where you’re segregated there. Then you get on your bus and come back to [your own neighborhood].

Along the same lines, Dr. Cooper stated, “We’ve never truly integrated.” She explained,

We mixed children…and even though they were in the same school, you would still see honors classes that looked one way and regular classes that looked differently. So I think the commitment has never been there truly [for] true integration.

These acts of resegregation within “desegregated” schools and intact busing present a false demonstration of integration and challenge the liberal myth of colorblindness, or the notion that color does not matter.

Acknowledging the Staunch Resistance to Desegregation

Lack of government action after Brown, coupled with White flight and resistance to the integration of Black children into all-White schools, illustrates what many described as a climate of racism and White self-interest that existed post-Brown (Bell, 2004; Tate, Ladson-Billings, & Grant, 1996; Wells, 1993). Massive resistance tactics included school boards closing public schools then to offer tuition vouchers to White students so they could avoid going to school with Blacks, while an individualized response for Whites was simply to flee impacted neighborhoods to avoid their children attending school with Black children.

Participant Dr. Lewis remembered how in his Midwestern school district, predominately White county schools paid predominately Black city schools “to accept their Black youngsters so that they wouldn’t have to teach them,” further segregating the school system and thus violating the Constitution. The state was then ordered to pay for the desegregation plan, which it simply refused to do. According to Dr. Lewis, “In the beginning years, the federal government had to take funds out of the treasury because the [state] legislature wouldn’t appropriate the money.” Despite or because of these extreme measures, Dr. Lewis concluded that this same school district is “in my judgment…back where we were in, say, 1964. …It’s, you know [chuckling], the powers that be. The folks that control the thing, that’s the way they want it. That’s the way they want it.”

Another study superintendent, Dr. Young, echoed this sentiment by describing how after 20–30 years of desegregation efforts, “people are saying, ‘Ah, but that costs too much money and maybe the results aren’t there, and we’d rather be in our own Black schools and our own White schools,’ and just trying to go back.” Participant Dr. Steele stated the educational community’s commitment to “diversity” is so “they don’t have to talk about…past segregation and discrimination” or “own up to all the policies and procedures that you have that made that state of segregation.” This observation challenges racial liberalism’s definition of equality as the mere removal of barriers that create racial separation.

Interrogating the Embedded Nature of Racialized Hierarchies

Participants were concerned that in desegregated schools, less was expected of students of color, of poverty, and of single-family homes, contradicting the liberal ideal of meritocracy. According to Dr. Cooper,

As our country has become more and more diverse, I’m seeing the schools almost being used to craft a caste system, because if you are trapped into an inferior education, you’re going to be trapped into a lifestyle and condition of livelihood that’s going to be substandard as compared to somebody else.

These structures and hierarchies are not limited to what Dr. Steele described as school systems that successfully “sort and sift” children according to the perceived abilities, but include those that determine who gets access to educational leadership positions and the level of responsibility afforded in those positions.

Superintendents shared examples of denied benefits and opportunities in desegregated contexts, where they were limited in their ability to find jobs or enjoy the same authority their White counterparts did in similar positions, debunking racial liberalism’s myths of colorblindness and meritocracy (DeCuirc & Dixson, 2004; Delgado & Stefancic, 2001; Guinier 2004). Dr. Baker said, “I think some of us thought desegregation was going to give us something that it didn’t give us and…[yet] there were certain positions you didn’t get because you weren’t White.” When selected as a finalist for a superintendent’s position, Dr. Clark was told that although she
was the most qualified candidate, the “community was not ready for a Black person” to assume the role.

Even after assuming the superintendency, some participants did not feel they enjoyed the same rights as their White counterparts. They recalled feeling restricted in their ability to share and implement their vision for fear of being prevented from doing what they wanted to do. According to Dr. Marshall, “Black superintendents, many of them…didn’t have the same power base as White superintendents to make certain kinds of decisions,” such as “the authority to hire and control their situation as some of my White friends [did].” Furthermore, they often were hired to lead districts that Dr. Lewis described as being in “disarray,” where the “infrastructure had just disintegrated,” the student population was majority Black, and “the board was fighting among itself.” Still, he added, “There are some school districts…you know you need not apply.”

**Applying Lessons Learned: Toward Racial Literacy in Educational Leadership**

Preparing educational leaders to recognize the limitations of desegregation policies; acknowledge the resistance to racial equality; and discern the pervasiveness of inequities embedded in administrative structures, district policies, and school processes is difficult work. Study findings show how important these skills and dispositions are, particularly for administrators working in diverse school environments. Contemporary efforts to close the “achievement gap”; address the “critical race disconnect between communities of color and their schools, teachers, and administrators” (Parker & Villalpondo, 2007, p. 521); and ameliorate racial disparities in educational access, opportunities, and performance cannot be achieved without an understanding of the legacy of discrimination in education and the maintenance of racialized hierarchies in contemporary contexts.

As professors of educational administration, the best way to approach and engage in this work is by using what Guinier (2004) defined as *racial literacy*—a framework that “requires us to rethink race as an instrument of social, geographic, and economic control of both whites and blacks” (p. 114). This framework is “flexible enough to apply to different contexts without forcing everyone’s experiences into a single explanatory narrative” (Guinier & Torres, 2002, p. 31). Based on the findings of this study, I offer three ways to advance racial literacy in the preparation of educational leaders. In addition to using the Brown decision as an example of how education law and policies are limited by the embedded nature of race, structural racism, and the distribution of power and resources along racial lines, education researchers, professors, and practicing and aspiring leaders should consider the following:

1. Study the histories and historical context of the school communities they serve. This information can be gained through historical research and artifacts to include newspaper reports, governmental data, and school and district performance reports, as well as informal interviews that capture the experiential knowledge of people who have been marginalized, underserved, or silenced in a particular community.

2. Focus interrogations and discussions of race and racism in ways that move beyond individual attitudes and acts of prejudice and discrimination. Educational leaders must recognize and examine the structural and institutional manifestations of exclusion and segregation that permeate administrative structures, policies, processes, and practices and that maintain racialized hierarchies and inequities in schools and school systems. Although some educators may wish to avoid such investigations, a critical race analysis of these factors is vital to establishing a school structure and fostering a school climate and culture that support school–family–community relationships built on the mutual respect, caring, and trust that many communities of color long for today.

3. Think critically about the ideologies of colorblindness, integration, diversity, and inclusion that are presented in racially neutral or ahistorical ways. Support for diversity and inclusion programs and initiatives that fail to recognize how race and racism work to maintain hierarchies, allocate resources, and distribute power will not do much to address gaps in student achievement, school performance, and connections to school communities.

**Conclusion**

With this article I do not seek to make the case for or against school desegregation, undermine the significance of Brown, or generalize the perspectives of the superintendents interviewed for this study. I merely aim to provide insight into the mixed legacy of school desegregation through the voices of educational leaders who experienced both segregation as students and desegregation efforts as school district administrators. Professors charged with preparing future educational leaders and scholars can use lessons from the past to advance fairness and social justice in all educational settings today and for generations to come. By advancing racial literacy in education leadership, we can better prepare aspiring educational leaders (many of whom are unaware of the histories of exclusion, segregation, and marginalization in their local school districts and communities) to develop the knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to recognize, resist, and transform the complex and complicated hierarchies governed by race and power in education.
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50 Years of UCEA Review

The first issue of UCEA Review was in 1959. Jack Culbertson proposed the newsletter to improve communication among members; report ideas and actions of UCEA to “stimulate other ideas”; and increase understanding of the new organization’s practice, policy, and potential.
Revisiting the Insights and Ideas of Jack Culbertson

From 1959 to 1981, Jack Culbertson worked through the UCEA consortia to improve the quality of leadership in educational administration. Jack linked people with ideas; mentored and influenced the careers of countless professors and practitioners; and molded a national organization that assumed a leadership role in both shaping and articulating the movements, trends, and developments in the field of educational leadership. His work with professors led to the development of well over 100 books, articles, essays, simulation training materials, and other published works. In this UCEA Review column, we will be revisiting a few of the many powerful ideas and insights Jack shared with our field. As UCEA considers its current and future international partnerships and ventures, the ideas and advisement of thinkers like Jack are invaluable. I hope you enjoy reading the piece (originally published in chapter 6 of Building Bridges: UCEA’s First Two Decades, by Jack Culbertson, 1995, University Park, PA: UCEA).

Michelle D. Young, UCEA Executive Director

The Changing Directions of UCEA

Jack Culbertson

(1995)

“Those gazing on the stars are proverbially at the mercy of the puddles on the road.” – Alexander Smith

During the 1974–81 period, the navigators of UCEA encountered strong crosswinds. New winds pushed UCEA toward greater equity for minorities, women, and the physically challenged, while opposing winds caused UCEA to cling to old moorings. Other winds propelled UCEA toward ports of renewal, while counter ones stirred entropic tendencies, as governance personnel became more involved in rule making, altering by-laws, and administrative matters. The counter tendencies activated by these and other crosswinds created an unusual challenge: Could UCEA’s leaders keep the organization sailing toward new ports, or would they allow it to veer into tempestuous seas?

Confronting Human Inequities

UCEA’s efforts to enhance equity were partially rooted in earlier events. In 1972 Associate Director Michael Martin developed a UCEA Task Force on Native American Educational Administration. Among the programs generated by the task force was a federally funded conference on Indian education. In 1973–74 UCEA had developed an information exchange project with professors in three institutions that specialized in training Black administrators: Atlanta University, Cheyney State College, and Howard University. An extensive project to integrate general and special education administration was implemented. Such programs increased UCEA’s awareness of human inequities in the field and provided a base for more far-reaching efforts during the last half of the 1970s.

In 1959 the number of women professors of educational administration in UCEA’s 34 universities was fewer than six. The situation changed very little until the late 1960s when numerous women began entering doctoral programs. Soon thereafter, some professors began nominating able women for UCEA associate director posts. In 1972 the short list of candidates for a UCEA post included a woman. When I reported this fact informally to a group of professors in Atlantic City, an awkward pause ensued. The silence was broken when an internationally known professor asserted that the employment of a female associate would be a mistake. She would not be able to function effectively during university visits, he said, because professors would be viewing her more as a sex object than as a professional colleague.

Though no one openly contested the professor’s view, apparently some did not accept it. Later in the evening the view was assessed further, when a female staff member from a regional educational laboratory volunteered to play the role of an associate director on a UCEA university visit. After much role playing the group, according to a subsequent report from Troy McKelvey, concluded they could work professionally with a female staff member.

In the spring of 1973, UCEA employed Paula Silver, the first of three females who would serve UCEA in the 1970s. A confrontation of discriminatory norms, Paula during university visits offered frank and often unpopular responses when asked about women’s equity. She also helped sensitize UCEA’s male staff members to inequitable practices. Very early she asserted that writers of UCEA’s by-laws had behaved as if women were nonexistent in UCEA. Her observation, an undeniably accurate one, led to a rewriting of the by-laws.

May 1974, the Executive Committee asked Paula Silver to assume the duties of UCEA secretary. Before accepting the post, she requested that her title be changed to “administrative associate.” Taking minutes, she noted, was not the only duty in the post. More importantly, some in UCEA were already presuming that she was a member of UCEA’s clerical staff—a tendency she did not want to reinforce. The committee acceded to her request.

In early 1974 Paula Silver conceived of the UCEA Computerized Research and Placement System (CORPS). This system was designed to gather and store data on all students completing doctoral and 2-year programs in educational administration and to provide data to help women and members of minority groups obtain administrative posts. The general idea for a computerized student data system was outlined in 1969 by UCEA Associate Director Alan Gaynor. Then Frank Banghart of Florida State translated the idea into a specific plan. In 1973–74, Charles Kline and Richard Munsterman of Purdue University pilot tested the system. After Paula Silver outlined a 3-year plan to assess the research and placement capacities of the system, the Ford Foundation provided UCEA a $150,000 grant to support the proposed plan.

In November 1974, the UCEA Plenary Session had a lively
discussion about CORPS. Two ideas proved to be very controversial: the exclusion of White males from the placement system and the inclusion of women and minority graduates from UCEA and non-UCEA institutions. Some Plenary members argued that the system promoted “reverse discrimination.” Others felt it was unfair to include students from non-UCEA institutions. After a long discussion, John Seger, a Plenary member from the University of Alberta, movingly argued that UCEA should implement CORPS because it was morally correct to do so. He then made a motion that the Plenary Session “approve the spirit of the CORPS project and its…progress to date.” The body approved his motion.

The central staff worked diligently to make CORPS an effective system. More than 20,000 descriptive mailings were sent annually to school systems and other agencies in 1974, 1975, and 1976. Also, two directories—one featuring women and one minority candidates—were mailed widely yearly. Although the system helped some candidates obtain positions, its overall results were disappointing. CORPS simply could not compete with professors who used their own informal networks to place graduates. Further, placement was often influenced by male professors who were employed by school boards to recommend candidates for administrative posts. The impersonal computerized system meshed poorly with existing placement practices.

CORPS’s data made their way into several articles on such questions as, how did the characteristics of candidates for professorships compare and contrast with those of candidates for administrative posts? What subjects did professorial candidates desire to teach? What were the differences in the experience backgrounds of White males, women, and members of minority group? Answers to such questions had import for the redesign of academic and clinical training experiences. An annually updated information system on all UCEA students would have provided a resource for research, program redesign, and placement efforts. Unfortunately, neither UCEA nor its members had the resources to continue the system.

CORPS had an important impact on UCEA norms. When the Executive Committee and the Plenary Session agreed, after much deliberation, that CORPS should be enacted, they gave professors an important message, namely that it was morally correct to conduct programs to rectify the negative effects of long-standing discrimination against women and minorities. The decision made it easier for UCEA to address other equity problems. It also influenced equity decisions in universities. For example, by 1980 most of the UCEA universities had employed at least one female professor of educational administration. Discussions about CORPS helped pave the way for such actions.

In January 1976, UCEA convened a task force on the advancement of women’s equity in educational administration. Serving on the task force were five pairs of professors: Joan Dee and Don Davies, Boston University; Charlotte Robinson and James Maxey, Georgia State; Ann Engin and Russell Spillman, Ohio State; Virginia Nordin and Marvin Fruth, Wisconsin; and Gladys Johnston and Wayne Hoy, Rutgers. The group proposed that UCEA (a) develop training materials to enhance women’s equity and (b) create a network of women and minorities to facilitate information exchange. The network, the group decided, might best be built through the launching of a new journal.

One month later the staff recommended to the Plenary Session that UCEA develop the desired training materials—a proposal the body debated and approved. Paula Silver then wrote a proposal for a 2-year program. Later the U.S. Office of Education awarded UCEA about $250,000 to help implement the program. In 1976 Grace Butler, possessor of a newly acquired Ph.D. from New York University, joined UCEA as an associate director and the coordinator of the project. Earlier she had taught music and had served as a department head and a project director in the New York City Schools. Sensitive to interpersonal relations and skilled in strategic thinking, she helped the project’s leaders realize their aims.

Six teams composed of two or three professors and one or two graduate students developed the materials. Professorial team members were Miriam Clasby, Joan Dee, and Don Davies, Boston University; Charlotte Robinson and James Maxey, Georgia State; Martha McCarthy, David Clark, and Marianne Mitchell, Indiana; Ann Engin and Russell Spillman, Ohio State; and Lillian Dean Webb and John McClure, Iowa. Paula Silver, aided by new colleagues at Tulsa University, developed a sixth set of materials.

Each of the six diverse sets complemented one another. The Boston team developed materials to train women for their first administrative post; the Iowa team, materials to sensitize all education trainees to important equity issues; the Georgia State team, materials to help professors change discriminatory practices in their departments; the Indiana team, materials for higher education administrators; the Ohio State team, materials to help K–12 leaders reduce inequitable school practices; and the Tulsa team summarized the basic content in the five other sets.

Each set offered both written and audio-visual components. The Georgia State set, for instance, contained a booklet on the status of women in administration, a self-study package for analyzing equity practices in departments; action guides for combating sex discrimination; a filmed case; and a group of role-playing situations and games. At Indiana the team prepared a monograph on the effects of sex discrimination in higher education, a simulation, written and audio-recorded cases, a game, and a resource file. When the sets were nearly finished, Grace Butler arranged for the pilot testing of the materials at 18 university sites. Each team revised its materials after obtaining feedback from attendees at three sites.

The materials were arguably the richest ones ever created by UCEA. However, when judged by the use of its products, the project was a major failure. Early in the project I spoke with Washington officials about UCEA’s strategies for disseminating materials. While my hosts listened politely, they displayed no interest. When I later learned that they had already awarded a large grant to a women’s center in the Northeast to disseminate federally funded materials on women’s equity, I understood their reaction.

In the summer of 1978 UCEA shipped 46 training components to the U.S. Office of Education. Many months later we learned that the agency’s evaluators had approved 44 of the 46 for distribution, and that most of the 44 had received the “highest” recommendation. When I talked with the head of the women’s center in the Northeast about distributing the materials, it was apparent that we had discrepant views. UCEA wanted to distribute materials to a special group; she wanted to reach more general populations. UCEA valued reality-oriented training materials, while she seemed more interested in concepts about ideal practices. Unfortunately, the center did not distribute the materials. One of my major regrets on leaving UCEA was that the materials were still not in use. Fueling my regret was the conviction that most of the training components could have had extensive use within and beyond UCEA.

The task force’s proposal for a new journal posed special chal-
The two journals UCEA had launched a decade earlier were still not fully self-supporting. In addition, one study showed that only 10% of the professoriate believed that the “problems minority groups” faced were “very serious” ones (Campbell & Newell, 1973, p. 87). Some who were relatively complacent about human inequities contended that the proposed journal was an unneeded competitor to UCEA’s Educational Administration Quarterly (EAQ). Only one female and no minority members had ever served on the board of UCEA’s refereed EAQ. Minorities and women resented the fact that their groups were excluded from the circle of White males who controlled the content of the EAQ.

Efforts to create a new journal, then, were fraught with risk. Yet the staff believed that the initiative might diminish discrimination. On May 10–11, 1976, we convened several individuals to help conceptualize the project: Frank Brown, the State University of New York at Buffalo; Gerald Gipp, Pennsylvania State; James Maxey and Charlotte Robinson, Georgia State; and Leonard Valverde, Texas. Naming the medium Emergent Leadership: A Focus on Minorities and Women in Educational Administration, the group decided that the purpose of the journal would be to help “educational leaders reduce sex and racial discrimination” (“UCEA Evaluation and Planning Commission,” 1976, p. 17). The group also agreed that leaders from the UCEA Partnership could serve on the journal’s editorial board.

In the spring of 1976 the UCEA Executive Committee, after a lively debate, approved a 4-year trial period for the journal. Edited the first year by Charlotte Robinson and James Maxey of Georgia State, the periodical was designed to serve as a “vehicle” of exchange for those “traditionally underrepresented” in leadership positions (Robinson, 1976, p. 5). In its second year the journal was edited by Frank Brown at Buffalo, the third year by Leonard Valverde at Texas, and the fourth year by Grayson Noley at Pennsylvania State. While planning for the 1979–84 period, the UCEA staff asked scholars not previously involved in the new journal to evaluate its first six issues. Noting that Emergent Leadership was the only journal written primarily for minority group members and women, the scholars recommended that UCEA continue the initiative. Suggestions for improving it were incorporated into UCEA’s 1979–84 plan.

In October, 1979, the Executive Committee reviewed applications from four universities whose staffs wanted to assume editorial responsibility for the journal. After assessing the proposed editors, resources, and commitments of each university, the committee chose Arizona State. When I reported the decision the next day to Lillian Dean Webb, the new editor, and to Susan Paddock and Kay Hartwell, the new associate editors, they seemed elated. About a year later UCEA distributed the first issue. Although the periodical focused upon equity issues related to women, African Americans, Hispanics, Native Americans, and other groups, a new title appeared on its cover: The Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership.

For long-time supporters of the EAQ, the new journal was a negative symbol. One well-known UCEA professor expressed the view thusly (Campbell, 1979, p. 16): “It appears that UCEA gives little time and energy to EAQ and more time and energy to...other journals that may compete with EAQ for at least some desirable manuscripts.” Firmly expressing his priorities, he proposed that “UCEA should withdraw as soon as possible from its obligations to Emergent Leadership” (p. 18). A few months later the UCEA Executive Committee forthrightly voted to continue the journal. However, at its January 1980 meeting the committee charged the staff and the editorial boards of UCEA’s three journals to make them all “financially self-sustaining by June 30, 1983.” The decision put UCEA’s youngest journal at a greater risk than was the case with its two older ones. At the time that journal had about 300 subscribers.

References


IES Hosts Webinars on Federal Funding

The Institute of Education Sciences (IES) will host a series of webinars to discuss research funding opportunities at the National Center for Special Education Research (NCSER) and the National Center for Education Research (NCER). Registration information is online at http://ies.ed.gov/funding/webinars.asp. Each webinar will host up to 100 individual participants. Participants will be registered on a first-come, first-served basis. Three types of webinars are planned.

Basic Overview Session: IES staff will provide a general overview of IES, NCSER and NCER research topics, the IES goal structure, and the peer review process. These sessions are intended for researchers who are unfamiliar with IES or are novice applicants.

Grant Writing Workshop: IES staff will provide more in-depth information about requests for applications and the IES grant structure.

Application Process Session: Presenters will provide information on the grant submission process. Topics will focus on the application instructions package, including content and formatting requirements, human subjects clearance, and application forms.
Diversifying the Pipeline
Mónica Byrne-Jiménez
Hofstra University

The low number of underrepresented groups in our doctoral programs and in the academy continues to be a blemish on the social justice agenda espoused by institutions and individuals alike. As K–12 schools in all areas of the country continue to see their community demographics change, higher education and doctoral programs in particular have been slow to recognize that current efforts are limited when it comes to recruiting, supporting, and retaining graduate students and faculty from underserved groups. The pipeline entails moving minority students from doctoral studies to faculty positions to tenure and promotion. It requires an inquiry into the experiences and needs of both doctoral students and young faculty in organizations that are often unaware of their role in “clogging” the pipeline.

The following essays reflect two leadership perspectives on “priming” the institution for organizational change. Fran Kochan, dean of the School of Education at Auburn University and former UCEA president, offers several concrete strategies and lessons learned from their ongoing work. According to Dr. Kochan, local efforts coupled with national leadership are necessary to demonstrate an institution’s commitment to its minority graduate students, K–12 schools, and the field of education leadership. Olga Welch, dean of the School of Education at Duquesne University, emphasizes the relationship between school mission or identity and faculty commitment to diversity. Dr. Welch states that only by engaging faculty in the development of a culture that values and fosters diversity can the institution and the pipeline be strengthened. Both Drs. Kochan and Welch advocate for moving beyond incremental thinking and towards large-scale change.

These honest and thoughtful essays challenge us to look critically at program activities, culture, and structures that provide a supportive and safe pipeline for students—or do not. While a pipeline is necessary, it is not sufficient. We also must look carefully at our teaching, research, and service as vehicles to enhance diversity in our programs. In order to prepare school leaders for the demands of increasingly diverse schools, we must pay attention to the context-related issues that often hinder our best intended plans and programming. It is our hope that these essays will encourage faculty to continue, or renew, their efforts to ensure a steady stream of faculty that mirror the changing nature of public education.

Promising Practices and Reflections on Unresolved Problems
Frances K. Kochan
Auburn University

Success in diversifying the pipeline in the academy requires a comprehensive approach that includes the institution, the administrative leadership, and faculty members. It works best when everyone is involved and committed. Our college engages in this effort through a number of activities at the local and national levels. The simplest and yet perhaps most important is our recruitment through our partnerships with school systems with high percentages of minorities. We have found that those from underrepresented groups often do not consider graduate education as an option. As we engage in partnership work, we have gained the trust of those we work with and have been able to encourage minority faculty and administrators to become a part of our graduate program. In some instances, we have asked individuals who are in administrative positions to make presentations to our classes or to team teach an educational leadership class with one of our faculty members. Often, it will take years before they finally take the plunge and enroll in our doctoral programs. Relationship building is a key ingredient in successful recruitment.

Many of our students, particularly those in the educational leadership program, are part-time students, but for full-time students, our university has provided a graduate assistantship program that has allowed us to expand our enrollment of full-time minority graduate students. The program permitted us to provide assistantships to African American students with a $5,000 contribution from the department that was matched with enough funding to provide an assistantship with a tuition waiver. The Michigan State case has put this program on hold, but we are hoping that it will be reconfigured in a way that will continue to allow us to encourage underrepresented groups to become full-time students in our programs.

Our institution is a member of the Holmes Partnership. All university members of the partnership must commit to having Holmes Scholars. These scholars are graduate students from underrepresented groups who want to enter the professorship ranks. Now over 500 graduates from these programs are in institutions all over the country. I was the sponsor of this program at our institution when it began, and I serve as their sponsor now. Our scholars are all full-time students, so we are able to meet monthly and have opportunities to engage in activities to develop their leadership capacities by meeting upper level administrators, talking with successful minority faculty, engaging in leadership development activities, and having them mentor one another.

When I served as an officer of the UCEA Board, we developed the Barbara Jackson Scholars Program modeled after the Holmes Scholars Program to ensure that educational leadership programs would have a pool of minority candidates to choose from in the years ahead. Most of the Jackson Scholars have been part-time students, so we have had to develop their mentoring and development activities in a somewhat different manner than we have done with our Holmes Scholars. They receive mentoring in preparing for the academy; attend UCEA, AERA, and other appropriate conferences; and are introduced to others who can help them along the way, including their UCEA mentors.

Many of our faculty and department heads are involved in identifying, recruiting, and supporting underrepresented groups into our programs. For example, one of our faculty members is a graduate of a nearby Historically Black College or University (HBCU). He and his department head have assisted the college in creating a partnership with his undergraduate institution. The program began in the fall of 2009. We have two graduate students now enrolled in our program and expect more to come in the future. We are looking at some potential joint ventures between our students so
that we can build a community in which all can learn, all can grow, and students from the HBCU will feel comfortable and welcome. The department head from this program also has visited a Native American reservation, and we are hoping to be able to recruit students from that location as well.

Some of our faculty members have created partnerships with their colleagues across the country to aid them to recruit some of our promising undergraduate students into their doctoral programs, to recruit their students into our programs, and to recruit one another’s graduates into the faculty ranks. The Holmes and UCEA Scholars networks provide a similar avenue for recruitment. We encourage our students to become part of the Brothers and Sisters of the Academy, which also serves as a support network. In addition, our college has a shared governance model that includes eight working committees, one of which focuses on diversity. This committee oversees our diversity climate, creates strategies for change, and serves as an advisor to the dean.

No matter who is being recruited or what mechanisms of support are being utilized, some basic principles are essential for success. First, it is important to let people know that their abilities are recognized and honored, that you want them in your program, that you believe in their capacity to succeed, that you are going to be there to support them, and that the academy will have a place for them when they complete their degree. Second, once people are in the program, it is imperative that the environment that they enter supports and guides them. Faculty members must be sure to pull together faculty committees that are serious about the success of these students. Creating systems of support that provide mentoring opportunities and networks within and outside of the institutions, such as that created within UCEA, should be accessed. Third, opportunities to discuss issues of diversity with others should be integrated into the life of the department and the college so that they can be dealt with in meaningful ways. The curriculum itself needs to be examined and reexamined to assure that it is providing a forum to exchange ideas and educating all about the world of yesterday, today, and tomorrow. Without such change, the environments in which students from varied backgrounds enter and into which they will be serving as faculty members will not be supportive or comfortable.

These efforts work best when everyone is involved, but even if one is working in an institution that is not supportive, I believe that everyone can do something to make a difference. I encourage everyone reading this essay to consider what they do to foster the diversification of the academy. I sincerely believe that unless we all become actively engaged in this goal, we will fail the students of the 21st century, in both K–12 and higher education, and our country and world as well.

While most of us are sincerely engaged in trying to bring greater diversity to our institutions and to the educational leadership field, there are many barriers to success. Two questions may help us to address them.

1. How can we assure that the environment into which we are recruiting individuals at the graduate and faculty levels is ready and willing to embrace and support those who traditionally have not been a part of the academy?

This is an area of particular concern to me. In recent years, we have had a number of minority groups who have had difficulty when going through promotion and tenure. This has been true in other colleges on campus and in other university settings. Although not all faculty members will be successful in becoming tenured, part of the problem with some of these faculty members is related to their area of research. Some were doing research in new areas—breaking ground in areas dealing with diversity. Thus, there was not a great deal of literature for them to use. Similarly, in some situations it was difficult for them to get their research published. Some faculty inside and outside of our college view such research with concern or question its validity. In speaking with deans from other settings, this concern is real and has led some of them to recommend that minority faculty do research in areas not related to issues of diversity.

2. Who is still being left out of the equation?

During the past 40 years, Auburn University and our college have focused diversity issues on recruiting African American students and faculty into university ranks. Although we have had some success in this realm, much more remains to be done. In addition, over the past few years, our efforts have expanded to be more inclusive. Although the Latina/o population in our state is increasing, we have almost no students from this group and only two Latina/o faculty members in our college. We have only two faculty members with Native American roots and no students who have indicated that they have such a background. Only one of our faculty members has a disability, although we are seeing an increase in students with disabilities coming to us who are seeking to become faculty members. We have an increase in students who are lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender (LGBT) and have a strong support group in place for them. While we are making inroads in helping to diversify the pipeline and have programs in place for students who may need additional support, we need to think in a comprehensive manner and to consider our definitions of diversity and how we are going to assure that they are truly inclusive.

**Priming the Pump: The Conundrum of Diversifying the Pipeline**

Olga M. Welch

**Duquesne University**

In higher education, when we speak of “diversifying the pipeline,” a cynic rightly might question our resolve given the number of initiatives at institutions, large and small, private and public, Research 1 and research intensive, aimed at student, faculty, and administrative populations. Although few doubt our stated commitment, realizing the goal of a diverse academy by developing sustained and replicable models remains elusive. Certainly, excellent examples of effective programs exist throughout UCEA member institutions. However, for the most part, we have yet to form long-term solutions to the conundrum of moving diversifying the pipeline from a “desirable” goal in university strategic planning to an intentional and critical “necessity” for our 21st-century institutions to achieve.

In July 2005, I came to Duquesne University as dean of the School of Education, having served as a professor and as department head of two academic units, one of which was the Department...
of Educational Administration and Policy Studies at the University of Tennessee. I was drawn by Duquesne University’s mission, “to serve God by serving students,” and its commitment as the only Spiritan university in the world to actualize the Spiritan Order’s mission to serve the poor and oppressed through a social justice agenda that includes requiring all undergraduate and graduate students to engage in service to the community. I also believed that a vision for the School of Education could not come from the top down but had to evolve from faculty dialogues focusing on the school’s direction and future. The mission of the university had guided the School of Education throughout its 77-year history. Grounded in that mission, the school enjoyed a rich and well-established reputation in Pennsylvania for preparing excellent teachers, administrators, school psychologists, and counselors. While recognizing and respecting that reputation, I acted the role of “critical friend,” posing one question to my colleagues, “Why Duquesne?” In a state boasting 94 colleges and schools of education, including the University of Pittsburgh, Temple University, Penn State University, and the University of Pennsylvania, with equally strong competing programs in Ohio and West Virginia, I believed the need existed to articulate an identity that clearly differentiated Duquesne’s School of Education from its peers. Moreover, I held strongly that crafting any identity had to be undertaken by those who would be accountable for its implementation: the faculty, not the dean. In that spirit, I left the faculty to design a process that would result in an identity for the school they could support.

In 2006, the faculty developed and unanimously endorsed an identity for the school based on three pillars: (a) the preparation of educational leaders whose contributions to their respective fields could be documented and quantified; (b) scholarship for schools, scholarship in partnership with schools and school systems that would address local problems as well as larger national research questions; and (c) the Spiritan tradition of caring, the tradition that would inform and be represented in our preparation of undergraduate, graduate, and doctoral students whose ethical practice would reflect their commitment to the caring service to humanity and social justice modeled by the Spiritan fathers who founded Duquesne University. These identity pillars guide and frame our school’s governance structure, including the decision-making and communication systems, the hiring and retention of new faculty, and the promotion of associate professors to full rank. This identity also informs our interactions with staff and, above all, with our students.

Thus, aligned with the university mission, the School of Education’s identity has set the parameters for building a school climate of respect for all faculty, an ethos grounded in the belief that diversity flourishes best when the school’s identity produces a climate that promotes the development of human capital and humane, professional partnerships of research and practice. In the School of Education at Duquesne, therefore, we approach diversifying the pipeline from the premise that the school itself must reflect that belief and be accountable for actualizing it in the faculty’s research, teaching, and service activities.

To that end, in our marketing plan, in our recruitment efforts, and in the conversations with prospective students, and in our relationships with one another, we seek to make the school a diverse and welcoming professional environment. However, we candidly admit that this remains a goal not yet realized, but one that we consider a priority worth pursuing. We pursue that priority in a variety of ways, including but not limited to (a) building on the legacy and reputation enjoyed by the school in western Pennsylvania and the region, (b) engaging in research that is recognized nationally, and (c) promoting our graduate students’ ability to present their work at national conferences with faculty mentors. Thus, in addition to providing financial support for doctoral students in school psychology, counselor education, and teacher education to present their research, our commitment to preparing strong educational leaders is best captured in the Interdisciplinary Doctoral Program in Educational Foundations and Leadership (IDPEL). Housed in the Department of Educational Foundations and Leadership, the program has graduated 60% of the practicing or past superintendents in western Pennsylvania. Moreover, it is the site of the largest cohort of students named as UCEA Jackson Scholars.

Marketing the Jackson Scholars Program

To ensure that all eligible doctoral students in IDPEL are aware of the opportunity to become Jackson Scholars, we make the marketing of this program a priority. We also tie the Jackson Scholars program to the identity pillar—preparing educational leaders—to ensure that faculty and students are reminded of its centrality to the school’s mission. By doing so, we seek to underscore for both faculty and students their role in making this goal a reality.

Further, as indicated earlier, in all programs, a priority is funding doctoral students’ ability to present their work at national conferences. Consequently, funding for Jackson Scholars also is not an afterthought but an integral and intentional component of their doctoral preparation. Moreover, when a student from Duquesne is chosen as a Jackson Scholar, we envision that selection as a multyear commitment to the scholar’s research agenda and to the presentation of that research in national professional venues.

A school of education culture that actualizes the Spiritan tradition of caring and the university mission of “serving God through serving students” begins with the faculty in the Department of Educational Foundations and Leadership. In the case of the Jackson Scholars, collectively, the faculty have worked hard to attract doctoral students of color and to mentor them as they prepare to become members of the academy, superintendents, or school-based administrators. These include presentations at field sites, one-to-one conversations with prospective students, and contributions to marketing materials that clarify our desire to diversify our student ranks and our representation in the Jackson Scholars Program. Moreover, in addition to opportunities to present with and or under the tutelage of Educational Foundations and Leadership faculty members, Jackson Scholars receive financial support from both the department chair and the dean for their presentations at UCEA or AERA.

Building a culture that invites and welcomes diversity cannot depend solely on the faculty or school administrators to succeed. At Duquesne, the scholars themselves have developed a mutual support system. For example, at last year’s UCEA conference, it was gratifying to see our young Jackson Scholar colleagues actively engaged in presenting their scholarship and providing critical feedback to each other on these presentations.

Finally, for us, a significant indicator of whether or not we have
been successful in our efforts to attract and retain graduate students of color must be the graduation rate. For the Jackson Scholars program, then, the graduation rate represents for us a significant indicator of whether or not we have begun to actualize our school’s commitment to creating a caring professional climate for students. This semester, all five of the current cohort of UCEA Jackson Scholars successfully defended their dissertations and were hooded in May 2009. Moreover, it is worth noting that without prompting, as each of their peers defended, the other Jackson Scholars attended the defense to offer support, provide critical feedback, and tender their congratulations. Indeed, one of the graduated students recently offered to meet with the current IDPEL cohort of doctoral students of color to recruit them into Duquesne’s Jackson Scholar initiative.

Diversifying the Faculty Pipeline

One of the issues affecting retention of faculty of color is building a community that prevents isolation. A critical component of that community building involves making clear to prospective faculty the genesis of our identity; the priority we place on realizing its tenets; and our unequivocal support and assistance as they work towards a successful third-year review, promotion, and tenure. We make clear our expectation that new faculty become fully engaged with our school-based partners in their research and practice endeavors as well as demonstrate the collegiality needed to create the environment for all faculty that aligns with the Spiritan tradition of caring actualized within a climate of professionalism and mutual respect.

Using this approach in our searches has resulted in small but important additions to the faculty ranks in the School of Education. Since 2005, we have attracted and hired Chinese American, Turkish American, Korean American, African American, and Romanian American faculty members. More than just “token” representatives, these young scholars have enriched the intellectual life of the school, bringing with them varied perspectives, research, and methodological traditions. Above all, they have brought a demonstrable dedication to preparing the educational leaders, engaging in scholarship for schools, and contributing to a school of education climate that embodies the Spiritan tradition of caring professionalism we seek in our faculty members.

The Absence of a Sense of Urgency

While I focused much of this essay on Duquesne’s efforts to diversify its pipeline of students and faculty, I began this essay by noting that while many sincere initiatives exist to bring greater diversity to our institutions, the lack of sustainable and transferable models remains an issue. Sustainable and transferable models require that UCEA institutions candidly admit the barriers that persist and that stymie our best efforts to diversify the pipeline. Perhaps the most pernicious of these is the idea that liberal university environments and the faculty members who inhabit them have eradicated discrimination and the systemic barriers that continue to exist in the academy. We persistently can develop ingenious and even effective strategies for diversifying our institutions, but unless we admit that “we don’t know what we don’t know,” we risk complacency and the lack of a sense of urgency needed to make real change. Long ago, Socrates noted that true wisdom begins with the recognition of one’s own ignorance. As UCEA members, we must possess and demonstrate the courage and the conviction to admit that, despite our best efforts, an urgent need exists to address the appalling complacency in our institutions that allows us to accept as progress steps toward equality and access. Without a sense of urgency—even of outrage that we have come so far yet not quite far enough in eradicating the barriers that persist for many of our colleagues—we risk remaining satisfied with “token progress” and the “ignorance” of accepting as successful those efforts that merely “tinker around the edges” of diversifying the pipeline.

UCEA Selects Linda Skrla as the New Editor for the EAQ

Linda Skrla (Ph.D., The University of Texas at Austin) was recently selected to serve as editor of the Educational Administration Quarterly (EAQ), UCEA and the field’s premier journal of educational leadership. Dr. Skrla is Professor of Educational Administration and Associate Dean for Research, P–16 Initiatives, and International Programs in the College of Education and Human Development at Texas A&M University.

Skrla has served as an editorial board member for EAQ for many years and has been recognized for her excellent reviews. Her research, which has appeared in EAQ and other highly ranked academic journals, focuses on educational equity issues in school leadership, including accountability policy, high-success school districts, and women superintendents. She has coauthored and coedited five books, the most recent of which is Using Equity Audits to Create Equitable and Excellent Schools (Corwin Press, 2009). In 2001, Skrla received the prestigious Jack A. Culbertson Award from the UCEA for significant research contributions as a junior professor. More recently, Skrla has been elected Vice President-Elect for Division A of the AERA.

Skrla’s editorial team will include 10 professors representing a variety of ranks and specialty areas, including leadership, law, finance, organizational theory, equity, and curriculum and instruction. These team members also have considerable expertise in a variety of epistemologies and methodologies ranging from positivist to poststructural and from advanced methods of statistical modeling to innovative qualitative designs. The team also will include doctoral students.

Texas A&M University, which will host EAQ during Skrla’s tenure, has a strong record of housing research journals in many fields. For example, college faculty members have been or currently are editors of AERA’s American Educational Research Journal, Qualitative Inquiry, the International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, Applied Neuropsychology, the Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy, Reading Psychology, Readings and Writing, and School Science and Mathematics, to name just a few.

It is Skrla’s intent to build upon the journal’s reputation as a high-quality and high-impact educational leadership journal. In the editorial proposal, Skrla noted that the problems and challenges that face children in K–12 public schools, their families, their communities, and the educators who work with them place a great deal of responsibility on EAQ, the premier journal of research on educational administration and leadership, to publish high-quality and impactful research on the essential problems of leadership practice.
Ronald T. Takaki, UCEA Keynote Speaker for Convention 2009, dies at 70

Ronald T. Takaki, a prolific and controversial scholar who helped pioneer the field of ethnic studies and wrote animated histories about Blacks, Asians, Latinos, and other marginalized Americans during four decades on the University of California (UC) Berkeley faculty, has died. The scholar had struggled for nearly 20 years with multiple sclerosis, a potentially debilitating neurological disease for which there is no cure. According to his son Troy, “He couldn’t deal with it anymore.” He took his own life at his Berkeley home Tuesday, May 26, 2009.

Takaki was the author and editor of more than 20 books, including Iron Cages: Race and Culture in 19th Century America (1979), Strangers From a Different Shore: A History of Asian Americans (1989), A Different Mirror: A History of Multicultural America (1993), and Double Victory: A Multicultural History of America in World War II (2000). He established UC Berkeley’s Ph.D. program in ethnic studies, the first of its kind in the nation, and gave prestige to the program by drawing top-notch scholars to teach in it.

Takaki, the grandson of Japanese immigrants, was an activist as well as a scholar. He was a vigorous proponent of multicultural education and a vocal opponent of Proposition 209, the 1996 California ballot initiative that rolled back affirmative action policies in state-funded institutions.

His work often invited controversy. He earned some of his most favorable reviews for Strangers From a Different Shore, which covers the long history of Asian immigrants’ odysseys to America, starting with the Chinese who arrived in the 1850s and ending with the Hmong refugees from Southeast Asia of the 1980s.

His focus on the pluralism of America began in the ethnic stew of Hawaii, where he grew up. Born in Honolulu on April 12, 1939, he was the grandson of a Japanese immigrant who went to Hawaii in 1886 to work in the sugarcane fields. After his father died when Takaki was 7, he was raised by his mother and Chinese stepfather, who ran a Chinese restaurant in Honolulu. “I grew up peeling shrimp, cutting onions and reading Moby Dick,” he told The Times in 1989.

Nicknamed “Ten-Toes Takaki,” he was a fearless surfer who was indifferent to school. But in high school a Japanese American teacher urged him to try college and wrote him a recommendation to the College of Wooster in Ohio, which accepted him. One of three children, he was the first in his family to attend college.

His years at Wooster, where he was one of two Asian Americans on campus, gave him a new awareness of himself as an ethnic American. He recalled in an interview in the Lincoln Journal Star in 2000 that one of his professors “asked me how long I’d been in this country, where did I learn to speak English. I told him I was from Hawaii and he says, ‘But how long have you been in this country?’ I guess I didn’t look American.”

He graduated from Wooster in 1961 with a bachelor’s degree in history. At UC Berkeley he received a master’s in 1962 and a doctorate in 1967 with a dissertation on the history of American slavery.

His doctoral work caught the attention of UCLA. Takaki was hired and in 1967 taught the university’s first African American history class. When the young Japanese American, sporting a crew cut, walked into the classroom for the first time, the students, some wearing Afros and dashikis, fell silent. One student finally spoke up. “Well, Professor Takaki,” the student said in a challenging tone, “what revolutionary tools are we going to learn in this course?”

Takaki replied, “We’re going to study the history of the U.S. as it relates to African Americans. We’re going to strengthen our critical-thinking skills and our writing skills. These can be revolutionary tools if we make them so.”

The class and its unlikely professor became hugely popular. UCLA dismissed him in 1970 after he openly criticized the university’s hiring policies. He wound up at Berkeley in 1972 and taught the course there for 28 years, often turning students away for lack of seats. “If he wanted to, he could have had 1,000 students each term,” said retired ethnic studies professor Roberto Haro, who had taught with Takaki at Berkeley.

Takaki was invited to deliver the Texas A&M Social Justice Lecture for the 2009 UCEA Convention in Anaheim. “We are deeply saddened by his death,” said Alan Shoho, UCEA’s President Elect and Convention Chair. Takaki is survived by his wife, Carol Rankin; sons, Troy of Venice and Todd of El Cerrito; daughter Dana of Chester, Connecticut; a brother, Michael Young, of Thousand Oaks; a sister, Janet Wong, of Chatsworth; and seven grandchildren.
An EC Minute

Alan Shoho

February 20–22, 2009, the Executive Committee (EC) met at the Anaheim Marriott Hotel to conduct the business of UCEA. President Jim Koschoreck led the meeting throughout the weekend. The first order of business was a report from Executive Director Michelle Young. She updated the EC on the status of the UCEA hosting arrangement with The University of Texas (UT). The 5-year hosting contract has 1 year left, so depending on whether UT wants to continue their hosting arrangement with UCEA for a second 5-year term, UCEA may put out a Request for Proposals in 2009. Executive Director Young was scheduled to have a meeting in March 2009 with The University of Texas Department of Educational Administration Chair to share and exchange thoughts on this process. In addition, UCEA was working on having a Texas Day on the Hill in May 2009. The new UCEA Web site debuted March 2009. The EC is scheduled to meet in Austin at the end of July to formulate a strategic plan.

The next order of business pertained to membership applications from Clemson University and Old Dominion University. The EC voted unanimously to forward a seconded motion to the Plenum to accept Clemson University as a full member and is requesting Old Dominion University resubmit its application with additional information and clarification prior to formulating a recommendation on membership. In addition, UCEA is receiving membership interest from Texas Tech, Howard University, University of San Diego, University of Montana, Claremont Graduate University, UT–El Paso, and the University of South Florida. Interested international institutions include University of London, Hong Kong University, University of Glasgow, and Warwick University. Current partner members seeking full membership are UT–Pan American, Texas State University at San Marcos, and Portland State University.

The EC also discussed strategic planning in terms of membership growth and increasing the diversity of UCEA, possibly by encouraging Historically Black Colleges and Universities that offer a doctorate in educational leadership to apply for membership. There was further discussion on the current membership criteria. The EC plans to revisit these criteria in lieu of UCEA’s interest in attracting international members. From recent experience, the current membership criteria are geared specifically for U.S. institutions and do not translate directly to how international institutions are organized or operate. In addition to potential full membership opportunities, discussion involved recruiting school districts to be affiliate members and how practitioners may enrich the discussions at UCEA.

Following the membership discussion, the conference program planning team of Bob Johnson, Mariela Rodriguez, and Alan Shoho shared some conference logistics:

1. The conference will start on Thursday with an awards luncheon and ceremony, and the substantive sessions will end on Saturday, with only editorial board meetings occurring on Sunday morning.
2. The banquet will be on Friday evening instead of Saturday, and there will be a keynote speaker.
3. There will be a 30-minute lunch break on Friday and Saturday.
4. The chair and discussant roles will be combined to streamline sessions and encourage more interaction between presenters and the audience.

Due to the economic downturn, we anticipate a potential reduction in conference numbers, although the conference planning team and UCEA are reaching out to California institutions and professional associations to alleviate any shortfall from regular UCEA attendees due to travel constraints.

Next on the EC agenda was the discussion and decision about awarding of Educational Administration Quarterly (EAQ) to the next host institution. There was a long discussion about the merits of each applicant institution. The applicants included Lehigh University, Vanderbilt University, and Texas A&M University. In the end, Texas A&M was awarded the hosting rights for EAQ for the next 5 years.

The beginning of Day 2 started with an environmental scan of the field by Executive Director Michelle Young. Dr. Young gave the EC an update on the draft Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) standards. To date, feedback on the draft standards from UCEA institutions and faculty members has been minimal and raised the question among the EC: Why isn’t this more important to UCEA members? The discussion hypothesized the lack of response was due to apathy, feeling overwhelmed, and a disconnect between an externally mandated hoop to jump and what is really important to members. In the end, the EC felt the Plenum and UCEA members would appreciate it if the EC and the executive director formulated an official response to the draft standards. Drs. Colleen Larson, Andrea Rorrer, and Autumn Tooms will assist Dr. Young in articulating a UCEA response to the proposed ELCC standards.

Dr. Young updated the EC on UCEA’s work with other professional organizations, like the American Association of School Administrators and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. She also shared the possibility of a working relationship with the Wallace Foundation to develop research papers on principal preparation, leadership evaluation, and leadership influence on student learning.

Dr. Young then provided updates on the planned activities by UCEA for AERA in San Diego. Specifically, UCEA is sponsoring the Barbara Jackson spring workshop; UCEA College and Department Leadership strategy meeting; a joint reception with AERA Divisions A and I; Sage Publications, and The University of Texas College of Education; and the Clark graduate student research seminar. Dr. Linda Darling-Hammond is the kickoff keynote speaker for the Clark seminar.

Next, Dr. Young shared information on how the economy is affecting member institutions. In particular, she mentioned how several member institutions are reorganizing or pruning their programs. Concern was expressed about whether member institutions would cut their UCEA membership. The EC stressed the importance of strategic planning and demonstrating the value added by being a member of UCEA.

For the remainder of Day 2, the EC engaged in strategic planning activities. The EC was divided into three working groups with President Jim Koschoreck and Executive Director Michelle Young facilitating the process. Each group received an initial area to examine. Subsequently, each area was rotated among the three groups until each group had an opportunity to review and contribute their thoughts to the area of strategic planning. The end products of
this exercise will serve as the basis for the EC’s summer meeting in Austin, Texas.

On Sunday morning, the EC heard reports on the program centers. In particular, the Duquesne Program Center for Social Justice is sponsoring a symposium this summer in Pittsburgh, and Hofstra University is submitting a proposal for a program center focusing on urban metropolitan schools.

Following the program center reports, Dr. Young gave a report from Bruce Barnett on international affairs. Memoranda of agreement are being developed with the British Educational Leadership, Management, and Administration Society (BELMAS) and the New Zealand Educational Administration and Leadership Society. Dr. Barnett will be a keynote speaker at this summer’s BELMAS conference. There was also a discussion about the cost of travel for international students and how UCEA can lend support and develop strategies for making the conference more accessible to international participants, not limited to but including recording keynotes and major sessions to be placed on the UCEA Web site for dissemination. The EC plans to discuss potential revenue sources and means to provide assistance for students who are presenting at UCEA.

The next report was on graduate student development. Dr. Young reported she has approached Dr. Mark Gooden at UT–Austin to provide some leadership to the Jackson Scholars program until a new Associate Director for Graduate Student Development can be found. The Jackson Scholars program is the main focus of the Associate Director for Graduate Student Development. A Jackson Scholar advisory board is being reinstated for the express purpose of fundraising and mentoring assignments. Related to the graduate student development, Dr. Shoho reported on the initial UCEA Junior Faculty network. The Orlando conference included an initial session to support early-career scholars. About 25 junior scholars attended this session. The EC plans to continue support of this network as a means of creating a seamless support system from graduate school to tenure.

The last item of discussion at the February EC meeting addressed the diversity of the Plenum and EC. There was a vigorous discussion on ways and means to diversify the Plenum and subsequently the EC. Short- and long-term approaches were bantered about with no clear consensus on how to address this issue. The issue was subsequently tabled until a later date.

In the above, I have provided you an overview of the February EC meeting in Anaheim. I would be remiss if I didn’t share some reflections to personalize what happens at the EC meetings. Every time the EC meets, I relish the opportunity to listen to my EC colleagues and the perspectives they represent. The EC is a very diverse body of people encompassing multiple perspectives on every issue. I never worry about group think in the EC, because the members are always candid about challenging the thinking of others until all the issues are flushed out.

Our meetings are challenging, given the daunting issues facing UCEA. Furthermore, they are never dull as each member takes seriously his or her responsibility and leadership role. These sticky issues we address do not lend for easy or ready-made solutions. As I am reminded from teaching physics courses, for every action or force, there is an equal and opposite reaction or force that must be considered when making policy decisions. While there is a temptation to resort to simple solutions to complex problems, I have found the EC does not forward proposals to the Plenum for consideration until the issue has been fully vetted and all the implications considered. It is honest to say that at times, the EC’s pace is slow and deliberate, yet there is a reason for this measured response. Issues such as institutional racism, sexism, and other –isms are rarely solved with a wave of a wand, no matter how well intentioned we may be. I think what is most comforting in terms of our work as an EC and as an organization is that we are fully committed to thoughtfully engaging in the important work that is leadership, learning, and change.
Guidelines for Submitting Proposals

When submitting a proposal to host JCEL, please address the key questions identified below. The UCEA Executive Committee must have a clear understanding of the resources available within your institution to support the editorial offices of JCEL.

Proposals for this editorship must include the following materials:

• A letter of interest
• A current curriculum vitae of each editorial team member
• A prospective editorial strategy
• A statement from an administrator of the applicant’s institution or organization describing support for the appointment

Please submit the above materials before November 15, 2009, to be eligible for consideration.

Key Questions

• What is your vision for JCEL and how will you fulfill it?
• Who are the proposed editor and the associate editors? What is your proposed editorial strategy?
• What qualities make your institution a strong candidate to host JCEL?
• What type(s) of institutional support will be provided?

Contributions Requested of Host Institution

• Editor who will manage the flow and review of manuscripts, edit all copy (Sage does copy editing), and oversee the management and well-being of the publication
• Support of editing function by providing necessary equipment and materials (e.g., computer, printer, fax, photocopying, postage, and other pertinent materials)
• Support to send the Editor to the annual meetings of the JCEL Editorial Board, traditionally held at the UCEA convention.

Estimated Annual Costs for Hosting JCEL

• Release time for Editor
• Support personnel to fulfill Managing Editor responsibilities (approximately 20 hours per week)
• Travel support to JCEL Editorial Board meeting at the UCEA annual convention
• Limited expenses associated with copying and other supplies.

The Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership publishes, in electronic format, peer-reviewed cases appropriate for use in programs that prepare educational leaders. Building on a long tradition, the University Council for Education Administration sponsors this journal in an ongoing effort to improve administrative preparation. The journal’s editorial staff seeks a wide range of cases that embody relevant and timely presentations of issues germane to the preparation of educational leaders.
A Conversation With
Flora Ida Ortiz

Mariela A. Rodríguez
Michigan State University

Dr. Flora Ida Ortiz is a retired professor of educational administration from the University of California, Riverside. She was a pioneer as one of the first Latina faculty members in the field of educational leadership. Dr. Ortiz was honored by UCEA in 2005 with the Roald F. Campbell Lifetime Achievement Award. This award was established to honor professors, like Dr. Ortiz, who have demonstrated commitment, excellence, leadership, productivity, generosity, and service to the field of educational administration.

***

MR: Please state a brief timeline of your pathway to the professoriate, culminating with the work you are currently doing

FO: I started out as a public school music teacher and supervisor. I earned administrative credentials to continue being a supervisor, and that’s how I went into educational administration. I did good work and then I was invited to consider the PhD degree and I did. Being opted into higher education, I became a professor. When I graduated in 1972 there weren’t many graduates in that field. I did get a good position offered at the University of California–Riverside, and I remained there. Now that I am retired, I teach a class here and there. Most recently I’ve taught at New Mexico Highlands University. I like to teach and see students progress.

MR: It has been over 25 years since the publication of your seminal book, Career Patterns in Education: Women, Men, and Minorities in Public School Administration. What was your impetus for writing the book?

FO: I had just finished my dissertation that dealt with trying to develop a theory of exclusion. I used medical schools as the example. What I found out was that medical specialties served to route medical students into various specialties. So when I became a professor, I thought that maybe that would be true in educational administration as well. So I decided to examine educational administration, and I defined the administrators in terms of the requirements of the position. That meant that they had to have an administrative credential in order to obtain the position. So that’s why I looked at the way that men and women were routed into the various positions in educational administration.

MR: What were some of your reactions to how the book was received?

FO: It was not received very well. I collected the data between 1974 and 1979. I finished writing the book in 1981, and it didn’t get published until 1982. It was difficult to find a publisher. I think it was because of my surname. I think the first reaction was that I didn’t know enough English to write well. The second was that it probably wouldn’t be such a popular book. You can tell from the printing of the book how it was regarded.

MR: But the book has been cited by many educational leadership researchers—

FO: Well, yes. In fact, the Journal of Educational Administration just published an article by Kim and Brunner. My work is heavily cited. It looks at career patterns and where men and women are located. After it [the book] got into circulation it was more widely read.

MR: If you were to write the book today, what might you do the same and what might you do differently?

FO: Well, the sad part is that (and Brunner finds this out, too; she finds some differences that have taken place), in actuality educational administration remains very much the same. So, I don’t know what I would do differently. I think that it’s very difficult to change organizations. The processes by which one advances through the hierarchy of an organization do not seem to have changed very much. There are a few changes. Brunner most certainly deals with that. But they [changes] are slow and don’t permeate the field.

MR: In 2005, the Survey of Earned Doctorates reported that only 312 African Americans and 101 Hispanics earned doctorates in educational administration. That same year, National Center for Education Statistics data showed that there were over 35,000 full-time African-American faculty and almost 23,000 full-time Hispanic faculty working in degree-granting institutions. What could account for these discrepancies in the pipeline?

FO: Well I think the same dynamics that work in educational administration tend to work in higher education. In order to succeed in either one of those organizations, and probably all other organizations, or another way to say it is the measure of success in an occupation, is whether you can hold your job or advance. I think that these are the same dynamics that operate in every organization. So it’s very difficult to hold on to a position in an organization, and I think that has a lot to do with the numbers. Especially when you call the positions full time.

MR: In addition to full-time status, we also could consider earning promotion and tenure.

FO: Right, and I would say that the dropout rate would be relatively high. Higher education is very competitive. The more research oriented and prestigious the institution, the more competitive it is. So, I think that explains a lot. The playing field in the institution is not the same, and so the process by which you advance is the difficulty. The organization routs you. So you have to be prepared to commit yourself very heavily so that the organization doesn’t have any doubts and cannot prove that there are doubts so that you can continue staying within it [the organization].

MR: What are some promising practices that could help to diversity the pipeline of future scholars in educational leadership?

FO: There are individuals who are encouraging and who support you. I think that’s the first thing. Every organization will have some individual, at least one individual, that will support you. There are individuals. One of the things is to identify those individuals that will help you and support you and be available for you. They help you with what is required in the institution. They help you understand and learn, and support you. They explain to the institution who you are and what you can do. I think that’s one thing. Then of course I think higher education itself as a working setting gives you a lot of autonomy in a way for you to develop yourself, if that’s really what you want to do. There’s just a lot of autonomy in higher education that many other institutions don’t have. You’re given a lot
of independence and liberty to develop yourself, and I think that’s a good practice.

MR: What strategies for success do you have for diverse faculty regarding research and publication in academia?

FO: I think that’s hard to articulate because it might sound kind of harsh, but I think the first thing you have to realize is that you have to produce. Your identity is based on what you can do first and then who you are. Your identity will be attached to what you do. At least for me it meant that I had to be heavily involved in all three areas of higher education: service, research, and teaching. And the proof of it was the production of manuscripts, the students that I could finish, and the memberships that I could garner. So, I think in a nutshell that’s what you do. I think that as long as the institution is not balanced proportionately that is what is required.

MR: What were some of your experiences working with doctoral students who came from diverse backgrounds?

FO: In general, all students are the same. In general, they all more or less come with the same kinds of problems that are related to the institution. So, I think that at one level you try to do the best that you can in having the students understand that so that they can prove to the institution that they can produce. Throughout my experience I didn’t find that because they were a different gender or different ethnic group that they differed that much. Because they already have been socialized quite a bit by the time they get to the doctoral level. There are a lot of similarities. Where you see the most difference is in the topics that they want to research, the areas that they are interested in or gravitate towards. I guess in some cases the level of advocacy versus the level of research was different. I had some of that. But in general, overall, students are students. I think we have to respond as professors towards the students. If they succeed, we have proven two things. First that the students are capable, and [second] that we [as faculty] are capable. You have tangible products in the end.

MR: Thank you for sharing your insights based on your years of experience in the field of educational administration. It’s wonderful to see your work continuing. I am happy to hear that you continue to help others move forward along the pipeline.

UCEA Employment Resource Center

UCEA Job Search Handbook

The UCEA Job Search Handbook, located on the UCEA Web site (www.ucea.org), is an online resource for aspiring educational leadership faculty members and the institutions that prepare them. The handbook was created by Scott McLeod (Iowa State University), Ken Brinson (North Carolina State University), Don Hackmann (University of Illinois–Urbana Champaign), Bonnie Fusarelli (North Carolina State University), and Lisa Collins (Lehigh University) based upon a set of materials they have developed about the job search process for educational administration academic positions.

The handbook includes a variety of tips, techniques, and other useful resources and is intended to enhance the quality of the job search process for educational leadership faculty candidates. Topics covered in the Job Search Handbook include preplanning, preparing an application, the interview, postinterview tactics, negotiations, and sample materials. These materials have been presented during the annual UCEA Graduate Student Symposium for the last few years and have received tremendous praise.

UCEA Job Posting Service

UCEA provides, free of charge on its Web site, links to job position announcements. To submit a posting for the Web site, please e-mail the URL for the position announcement (Web-site address at your university where the position description has been posted) to Christopher Ruggeri (ucea@austin.utexas.edu). A link will be provided to the job announcement from the UCEA job posting page: www.ucea.org.

Job Search Resources for Educational Leadership Students and Faculty

www.EdLeadershipJobs.org

Subscribe to the feed to get new job postings in your e-mail inbox or RSS reader. Search by date, state, or type of position. The site aggregates in one place all of the jobs posted at

- HigherEdJobs: http://www.higheredjobs.com/faculty/search.cfm?JobCat=64
- The Chronicle: http://chronicle.com/jobs/100/300/3000/

UCEA Job Search Handbook: www.ucea.org/uceajobsearch/jobsearch

Stage-by-stage assistance for graduate students new to the academic job search process. The site includes a plethora of helpful tips and strategies and has been highly acclaimed by past job seekers. Please publicize these resources to your graduate students. Thank you.

A service of UCEA (http://www.ucea.org) and UCEA CASTLE (http://www.schooltechleadership.org)
Innovative Programs: The University of Texas at San Antonio

Preparing Leaders for Social Justice and Leadership in Diverse Communities

Liz Hollingworth
University of Iowa

The University of Texas at San Antonio (UTSA) serves the San Antonio metropolitan area and the broader region of South Texas. With more than 28,400 students enrolled in 131 undergraduate and graduate degree programs, UTSA is the second-largest university in The University of Texas System and has been one of the state's fastest growing public universities for much of the last decade.

It is in this context that the UTSA Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies has created an innovative training program that prepares educators to become transformational leaders who can work effectively in diverse, ambiguous, and challenging contexts. The goals of this transformational leadership include equity, excellence, social justice, democracy, risk taking, and responsiveness to community needs. Faculty in the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies are strongly committed to developing collaborative and responsive relationships with area schools and communities.

The key to this program, formally known as the Urban School Leaders Collaborative (USLC), is the unique partnership between the UTSA and the San Antonio Independent School District (SAISD). The proximity to the Mexican border provides an opportunity to examine the specific challenges facing schools in San Antonio. Master's degree students in this cohort program collaborate with the school district to practice and reflect on the issues facing the students and administrators, particularly with respect to advocating for students and ensuring equal access to educational opportunities for all students. The cohort experience is meant to establish mentorship networks, provide students with a curriculum with leadership skills needed to execute a collective vision of social justice, and prepare them to be leaders within their districts.

An Alternative Model of School Leadership

The USLC preparation program is designed to advance interactive collaboration among students, professors, and school district administrators. This partnership between UTSA and SAISD has helped to facilitate and enhance opportunities for practitioners and scholars to work collaboratively in a meaningful and effective manner in the preparation of aspiring school leaders. The USLC is a different model of preparation in distinct ways:

1. This preparation program is driven by a philosophy of social justice advocacy. The focus of preparation is initially on attitudes and mindsets, and then on skills.

2. This is a truly collaborative partnership; both entities (school district and university) are actively involved in the selection, planning, teaching, and evaluation processes.

3. This is a closed cohort model, only for employees of the partnering school districts, and leadership preparation is customized to meet the needs of the children of these school districts.

4. Professors have moved into the field; all classes taught by department faculty are held on campuses throughout the school district.

5. Support continues through a mentoring component even after the students graduate and assume leadership positions.

The Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies’ main objective for students is to provide advanced academic training in educational leadership. Students gain extensive theoretical knowledge of educational practices and emerging paradigms of organizational leadership. The curriculum emphasizes coursework designed to develop, analyze, and evaluate educational programs, school personnel, and effective system practices. The program also offers opportunities to work in linguistically diverse and urban educational settings. Students in the program pursue an emphasis on administrative leadership focusing on best educational methodologies and managerial skills designed to improve educational effectiveness.

Unique Student Recruitment

According to Professor Encarnacion “Chon” Garza, a partnership was established with the department chair, the dean of the College of Education, and the superintendent of SAISD 6 years ago. “This was a true collaboration,” Garza says. “The school district is very much involved in identifying a particular set of students who have the dispositions for social justice.” The principals in the district nominate teachers who have the potential to become district leaders in multiple capacities: academic coordinators, curriculum coordinators, department chairs, as well as principals. There are over 100 schools in the district, which serves approximately 54,000 students.

Students are admitted to the master's program as a cohort group each January and finish in December 2 years later. The USLC recruits students who meet these criteria:

- Committed to aggressive reform and improvement
- Skilled in the management of innovation and change
- Competent to work in diverse and increasingly complex cultural contexts
- Committed to understanding organizational cultures, how they operate, and how to create dynamic learning and working environments
- Willing to engage in deep reflection for the purpose of self-discovery and to establish a strong sense of self, who they are, and what they stand for as they prepare to become leaders for social justice.

Social Justice Curriculum

The coursework for the degree in Educational Leadership is grounded in theoretically sound and empirically tested models of instructional reform, particularly as these apply to the education of Hispanics, the educationally disadvantaged, and the diversely talented. The portion of the coursework in the “Cultural Core” is
what makes the program significantly different from the other educational leadership master’s program at UTSA.

Professor Elizabeth Murakami, who coteaches the cohort with Dr. Garza, explains that the students have two courses that differ from the core, which are culturally relevant and teach methodological and theoretical approaches to education in a linguistically diverse society. “The difference,” she says, “is the transformational focus, how we deliver the content, and looking deeply and critically into their nonnegotiables. How are they going to be courageous principals who will make a difference?”

Most importantly, the courses are taught in the field; the professors travel to classrooms in the SAISD where they meet the cohort of students for class. What is more, UTSA hires SAISD staff as adjunct professors to teach some of the courses in this program. Classes have been taught by the superintendent, the deputy superintendent, the executive director for curriculum and instruction, the director of finance, and the executive director for advanced academics and career and technology.

**Administrative Support**

The Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at UTSA and SAISD are generous in their support of graduate students in the cohort to travel to the annual UCEA meeting for paper presentations. As a culminating activity in the program, USLC students produce a video documentary of their experiences in the program, which they present at the UCEA conference. All three cohorts have presented at UCEA—(a) Cohort I in Kansas City (2004), (b) Cohort II in San Antonio (2006), and (c) Cohort III in Orlando (2008). These presentations are often celebrations of the innovative work that has come out of the cohort groups and reports from the field. Dean Betty Merchant has been involved deeply in the program, according to Garza and Murakami. Dr. Merchant was one of the founders of this program and continues to be involved by teaching classes and mentoring the emerging leaders. She provides financial support through travel grants made available for graduate students and is sensitive to requests such as extensions on admissions deadlines because of recruitment issues within the district.

**The Future of the Program at UTSA**

Garza and Murakami are proud of the sustainable, grassroots program implemented at UTSA. This program is self-sustainable because it does not depend on any dedicated funding that may expire. This year, Garza and Murakami have expanded the cohort to include students from one of the other large school districts in the county and four small districts that otherwise might be overlooked because of their size. Since they serve the same kind of population of students and are facing similar issues, Murakami believes this special cohort program can help them.

The first three cohorts were small (enrollments of 14, 12, and 9, respectively). But out of those 35 students, 26 already hold leadership positions in the district. One of the benefits of this “grow your own” program for the San Antonio district is that the superintendent considers the graduates when there are leadership vacancies. This is particularly important when nearby districts with smaller immigrant populations and fewer issues with second language learning pay more to try to recruit the best talent away from San Antonio public schools.

If you are interested in visiting the program and meeting the students in the cohort, contact either Chon Garza or Elizabeth Murakami at the address below:

The University of Texas at San Antonio  
College of Education and Human Development  
Educational Leadership and Policy Studies  
One UTSA Circle  
San Antonio, Texas 78249

Encarnacion (Chon) Garza: Encarnacion.Garza@utsa.edu  
Elizabeth Murakami Ramalho: elizabeth.murakami@utsa.edu

---

**Leave a Leadership Legacy Through UCEA’s Partners for the Future**

Dedicated supporters of the UCEA who include UCEA in their wills or estate plans are UCEA Partners for the Future. These special donors have decided to extend their support beyond their lifetimes and leave a legacy of tolerance and justice.

Writing a will and including a bequest to UCEA allows you to choose where your estate will go and, in most cases, helps you to reduce taxes on your estate. Your bequest or planned gift—regardless of size—is a meaningful way to honor UCEA’s work and assure its future. If you are interested in receiving information about wills, charitable gift annuities or other planned giving opportunities available at UCEA—with no obligation—please contact UCEA’s director of finance at 512-475-8592.

If you already have included UCEA in your will or estate plans, please contact us so we can update you as a UCEA Partner for the Future.

Martha M. McCarthy  
Indiana University–Bloomington

Donald G. Hackmann  
University of Illinois–Champaign

Given that the last comprehensive study of the educational leadership professoriat was in the mid-1990s (McCarthy & Kuh, 1997), we undertook such a study in 2008. This two-phase project entailed the administration of online questionnaires to educational leadership department chairs or program coordinators (program heads) and to individual faculty members in educational leadership units nationally. E-mail invitations were distributed to 590 program heads and 2,381 faculty members in the spring of 2008. The program head questionnaire was designed to gather information on unit size, degree programs, faculty composition, changes in units over time, and other program characteristics. The faculty questionnaire solicited information from faculty members of P–12 educational leadership preparation programs regarding their personal characteristics, professional activities, and attitudes about the educational leadership profession and preparation programs. Useable responses were obtained from 217 program heads and 895 faculty members.

To permit longitudinal comparisons with prior studies, these questionnaires retained many items from survey research on the educational leadership professoriat conducted in 1972, 1986, and 1994 (Campbell & Newell, 1973; McCarthy & Kuh, 1997; McCarthy, Kuh, Newell, & Iacona, 1988). However, some revisions were made to reflect programmatic reforms that have occurred in leadership preparation in the past several decades and emerging issues. An in-depth analysis of the findings regarding educational leadership faculty members’ characteristics, activities, and attitudes as well as a profile of educational leadership units nationally will appear in a monograph published by UCEA in 2010. This column presents a snapshot of one small piece of the study—changes in demographic characteristics of educational leadership faculty members since the 1970s.

Gender and Racial Composition

The most dramatic change in the educational leadership professoriat since the 1970s pertains to the gender composition of faculty. Although only 2% of the faculty were women in 1972, in 2008 the composition was 45% women and 55% men. Caucasian males no longer are in the majority; they represented 49% of the 1994 faculty. Although only 2% of the faculty were women in 1972, in 2008 the composition was 50% currently employed faculty in 2008, suggesting that the dramatic increase in women has hit a plateau and will level off now that gender parity almost has been reached.

Minority representation also has increased significantly since 1972, when 3% of the educational leadership faculty was comprised of people of color. This percentage increased to 15% of currently employed faculty by 2008. Specifically, the racial identity of the 2008 respondents was American Indian or Alaska Native, 0.8%; Asian, 1.5%; multiracial, 1.9%; Black or African American, 7.6%; Hispanic or Latino/a, 2.6%; Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, 0.2%; and White, 85.4%. Table 1 provides trend data related to gender and ethnicity since 1972.

Similar to women, there was not a large difference in minority representation among recent hires compared with all faculty employed in 2008. In contrast, the 1986 and 1994 studies reflected significantly higher percentages of minorities among recent hires compared with all faculty employed when the studies were conducted. Although minority representation has increased 5-fold since the 1970s, female representation has increased 15-fold during the same period. Nonetheless, both minority and female representation in the educational leadership professoriat in the spring of 2008 almost paralleled the demographic composition of faculty in colleges and universities in the United States. In the fall of 2007, women comprised 46% of total U.S. faculty, and 17% of the total faculty were people of color (Snyder, Dillow, & Hoffman, 2009).

As was also documented in 1994, UCEA programs remain more successful than non-UCEA institutions in hiring women and minorities. Indeed, in 2008 UCEA programs employed comparable percentages of women and men; women comprised 50% of faculty in UCEA institutions and 42% of faculty in non-UCEA programs. Seventeen percent of faculty members at UCEA institutions were people of color among all employed in those programs in 2008, compared with 14% in non-UCEA institutions. The racial composition was similar for those hired within the past 10 years in non-

Table 1


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian female</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian male</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority female</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority male</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCEA female</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-UCQA female</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCEA minority</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-UCQA minority</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

*These categories were not used in the 1972 study.

Due to low numbers for some subgroups, instead of rounding the percentages to whole numbers as is done elsewhere, these percentages are reported to the nearest 10th.
UECA programs, but more than one fifth (22%) of the recent hires in educational leadership units at UCEA institutions were people of color.

Rank and Tenure Status

In contrast to the earlier studies in which the faculty members were predominantly tenured full professors, faculty were nearly evenly distributed across the professorial ranks in 2008 with 27% professors, 29% associate professors, and 28% assistant professors (Table 2). Fewer than three fifths (57%) of faculty members in tenure-eligible positions were tenured in 2008; twice the proportion of faculty were nontenured in 2008 than in 1994. Nearly two thirds (65%) of faculty in UCEA institutions were tenured in 2008, compared with 53% in non-UCEA institutions.

The significant increase in nontenure-line faculty documented in 2008 warrants additional investigation. The three previous studies of the educational leadership professoriate identified very low numbers of nontenure-line faculty, representing 1–3% of the total faculty composition. However, the 2008 study determined that 16% of educational leadership faculty members were in positions outside the traditional tenure stream. Given that such clinical faculty now comprise a significant portion of the overall educational leadership professoriate, the influence of this group should not be underestimated. Unfortunately, these faculty members largely have been ignored in the empirical research to date.

Age

Despite the even distribution of the 2008 respondents across professorial ranks, the mean age of educational leadership faculty members has continued to climb. The average age increased from 48 in 1972 to 52 in 1986, 54 in 1994, and 56 in 2008. This anomaly of documenting an older professoriate but a higher percentage at junior ranks may be explained by two factors. It can be attributed in part to educational leadership faculty increasingly being hired at an older age. Although 44 was the mean entry age for all currently employed educational leadership faculty in 2008, the mean for those hired in the past decade was 48. An additional explanation is the dramatic increase in the number of clinical faculty, whose mean age in 2008 was 59 and mean entry age was 51.

Primary Strength

As with prior studies, more than 7 out of 10 educational leadership faculty members considered teaching to be their primary strength, and this percentage had increased slightly by 2008 (74%). Research was listed as the primary strength of 18% of the 2008 respondents, representing a slight but steady increase since the mid-1980s. Gender differences that were evident in the prior studies, when women were more likely to list research and less likely to list teaching as their primary strength, had dissipated by 2008. However, faculty of color (21%) were more likely than Caucasians (18%) to note that research was their primary area of emphasis (Table 3).

Whereas a far larger percentage of men (15%) than women (9%) noted service and outreach as their primary strength in 1986 and comparable proportions said so in 1994 (15% of women and 14% of men), women (11%) were more likely than men (7%) in 2008 to report that service/outreach was their major strength. Minority faculty were considerably less likely than Caucasians in 1986 and considerably more likely in 1994 to note service as their primary strength. However, these racial differences had been eliminated by 2008, when 9% of Caucasians and 8% of minorities identified service as their major strength.

The overall decline in the proportion of faculty identifying service/outreach as their primary area of emphasis is somewhat troubling, given the emphasis on field work and connections with practitioners in educational leadership nationally. Perhaps this de-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>% of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate professor</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant professor</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (nontenure-line)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic/year</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Service/outreach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total faculty</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCEA</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-UCEA</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.
cline in service/outreach interests among tenure-track faculty in part explains the significant increase in hiring clinical faculty members, who might have been sought to focus on connections with the field. In 2008, 19% of faculty in nontenure-line positions listed service/outreach as their primary strength, compared with 7% of tenure-line faculty.

The major distinguishing factor among educational leadership faculty as to primary strength in all three studies since the mid-1980s was being employed in a unit belonging to UCEA. This finding is not surprising since UCEA institutions are primarily research intensive as classified by the Carnegie Foundation. In 2008, 81% of the non-UCEA respondents compared to 57% of the UCEA respondents listed teaching as their primary strength. In contrast, one third (33%) of the UCEA respondents compared to 11% of those in non-UCEA institutions identified research as their primary strength. Differences were minimal in the area of service/outreach, with 9% of UCEA respondents and 8% of respondents from non-UCEA institutions citing service/outreach as their primary strength.

Conclusion

As predicted in the mid-1990s (McCarthy & Kuh, 1997), significant faculty turnover has occurred, with 60% of the educational leadership faculty hired within the past decade. This turnover has resulted in an educational leadership professoriate that looks quite different from that documented in prior studies. The upcoming monograph on this study will explore implications of the significant demographic changes for the activities and attitudes of faculty nationally and for the norms and culture of leadership preparation programs. Specifically, the dramatic increase in female faculty members, the increases in minority and clinical faculty, and changes in rank and age distribution will be addressed in detail. Also, the monograph will explore many other topics, including trends in faculty attitudes over time, changes in educational leadership programs, and emerging issues of concern in the field.
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**UEA Members-Only Site**

Membership in UCEA is a significant marker of program quality, but the benefits of membership extend beyond being apart of a scholarly community. UCEA member faculty have long enjoyed discounted prices on hard copies of the Educational Administration Quarterly (EAQ) and the Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership (JCEL). Each year faculty and graduate students are provided with special forms for ordering EAQ at a steep discount off individual subscription rates. Additionally, for the last 8 years, UCEA members have enjoyed free access to the Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership (JCEL) and the UCEA Review. UCEA member faculty continue to enjoy these benefits, though they have been enhanced. JCEL has been included, along with EAQ, in the Sage online education collection. UCEA member faculty can access the entire bundle though the UCEA Members-Only site. The bundle includes all of Sage’s education journals and allows cross-journal searches.

Unfortunately, UCEA can only offer this access to UCEA member faculty. Individuals who are not UCEA member faculty will no longer have free access to JCEL, unless they or their institutions subscribe to the journal/bundle through Sage. If you have not already visited our website and seen the New Members section, please visit www.ucea.org! UCEA Plenary Session Representatives were provided information on accessing the Members-Only Site.
The Session Chair/
Discussant’s Role

The duties of the Session Chair/Discussant include the following,

1. You should receive copies of the papers to be presented
   in your session in advance of the session. Please read these
   papers carefully and come prepared to comment on the papers,
   individually and as a whole. These comments should include,
   but need not be limited to, constructive criticism about the re-
   search questions addressed, the theoretical foundations estab-
   lished, the methodologies employed, the analyses and results
   presented, and the implications derived. You also may want to
   indicate where you believe the papers make contributions to the
   broader stream of literature or how the papers open up new
   perspectives. Feel free to send your comments to the authors
   prior to the conference.

2. Show up to the session 5-10 minutes before the session
   begins. Identify the paper presenters in advance and introduce
   yourself. Remind each presenter of the time limits that apply
   and describe the method you will use to alert them of time limits
   during the actual presentation.

3. At the start of the session, introduce yourself to the audi-
   ence, announce the session/title, and offer a brief over-
   view indicating how the papers are related.

4. Next, introduce the speakers with brief comments regard-
   ing the affiliation and/or background of each presenter.

5. Prior to each presentation, announce the paper’s title, au-
   thors’ names, and their affiliations. Identify the individual
   who will be speaking if someone other than the first author.

6. During the presentations, enforce time limits strictly so
   that no author (or audience member) monopolizes some-
   one else’s time. Times vary depending on the number of pre-
   sentations in a given session.

7. As discussant you have been allocated 10 minutes, total.
   Please try to keep your remarks limited to this amount of time
   so that ample time is left for audience participation.

8. Importantly, the bulk of your time as discussant should be
   spent stimulating audience interest in the subject and the
   papers. Whenever possible, we encourage you to assume the
   role of devil’s advocate, provoking discussion among the ses-
   sion’s presenters and between the presenters and the audience.
   We encourage you to use as a measure of your effectiveness
   the extent to which you engaged others in an open discussion
   and/or stimulated audience interest in the subject. Thus, rather
   than using your allotted time to conduct a one-way presentation
   about the papers, we encourage you to use the bulk of your
   time to highlight controversial issues that will stimulate a dia-
   logue among those in attendance. As this description suggests,
   preparation in advance and attentiveness during the session are
   two keys to serving successfully as a discussant. Please help us
   make the program sessions as meaningful by fulfilling this role
   effectively.

9. Once presentations are complete (paper presentations and
   your discussant presentation), the remainder of the time
   can be used for informal discussion with the audience and
   session participants. It is your job to field questions from the
   audience.

10. Try to conduct the session as informally as possible (e.g.,
    use first names when addressing participants and mem-
    bers of the audience) to encourage as much audience par-
    ticipation as possible.

---

Revised Program for UCEA
Convention 2009

Bob L. Johnson, Jr.
University of Utah
Mariela A. Rodriguez
The University of Texas–San Antonio
2009 UCEA Program Co-Chairs

There are a few innovative ideas that the UCEA Convention
2009 Planning Committee has prepared to make the upcoming an-
nual meeting fulfilling and exciting. First, we’ve changed the format
so that we can all come together for an awards luncheon on Thurs-
day. This event will serve as an opportunity to recognize all of our
award winners. This will be followed by the first set of break-out
sessions. Then, the Opening General Session will take place Thursday
afternoon at 5:30 p.m. with a keynote address, followed by the Past
President’s Reception.

Sessions will continue Friday morning and will be followed
by the second keynote address. Beginning on Friday, there will be
a 45-minute lunch period, during which convention participants
can network with colleagues and reflect on sessions and keynote
addresses. Friday evening will culminate with our annual banquet
featuring a third keynote speaker.

An innovative idea that will distinguish this annual meeting
is the development of a Leadership Summit for Saturday evening.
The Leadership Summit will focus on panelists including scholars,
policymakers, and administrators. Several education officials from
California will be invited to participate. The panelists will discuss
timely issues impacting education in California and across the country.
Audience participation is highly encouraged so that all participants
can engage in this salient conversation. It is our hope that this will
be the first of many leadership summits that will integrate theory
with practice.

We look forward to seeing you in Anaheim!
New Program Centers

Julian V. Heilig
The University of Texas–Austin

I am pleased to report that the UCEA Executive Committee voted in early 2009 to support two new program centers. With the new additions, UCEA now sponsors seven program centers across the nation.

The UCEA Center for Educational Leadership and Social Justice at Duquesne University is led by Dr. James E. Henderson. The primary focus of the center is to investigate the relationship between educational leadership and social justice critically, comprehensively, and collaboratively. The proposal defined the center’s primary goals:

Although ontological innovation is a primary goal in the investigations of the [new] UCEA Center (hence our focus on theoretical consequences), we believe strongly that academics have theorized about issues of social justice in education long enough; that we need to do more to identify and remedy those conditions that marginalize, trivialize, and suppress have-not students, schools, and communities. We believe further that educational leaders must possess the capacities to recognize and ameliorate social justices in their own work context, not simply in some amorphous sphere of dialogic contention. All too often educational leaders attend only to the injustices their assumptions allow them to address and—intentionally or unintentionally—ignore so many others. We want to change that; we want to shine a bright light of interrogation on the relationship between educational leadership and social justice in order to facilitate the formation of scholars of the discipline and scholars of practice who can examine their own assumptions and beliefs in light of social justice imperatives and who can share their learning to influence policy. We seek to establish a nexus of scholarship, practice, and policy that will improve how all students are taught and how all educational leaders are prepared.

The UCEA Joint Program Center for the Study of the Superintendency and District Governance is codirected by Dr. Thomas Alsbury, North Carolina State University; Dr. Theodore Kowalski, University of Dayton; Dr. Meredith Mountford, Florida Atlantic University; and Dr. George Petersen, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo. In their proposal, they stated their main purposes:

The main purpose of the UCEA Joint Program Center for the Study of the Superintendency and District Governance is to bring together a collaborative group of researchers in the area of the superintendency and school board governance and provide a center for the administration of a nationally funded joint-research agenda. The center endeavors to use technology to provide accessibility and broad dissemination of research not only to an academic audience, but practical applications and guidance for district-level leaders in the field. The center also endeavors to provide a central organization for national associations to use to improve linkages and mutually beneficial collaborations between academic and practitioner worlds.

I anticipate that the efforts of the new UCEA program centers will exemplify the mission of the UCEA in the promotion of scholarship and knowledge in our field.

IES Research Grant Competition

The Institute of Education Sciences (IES) is gearing up for its research grant competitions for Fiscal Year 2010. Within IES, the National Center for Education Research anticipates conducting one research competition (84.305A Education Research) that encompasses two topic areas that may be of interest to UCEA members: Education Leadership:

http://ies.ed.gov/funding/ncer_rfas/edleadership.asp?page=all

and Education Policy, Finance, and Systems:

http://ies.ed.gov/funding/ncer_rfas/edpolicy.asp?page=all

Program announcements are available at the above links. The FY 2010 Request for Applications may not have been released by the publication date of this newsletter. However, information on the anticipated application deadlines is located at http://ies.ed.gov/funding/futureComp.asp.

If you are interested in applying to an upcoming IES research competition, please check http://ies.ed.gov/funding/regularly for new Request for Applications or sign up for the IES Newsflash (http://ies.ed.gov/newsflash/) for e-mail notification of the release of the new RFAs.

For additional information on the Education Leadership research topic contact

Katina R. Stapleton, Education Research Analyst
Institute of Education Sciences
555 New Jersey Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20208
202-219-2154, Katina.Stapleton@ed.gov.

For additional information on the Education Policy, Finance, and Systems research topic contact

Karen Ross, Associate Research Scientist
Institute of Education Sciences
555 New Jersey Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20208

IES also invites applications for research projects that will contribute to its new research program on the Evaluation of State and Local Education Programs and Policies (84.305E). For more information contact Dr. Allen Ruby at (202) 219-1591 or Allen.Ruby@ed.gov. For information on training opportunities, see http://ies.ed.gov/whatsnew/conferences. This year, IES will be sponsoring its third Summer Research Training Institute on Cluster-Randomized Trials at Vanderbilt University in Nashville, TN. More information is available at http://ies.ed.gov/whatsnew/conferences/?id=394.
Following Up Graduates: Development of the School Leadership Preparation and Practice Survey and a Shared Research Process

Margaret Terry Orr
Bank Street College
Karen Jackson
Andrea Rorrer
University of Utah

Background

Improving the preparation of school and district leaders has become an emerging strategy in districts and states’ approaches to school improvement. As the instrumentality of preparation programs in educational reform becomes more widely recognized, the political pressure to demonstrate both their value as program experiences and their impact on the leaders they prepare and ultimately on the schools their graduates lead has intensified. Yet, leadership preparation programs, despite their prevalence (almost 500 nationwide) and importance for K–12 school improvement and effectiveness, rarely have been evaluated, and their long-range impacts have not been measured in a systemic and comparative manner (Mccarthy, 1999; Orr, 2009). To inform and support program improvement, university-based educational leadership preparation programs need valid and reliable information on how their preparation programs contribute to the quality and effectiveness of their graduates as educational leaders. In response, a taskforce of university faculty developed the School Leadership Preparation and Practice Survey (SLPPS) and an evaluation research process through UCEA and the University of Utah. This article provides background on this evaluation research, the survey’s development and psychometric qualities, its use by individual and groups of programs, and recently created survey support.

In light of the demands to demonstrate effectiveness, university-based leadership preparation programs, like university-based teacher-education programs generally, are increasingly expected to earn national or state accreditations that recognize their quality and efficacy. In recent years, the most prominent national accreditation association, the National Council of Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE, 2009a), has stressed the need for more high-quality evidence of candidate and program effectiveness. The specialized professional association for educational leadership, the Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC), requires institutions that prepare educational leaders to provide seven or eight assessments. These assessments serve as evidence that leadership preparation programs meet ELCC standards as well as address candidates’ mastery of knowledge, including their ability to demonstrate their understanding of teaching and learning and apply their leadership knowledge in schools and classrooms, to focus on student learning, and to meet state licensure requirements (NCATE, 2009b).

Despite the acknowledgement of university-based leadership preparation programs that evaluation resources are valuable for demonstrating their own efficacy, for accreditation purposes, for program improvement and acknowledgement of effectiveness, and for the comparative benefits of their approaches, reviews of evaluation research in the leadership preparation field (Orr, 2009) show few evaluation research models and resources available for replication and use. Instead, the field has been challenged to create the conceptual basis for evaluation research and to develop valid and appropriate outcome measures and data collection tools for common use. The need for available comparisons to benchmark performance and effectiveness further has complicated attempts to evaluate leadership preparation programs to date.

This article describes how a community of educational leadership scholars worked together over the last 8 years to tackle this void and developed a valid and reliable survey instrument for programs to measure their graduates’ experiences and outcomes. They also created a system of working together to enable comparative evaluation, yielding both a sustainable process and new results on how preparation quality matters for graduates’ outcomes as effective school leaders.

Creating Collective Capacity

At the invitation of Robert Kottkamp, a strong advocate for evaluation research, members of the University Council of Educational Administration (UCEA) and the Teaching in Educational Administration Special Interest Group of the American Educational Research Association (TEA-SIG) met for a presession at the 2001 UCEA convention and discussed the need for systematic evaluation research. Out of this meeting grew the UCEA/TEA-SIG (now LTEL-SIG) Taskforce on Evaluating Leadership Preparation Programs to study these issues and develop a collaborative, comparative evaluation study. Together, the taskforce members established three goals:

1. Develop research designs, methods, and instruments that can be replicated and refined through study in multiple institutions and settings to facilitate ongoing knowledge development on leadership preparation both nationally and internationally.
2. Conduct comparative evaluation of leadership preparation programs’ impact on their graduates and the preK–12 schools that they lead.
3. Engage the leadership preparation field more broadly in the individual and comparative study of their programs’ effectiveness and impact.

Since then, the Taskforce on Evaluating Leadership Preparation Programs has met formally twice annually at the UCEA and American Educational Research Association (AERA) conferences and has made significant progress on all three goals (Orr & Pounder, 2006). Through individual and collective efforts, the taskforce has generated significant research methodology and instrumentation, conducted comparative evaluation research, and greatly broadened the participation of researchers and evaluators in the study of leadership preparation and its effectiveness. The most significant effort has been the development of a follow-up survey of graduates and alumni and a shared survey-administration process that allows programs to aggregate data for benchmarking and program evaluation purposes. Below is a description of the survey’s design and development and the survey-administration process.
Survey Conceptual Model

A primary goal of the taskforce and evaluation research on our programs generally was to sort out appropriate outcome measures and then to design a survey and fielding process. The Taskforce on Evaluating Leadership Preparation Programs began with multiple program evaluation needs and priorities. For instance, there were questions about our programs (e.g., were candidates having the experiences we were intending?), about program participant career outcomes (e.g., were candidates pursuing leadership positions or remaining in teaching?), and about their impact as school leaders (what are their leadership practices, and what is their effect on schools?). The taskforce agreed to combine these needs into our design as one survey of graduates and alumni but then debated the assumptions for program effects on our graduates’ leadership. In the end, we agreed to hypothesize the following:

1. Our programs would be powerful enough learning experiences to have measurable effects on our graduates as leaders.
2. Our programs developed candidates with effective leadership skills.
3. Candidates’ skills would positively influence school practices and improvement outcomes.

Since prior research has shown that these skills have positive but primarily indirect effects on school processes and student outcomes (Leithwood, Seashore Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004), we assumed our programs’ influence on school outcomes would be similarly indirect. Finally, the taskforce was concerned about how context and district support influenced our graduates’ success as principals, so adapted our conceptual design to incorporate these factors as possible mediating influences.

We spent 2 years reviewing the research literature on the effects of leadership preparation programs on graduates and leadership effects on schools (Orr, 2003). Through this process, we developed a conceptual model that ultimately served as the basis for survey design. To clarify and group the measures for our conceptual model, we drew from Kirkpatrick’s (1998) four-level program evaluation outcome model: (a) reaction to the experience, (b) learning gains, (c) the application or transfer or learning to practice, and (d) organizational impact. In applying this model to the taskforce evaluation ideas, we concluded that the leadership preparation outcomes to be measured for all graduates are (a) quality ratings of program features; (b) reported learning about leadership learning; (c) leadership career intentions; (d) advancement into leadership positions; (e) leadership practices; (f) school improvement work; and (g) improved school climate and student, parent, and teacher engagement.

A summary of current measures is included in the appendix.

The Taskforce on Evaluating Leadership Preparation Programs then drew on available research to identify robust measures, where available, and the relationship among the factors that these measures represent. Figure 1 shows the primary factors of our model and our assumptions about their relationship. The nature and quality of the program’s features is the primary focus of our conceptual model, since our aim is to measure the program’s effects on graduate outcomes. The primary features assessed in our model are drawn from prior research on exemplary program features (Jackson & Kelley, 2002) and ELCC standards for quality internship.

Second, the taskforce hypothesized that selective candidate demographic, educational, and prior-experience attributes would have a moderating influence on the program’s impact on graduates. There has been significant emphasis on and criticism of programs’ selection decisions (Levine, 2005; McCarthy, 1999), suggesting that the quality of candidates when admitted has an independent influence on their development as leaders.

Third, the taskforce identified two initial program outcomes: what candidates learn about leadership and their advancement into leadership careers. We drew on the national Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards and effective leadership research (Leithwood et al., 2004) to create measures of learning about leadership. We proposed that candidate learning would have a positive influence on likelihood of advancing into a school or district leadership position, and that learning had a mediating influence between participants’ program experience and career advancement outcome. In turn, we argued that program influences on schools are mediated through their graduates’ advancement into leadership careers.

Fourth, drawing on effective leadership research (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2000; Silins, Mulford, & Zarins, 2002), we applied the researchers’ findings of how leaders’ influences on school outcomes are mediated through the extent to which they exercise instructional and transformational leadership practices and develop teachers’ individual and collective capacity for school improvement. Using this
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![Figure 1. Conceptual model.](image-url)
research we laid out a series of mediated relationships, from principal practice to changes in school practices and conditions, to school and student outcomes. Throughout this model, we hypothesized that program effects would be mediated through each outcome factor. Finally, we added district support of principals’ work and the school challenges and conditions as moderating influences on the relationship between principals’ practices and school improvement progress.

Survey Development

Using our conceptual model and available research, the Taskforce on Evaluating Leadership Preparation Programs developed survey items and the instrument as a whole in an iterative process of developing and testing items and measures. Our work began with one member’s pilot research on a program, which measured program features and graduates’ career intentions (Orr & Hung, 2002). The survey instrument was revised in 2002 and 2003 by the taskforce to add measures drawn from research on leadership practices and school improvement. The survey was piloted again with three programs in 2004, enabling analysis of how well the measures differentiated innovative and conventional programs (Orr & Barber, 2007). Using Orr and Barber’s results, the survey instrument was refined further and fielded in two different studies in 2005. First, it was used as the basis of research on innovative leadership preparation programs for the Wallace Foundation (Darling-Hammond, Meyerson, LaPointe, & Orr, 2007). In that study, 200 graduates of innovative preparation programs were compared with a national sample of 571 principals on their preparation experiences, learning outcomes, and (for those who were principals) leadership practices and school improvement work. The measures in the Darling-Hammond et al. study proved to be robust enough to differentiate the two groups of principals on most program features and principal outcomes.

Second, the survey was piloted in 2005 among several programs by faculty who were affiliated with the taskforce (Orr, Silverberg, & LeTendre, 2006). This comparative study showed that the survey’s program measures differentiated the programs and that these differences were positively associated with graduate outcomes. The survey was revised again in 2007 to improve item clarity; reduce the number of items needed for each measure; and add more items on school improvement outcomes, including student, teacher, and parent engagement. Throughout this process, more programs fielded the survey, extending the survey sample to 17 programs. This sample enabled further analyses using programs as the unit of analysis and scale measure assessment (Orr & Pounder, 2007). Consequently, the survey was refined again in 2008, adding more measures on principals’ leadership practices.

Currently, almost all survey items have proven to be robust. The exception is reports on the number of hours and weeks of an internship or field experience, which we still include despite these weaknesses. Survey items aggregate well into conceptually guided scales, showing strong factor loadings and reliability coefficients (see Orr & Pounder, 2007, for scale statistics).

During the survey’s development over the last 8 years, the survey and its pilot results have been reviewed by the 20–30 members of the evaluation taskforce. Their oversight and feedback helped to strengthen the survey quality, both conceptually and methodologically, providing independent feedback on item quality, measures, and the survey process.

Alignment With ELCC Standards and National Research on Leader Effects

A related goal of the taskforce’s investment in developing a survey of graduates and alumni was to enable programs to gather valid and reliable information to use as one source of evidence for national and state program accreditation. To that end, the survey is aligned to ELCC assessment expectations by providing information on (a) the extent to which graduates’ internships meet the criteria outlined in ELCC Standard 7, which addresses interpersonal relationships; (b) the extent to which graduates’ learned leadership knowledge and skills are aligned to ELCC Standards 1–6 (and several substandards, specifically); (c) the school leadership career advancement outcomes of graduates; (d) the extent to which graduates’ leadership practices are aligned with the ELCC standards; and (e) the extent to which graduates’ school improvement work is aligned with the ELCC standards. In fact, the taskforce’s technical report provides a cross-walk between the ELCC standards and the survey items (Orr, 2008).

The evaluation taskforce did not try to align the survey 100% with all ELCC standards and substandards. Instead, the taskforce focused on the most essential features and those that could be most aptly measured by survey. Some ELCC substandards are not easy to measure; there is significant overlap among some substandards. Also, inclusion of all substandards would make the survey too long and unwieldy, reducing completion rates and response quality. In addition, our research showed that programs’ performance is highly correlated among the standards. This confirmed for us the importance of sampling from among the ELCC standards across the survey measures, rather than striving for 100% coverage.

In December 2008, the National Policy Board for Educational Administration reviewed the survey’s purpose and use by programs for program evaluation and accreditation purposes, particularly as evidence for meeting one or more ELCC assessment requirements. The National Policy Board agreed that programs can use the survey results as one of several evaluation sources of program effects for accreditation purposes, but not as the only source of evidence on graduate learning and outcomes.

Individual Institution Use of the Survey for Program Evaluation

Presently, at least 25 institutions have fielded the SLPPS since 2004 (note that some institutions have used the survey without notifying the taskforce or sharing the results). Typically, these institutions have surveyed one or more cohorts of recent program graduates. Some institutions limited their survey administration to only recent graduates and only measured the immediate outcomes of learning and career intentions and initial advancement. Other institutions surveyed all graduates up to 10 years prior and used the whole survey covering all aspects of principal practices and school improvement work. The scope of the survey administration influences the types of analyses institutions can conduct. Some institutions have multiple programs and have compared results between the various programs; others have compared graduates across multiple years to determine whether program changes influence graduate outcomes.

To date, informal reports from faculty of these institutions that used the survey with their graduates have shown significant benefits in comparing their results with those of other institutions.
These comparisons (a) highlight areas for program improvement, particularly in program areas and in areas of graduate learning that are rated lower than other areas and than exists in other institutions; (b) highlight how differences (within an institution) in program delivery (such as district partnerships, cohort structures, and theory to practice connections in program content) relate to differences in program outcomes; and (c) illustrate how program changes over time (particularly pre- and postprogram redesign to meet ELCC standards) are observable in differences in graduates’ ratings of their program experiences and their learning and career advancement outcomes.

As shown in Table 1, nine institutions have used the survey on their own for program improvement purposes, with one or more programs and one or more cohorts of graduates. In two states, all the programs fielded the survey together to generate comparative information and meet requirements for program accreditation and evaluation.

Collaborative State Program Evaluation

In recent years, many states have pressed programs to provide evidence of their effectiveness in producing graduates who advance to school leadership positions and can successfully lead schools, as measured through increases in student achievement. Similarly, many state-based groups such as the Missouri Professors of Educational Administration have discussed the need for common evaluation research approaches in order to meet state and national accreditation expectations and inform them about how differences in program delivery relate to graduate outcomes. Finally, evaluation research may provide evidence of the benefits of more rigorous programs in an era of rising concern over the emergence of “store-front” programs that provide quick, accessible degree options to large numbers of candidates.

The Taskforce on Evaluating Leadership Preparation Programs and its resources became a model for state-based groups of programs to undertake evaluation research together. In the past few years, taskforce members either guided their own states’ groups through consideration of collaborative evaluation work or served as consultants (often pro bono) to state groups such as Indiana’s statewide collaborative effort between university faculty and researchers and representatives from the Indiana Department of Education, which investigated programs and their graduates’ performance as school leaders (Black, Bathon, & Pointdexter, 2007). Such technical assistance has included discussions of the benefits of collaborative program evaluation, strategies on survey administration, and support in survey fielding and data analysis. Taskforce members also have provided guidance on how to gain state agency support (for those seeking funding and contact information for current principals), steps to engaging all programs in the state to negotiate terms of shared confidentiality, and working with other institutions to adopt the survey and the collaborative approach to program evaluation. Two paramount faculty concerns regarding collaboration with other institutions on program evaluation are worries that the evaluation results will be used by the state education agency to penalize programs and that respondent confidentiality will be violated.

As noted previously, members of the Taskforce on Evaluating Leadership Preparation Programs have assisted programs in their evaluation research either voluntarily (as a service to the field) or for a small fee-for-service. Much of this support has been provided to pilot methods for collaborative evaluation research, particularly to learn how to manage multi-institution IRB applications and confidentiality agreements and how to set up a shared online survey mechanism.

Presently, two states’ leadership preparation programs have jointly surveyed all their graduates of one cohort (2003 or 2004) and are beginning to discuss the findings together. In Utah, faculty from different institutions have used the comparative results to identify areas for program improvement. In Missouri, the results are being shared with faculty representatives from different institutions, and the institutions have launched a survey of a second cohort of graduates.

Table 1
Programs Completing the Survey of Leadership Preparation and Practice (a Follow-Up Survey of Graduates and Alumni), 2003–2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Program or institution</th>
<th>No. respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual program</td>
<td>(N = 713)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>St. Mary’s College</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>University of Denver</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Pittsburg State University</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Rowan University</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>University of New Mexico</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Future Schools Administrators Academy, Teachers College (now at Bank Street College)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Hofstra University</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>College of Staten Island</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Stephen F. Austin University</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide efforts</td>
<td>(N = 1,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>4 institutions</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>12 institutions</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Further State-Level Replication of the Collaborative Evaluation Research Work

Ten states (encompassing 198 institutions) are poised to replicate the collaborative evaluation process, greatly expanding the opportunity for program improvement in these states and institutions. Based on reports at the 2008 UCEA convention, this includes new survey administrations in the 2 initial states and at least 8 more states. In several states, such as Alabama and Kentucky, programs are required to redesign themselves to meet new standards and expectations. Program faculty are eager to solicit graduate feedback to inform this program redesign process and to use the evaluation results as a baseline for comparing to graduates of their post-redesign programs. A few states, such as Missouri, have Wallace Foundation funding to help support programs in their joint research. Representatives from 10 states reported at a 2008 UCEA Convention session that their state colleagues are currently discussing or are already eager to participate in fielding the UCEA/LTEL-SIG survey to benefit from its design and quality, the ease in using a hosted survey-administration process, and access to benchmarking information from other programs nationally. These states (Alabama, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Missouri, New Jersey, North Carolina, Texas, Utah, and Virginia) host a combined total of 198 leadership preparation programs.

Demonstrating the Relationship Between Preparation and Leader Outcomes

Recently, the Taskforce on Evaluating Leadership Preparation Programs has been able to generate findings to its most essential question: How and in what ways does preparation matter for graduates’ leadership work? The collaborative work of multiple institutions and their faculty researchers has enabled the taskforce to aggregate results across institutions with sufficient numbers to statistically evaluate the relationship between program-level differences in program features and graduates’ outcomes.

The results of these analyses have been quite positive, have been presented at UCEA and AERA conferences (Orr & Pounder, 2007), and are being revised for publication in a special issue of Educational Administration Quarterly. The study results show that programs differ on graduates’ ratings across features and attributes, with a few programs rated highly on most features and a few programs rated highly on few or no features. These differences are positively correlated with graduate outcomes on what they learn and their career advancement outcomes (Orr, 2009).

Using the Darling-Hammond et al. (2007) research, the data for graduates of four innovative preparation programs were compared with the conventionally prepared principals (Orr & Orphanos, in press). Using structural equation modeling, Orr and Orphanos demonstrated that innovative preparation-program participation was associated with better program and internship quality, which in turn was associated with more leadership learning, more frequent effective leadership practices, and more school improvement work underway in schools (even when school context was taken into account).

Resources and Next Steps

Throughout the survey development process, taskforce members have taken steps to enable other institutions to use the survey and combine their findings for program comparison. By fielding the survey as part of the taskforce, individual researchers shared their experiences, enabling the development of processes for groups of programs to field the survey. To date, the taskforce has made the survey available to all programs in the leadership preparation field, generally through conference presentations on research findings and training sessions on evaluation research at UCEA and AERA conferences (2003 to present) and through news updates through the LTEL-SIG semi-annual newsletters.

Through UCEA, the Taskforce on Evaluating Leadership Preparation Programs has established a Web page (UCEA, 2009) to provide information about the taskforce, the survey, and related information. Moreover, the taskforce has made arrangements to expand the availability of the survey electronically through a collaborative relationship with UCEA and the University of Utah Education Policy Center (n.d.). Through the taskforce’s work and the research and evaluation support provided by the Utah Education Policy Center, evaluation resources are available, including survey administration, the fielding process, data analyses, and report generation.

The taskforce is now piloting new, parallel work on teachers’ assessment of educational leadership program graduates as school leaders to provide further context and results for this critical work. The new Web-hosted survey application will permit institutions to continuously follow up on their graduates, compare findings over time, and share in a joint inquiry on leadership preparation program improvement and effectiveness.

Throughout this collaborative work, the taskforce has demonstrated the feasibility of working collectively to address a challenge to the field and enable inquiry-based strategies to support program improvement. As a group, the taskforce is committed to continuing our work in new evaluation research areas, while strengthening the processes and resources we have developed. As a means of enriching our scholarship and practice, the Taskforce on Evaluating Leadership Preparation Programs also encourages other collective research efforts in the field.
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Appendix: Evaluation Measures on Leadership Practice and School Improvement Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Element of practice &amp; school improvement work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prior influences</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Years of teaching experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prior formal &amp; informal leadership experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate degree/institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highest degree earned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District support for program participation</td>
<td>Nominated for program participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>District paying for some/all program costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program experiences</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key program features</td>
<td>Content focus on leading learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student-centered instructional practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supportive organizational structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Challenging, coherent reflective program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty competence &amp; challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive student relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cohort membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extensive internship/practicum (weeks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internship/practicum setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internship/practicum release time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standards-defined quality internship/practicum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initial outcomes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning to lead: What they learned in the program</td>
<td>Learned: Vision and ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learned: Leading learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learned: Managing operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learned: Engaging parents and community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learned: Organizational learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership orientation</td>
<td>Principal intentions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive beliefs about the principalship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative beliefs about the principalship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perceived control to make one’s intentions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subjective norm—perceived support from others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career advancement</td>
<td>Actual advancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Length of time to advance to the principalship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retention in leadership position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(cont.)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element of practice &amp; school improvement work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Second-level outcomes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributed leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent increased (over last year):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• teacher collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• coherence &amp; coordination,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• collective efficacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• teacher effort and risk taking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• use of data for planning &amp; improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• student engagement emphasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic emphasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third-level outcomes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacted student outcomes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• academic effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• misbehavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New teacher holding power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting most or all state &amp; national performance standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediating influences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived district support of the principal's leadership and school improvement work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal participation in professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School attributes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-level outcomes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional leadership practices:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours worked weekly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of engaging in:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• organizational learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• instructional leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• developing people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• parent engagement and participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived leadership efficacy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Barbara L. Jackson Scholars have a new Facebook Group**

[www.facebook.com](http://www.facebook.com)

Search for Barbara L. Jackson Scholars

---

**Education Secretary Announces Nine Senior Staff Appointments**

U.S. Department of Education Secretary Arne Duncan announced the following nine appointments to his senior staff.

**Margot Rogers, Chief of Staff**, comes to the Department of Education from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, where she most recently served as special assistant to the director of education and managed the development of the foundation’s 5-year education strategy, working closely with the director on organizational development, strategy, and personnel. Prior to her tenure at Gates, Rogers served as an independent consultant providing education-related program, policy, and strategy work for a variety of clients, including New American Schools, the Harry S. Truman Scholarship Foundation and the Gates Foundation. Rogers also worked for 6 years as a staff attorney at the Center for Law and Education, providing strategic guidance and content support for legal services and other attorneys around the country working on improving education for low-income students. Rogers also served as a senior program officer for the American Association of University Women Educational Foundation. Rogers received her master’s degree in history from Emory University, obtained her Juris Doctorate from the University of Virginia, and was a Rotary International Scholar at the University of Toronto.

**Juan Sepulveda, Director of the White House Initiative on the Educational Excellence for Hispanic Americans**, has has been a senior executive, strategist, and advocate in the nonprofit and philanthropic communities with a focus in community development, capacity building, and transformational management for over 20 years. Sepulveda comes to the Department of Education from The Common Enterprise (TCE), where he has been president since founding the organization in 1995 to help build stronger communities across America by making nonprofits, philanthropic organizations, governments, businesses, and communities more effective in their public work. Sepulveda also has worked at the Rockefeller Foundation, as a talk show host on KLRN, as a biographer, and as a Latino voting rights advocate. Sepulveda received a BA in government from Harvard; a BA in politics, philosophy, and economics as a Rhodes Scholar at Oxford University; and a law degree from Stanford University. Sepulveda served as Texas state director for Obama for America.

**Judy Wurtzel, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Office of Planning, Evaluation, and Policy Development**, comes to the department from The Aspen Institute, where she has served as co-director since 2005, helping local, state, and national education leaders improve the education and life chances of poor and minority students. Prior to her tenure at the Aspen Institute, Wurtzel served as executive director of the Learning First Alliance, a partnership of leading national education associations formed to improve teaching and learning. Wurtzel also served as senior advisor to the deputy secretary at the U.S. Department of Education from 1993 to 1999 and as associate counsel to the president in the White Office of Presidential Personnel. Wurtzel received her BA in literature from Yale and a law degree from New York University.
David Hoff, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Communication Development, has worked as a reporter in the education field for nearly 20 years, most recently serving as associate editor at Education Week, writing on issues facing K–12 education including school finance, assessment, and curriculum. Recently, Hoff founded and authored NCLB: Act II, a daily blog tracking issues related to the reauthorization of the No Child Left Behind Act and led the newspaper’s coverage of both the Democratic and Republican nominating conventions. Hoff has appeared regularly on television and radio shows as an expert on federal education policies and has spoken at education conferences. In addition to his work as a reporter at Education Week, Hoff has been published in a variety of publications, including The Washington Post. Hoff received his BA in history from Hope College.

John White, Press Secretary, comes to the department from Prince George’s County Public Schools, where he served as chief communications officer for the nation’s 18th largest school district since 2004. Prior to his tenure in Prince George’s County, White managed Public and Government Relations in Maryland for AAA Mid-Atlantic, and served as the director of communications for the Maryland Aviation Administration at Baltimore/Washington International Airport. Previously, White served as the press secretary for Maryland’s Office of the Secretary of State and worked as a reporter 1991–1997 at The Daily Banner Newspaper and for the Capital-Gazette newspapers. White earned his BA in English at the University of Maryland and an MBA from University of Maryland University College.

Kevin Jennings, Assistant Deputy Secretary, Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools, is the founder and former executive director of the Gay, Lesbian, and Straight Education Network (GLSEN), an organization that works to make schools safe for all students, regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity. Prior to his tenure at GLSEN, Jennings served as History Department chair and a history teacher at Concord Academy in Massachusetts and before that as a history teacher at Moses Brown School in Rhode Island. Jennings has authored six books, including Mama’s Boy, Preacher’s Son: A Memoir, which was named a 2007 Book Award. Jennings received an AB in history from Harvard, a MA from the Columbia University Teachers College, and an MBA from New York University’s Stern School of Business.

Julius Lloyd Horwich, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislation and Congressional Affairs, most recently served as education counsel and policy advisor to the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Education and Labor Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, where he works with House, Senate and executive branch staff to develop and reauthorize legislation and secure appropriations for education and children’s programs. Prior to his tenure in the House, Horwich served as education counsel on the U.S. Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions; on the Subcommittee on Children and Families; and as Policy Counsel to Senator Tom Harkin, working to develop and reauthorize legislation and secure appropriations for disability and education programs. Horwich also served as the director of federal relations for the University of Pennsylvania, where he worked with university officials, deans, and faculty to develop and secure Congressional support for the university’s legislative priorities. Horwich received his BS in foreign service from Georgetown University, his JD from Boston University, and a MA in Public Affairs Administration from the University of Wisconsin.

John White, Press Secretary, comes to the department from Prince George’s County Public Schools, where he served as chief communications officer for the nation’s 18th largest school district since 2004. Prior to his tenure in Prince George’s County, White managed Public and Government Relations in Maryland for AAA Mid-Atlantic, and served as the director of communications for the Maryland Aviation Administration at Baltimore/Washington International Airport. Previously, White served as the press secretary for Maryland’s Office of the Secretary of State and worked as a reporter 1991–1997 at The Daily Banner Newspaper and for the Capital-Gazette newspapers. White earned his BA in English at the University of Maryland and an MBA from University of Maryland University College.

Kevin Jennings, Assistant Deputy Secretary, Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools, is the founder and former executive director of the Gay, Lesbian, and Straight Education Network (GLSEN), an organization that works to make schools safe for all students, regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity. Prior to his tenure at GLSEN, Jennings served as History Department chair and a history teacher at Concord Academy in Massachusetts and before that as a history teacher at Moses Brown School in Rhode Island. Jennings has authored six books, including Mama’s Boy, Preacher’s Son: A Memoir, which was named a 2007 Book Award. Jennings received an AB in history from Harvard, a MA from the Columbia University Teachers College, and an MBA from New York University’s Stern School of Business.

Julius Lloyd Horwich, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislation and Congressional Affairs, most recently served as education counsel and policy advisor to the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Education and Labor Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary, and Secondary Education, where he works with House, Senate and executive branch staff to develop and reauthorize legislation and secure appropriations for education and children’s programs. Prior to his tenure in the House, Horwich served as education counsel on the U.S. Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions; on the Subcommittee on Children and Families; and as Policy Counsel to Senator Tom Harkin, working to develop and reauthorize legislation and secure appropriations for disability and education programs. Horwich also served as the director of federal relations for the University of Pennsylvania, where he worked with university officials, deans, and faculty to develop and secure Congressional support for the university’s legislative priorities. Horwich received his BS in foreign service from Georgetown University, his JD from Boston University, and a MA in Public Affairs Administration from the University of Wisconsin.

Stacey Jordon, Director of Intergovernmental Affairs, comes to the department from The Education Sector, where she has served as communications manager since 2002 working with executive, policy, research, and marketing teams to develop communications strategies on education policy. Jordan also has served as special advisor for education policy to the mayor of Providence, RI, and as director of The New York City Department of Education Office of Strategic Partnerships, which was created by the New York chancellor to engage the private and public sector to support improvement of New York Public Schools. Jordan earned a BA in philosophy from Wheaton College and a master’s in social welfare policy from The University of Texas at Austin.

Dianne Piche, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Enforcement, Office of Civil Rights, joins the department after serving as the executive director of the Citizens’ Commission on Civil Rights, which monitors the civil rights policies and practices of the federal government, and as an attorney at the Law Office of William L. Taylor, where she specializes in civil rights, education law, and federal litigation. Piche has served as an adjunct professor at the University of Maryland in College Park, as a counsel on the Independent Commission on Chapter 1, and as a consultant to the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Education and Labor. Piche has published extensively and testified on numerous occasions before the U.S. House Committee on Education and Labor. Piche earned her BA in English and women’s studies from State University of New York at Albany and her JD from Catholic University.
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This year, UCEA acknowledges the interdependent relationship of leadership and learning for both academics and practitioners in creating innovative leadership practices and partnerships needed for the 21st century schools. In this spirit, we invite all members of the UCEA community (a) to share their research and scholarly perspectives on this theme; (b) to offer innovative ways to think about how research and theory can inform leadership practice at national, state, and local levels; and (c) to discuss insightful ways in which educational leadership can enhance academic excellence, equity, and social justice in P-20 educational contexts.
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**EAQ’s 2008 Volume Year Davis Award**


The award selection committee was chaired by Ron Heck (University of Hawaii, the EAQ’s 2007 volume year Davis Award winner) and included Scott Bauer (George Mason University), Andrea Evans (Northen Illinois University), Sharon Kruse (University of Akron), Mark Smylie (University of Illinois–Chicago) and Ellen Goldring (Vanderbilt University). The committee had the following to say regarding the article:

The Robinson, Lloyd, and Rowe paper informs a question that is at the very center of the field’s ongoing quest for relevance—that is, the impact of school leadership on learning. The paper examines two of the key forms of leadership, instructional and transformational, as well as the dimensions of leadership and their impact. Robinson, Lloyd, and Rowe provide strong support for the importance of leadership in securing student achievement outcomes. The synthesis of the literature to date provides an important conceptual framework for thinking about school leadership, and the resulting unambiguously defined attributes of high-quality instructional leadership set forth an ambitious agenda for future research. The committee members found the approach taken by the authors to deal with the problem of inappropriate aggregation across studies in the meta-analysis to be quite clever. We applaud their ingenuity and willingness to take this on to draw out new meaning from their data. For scholars, their study extends recent work on leader–student learning connections in interesting ways and provides guidance for subsequent studies. For practitioners, we envision the message conveyed in the paper regarding leaders’ attention to promoting and participating in teacher learning will create some spirited conversations—maybe even change.

The committee concludes that the paper moves the field’s conversation about the impact of leadership forward significantly, and it serves as an exemplar for the type of research approach it uses to make its substantive contribution. In terms of choice of topic, overall influence and impact for the field, and unique contribution and methodology, the article is superior.

**Dr. Viviane M. J. Robinson** is Professor of Education with the Faculty of Education at the University of Auckland, New Zealand, where she leads an interfaculty graduate program in educational management. She is also Academic Leader of the First-Time Principals Programme, New Zealand’s national induction programme for new school principals. Her research interests include the analysis and promotion of organizational and interpersonal effectiveness and the contribution of educational research to the improvement of educational practice. Her books include *Practitioner Research for Educators: A Guide to Improving Classrooms and Schools* (Corwin Press, 2006, coauthored with M. K. Lai), and *Problem-Based Methodology: Research for the Improvement of Practice* (Pergamon, 1993). She has published widely in leading international journals and handbooks, including *Educational Researcher, Review of Educational Research, EAQ, Leadership and Policy in Schools, and Educational Management Administration and Leadership*. She recently completed an iterative best evidence synthesis for the New Zealand government on the impact of educational leadership on a wide range of student outcomes.

**Dr. Claire A. Lloyd** is an education faculty member at The University of Auckland in Wales. She has a PhD in Educational Psychology from the University of Illinois–Champaign-Urbana. Her interests lie in the area of children’s learning and development.

**Dr. Kenneth J. Rowe** is Research Director of the Learning Processes research program at the Australian Council for Educational Research. Ken’s substantive and methodological research interests include authentic educational and psychological assessment, multilevel value-added performance indicators and benchmarking, and teacher and school effectiveness. He has published widely in scholarly journals and in technical reports for policymakers and professional bodies.

The authors received recognition for the 2008 Davis Award at the 2008 AERA Division A business meeting held in San Diego, California, April 13–17. The William J. Davis Award is given annually to the author(s) of the most outstanding article published in the EAQ during the preceding volume year. The article selection is made by a review panel that typically includes the previous year’s award winner, along with EAQ editorial board members or former members who have not published in the volume being reviewed.

The Davis Award was established with contributions in honor of the late William J. Davis, a former associate director of UCEA and Assistant Professor at the University of Wisconsin–Madison. Previous winners are listed on the UCEA Web site: www.ucea.org. Contributions to the award fund are welcome and may be sent to: University Council for Educational Administration

College of Education
Department of Educational Administration

The University of Texas at Austin
1 University Station D5400
Austin, Texas 78712-0374

The EAQ editorial team and the UCEA Executive Committee join the selection committee in congratulating Drs. Robinson, Lloyd, and Rowe on their outstanding contribution to scholarship in the field of educational leadership and policy.
NASSP’s 2009 Dissertation Award Winners

Joni L. Swanson, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction at Geneseo CUSD #228 in Geneseo, Illinois, won the 2009 National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) High School Dissertation Award. Dr. Swanson completed her Doctor of Philosophy in Teaching and Learning at The University of Iowa in April 2008. Dr. Swanson’s dissertation, *An Analysis of the Impact of High School Dual Enrollment Course Participation on Post-Secondary Academic Success, Persistence and Degree Completion,* examines the impact of high school students’ participation in dual enrollment courses upon college persistence and degree attainment. John Nori, Director of Program Development in the Leadership Programs and Services office at NASSP, stated, “Dr. Swanson’s dissertation provides information to NASSP members who are considering implementing dual enrollment programs. She found that these programs provided students with ‘academic momentum’ and ‘may enhance high school reform.’”

Gregory W. Mees, Assistant Principal at Liberty High School in Liberty, Missouri, has won the 2009 NASSP Middle Level Dissertation Award. Dr. Mees completed his Doctor of Philosophy at The University of Missouri–Columbia in April 2008. Dr. Mees’s dissertation is entitled *The Relationships Among Principal Leadership, School Culture, and Student Achievement in Missouri Middle Schools.* John Nori, Director of Program Development in the Leadership Programs and Services office at NASSP, stated, “Principals are always under pressure to improve student achievement and meet standards. Dr. Mees’s dissertation reflects the importance of establishing relationships among students, teachers, and parents.”

About the Dissertation Award Competition Program

UCEA collaborated with NASSP in the nomination and review process of these awards and extends congratulations to both winners. NASSP offers two dissertation award competitions to encourage and recognize high-quality research in high school leadership and in middle-level leadership. The award programs focus professional and scholarly attention on the complex problems facing high school and middle level leaders. Each award winner will receive a $1,000 cash award, a complimentary one-year NASSP membership, and a recognition plaque. Winners are also encouraged to write articles about their research for one of NASSP’s publications.

NASSP is pleased to recognize the collaboration of two other associations: The National Council of Professors of Educational Administration and UCEA in promoting these competitions to their members and providing judges. The award programs are open to doctoral students who complete and successfully defend their dissertations. Completed dissertation applications are reviewed by an impartial panel of judges made up of university and college professors and consultants who are experts in the field of high school and middle level education. For more information on the award program or to read the dissertations, please visit www.principals.org/awards.

About NASSP

In existence since 1916, the NASSP is the preeminent organization of and national voice for middle-level and high school principals, assistant principals, and aspiring school leaders from across the United States and more than 45 other countries. NASSP’s mission is to promote excellence in school leadership. The National Honor Society, National Junior Honor Society, National Elementary Honor Society, and National Association of Student Councils are all NASSP programs. For more information about NASSP, located in Reston, Virginia, visit www.principals.org or call 703-860-0200.
Excellence in Educational Leadership Awards

The Excellence in Educational Leadership Award is for practicing school administrators who have made significant contributions to the improvement of administrator preparation. Each year, the UCEA Executive Committee invites member university faculties to select a distinguished school administrator who has an exemplary record of supporting school administrator preparation efforts. This is an unusual award in that it affords national recognition, but the recipients are selected by individual universities. It provides a unique mechanism for UCEA universities to build good will and recognize the contributions of practitioners to the preparation of junior professionals.

Mr. Tom Bastean, a 1968 graduate of the Missouri School for the Deaf (MSD), has devoted his life and seemingly boundless energies toward expanding educational and leadership opportunities for the deaf communities of Missouri and the nation. In 1987, Tom founded the Missouri Commission for the Deaf and served as its first chairperson. He has served continuously as member, officer, and chair of innumerable commissions, task forces, and associations advancing the education of the deaf. Tom’s advocacy efforts occur in his off time, when he is not working at his alma mater. After earning his BS from Gallaudet University and MA at McDaniel University, Tom returned to MSD in 1975. He since has served as classroom teacher, dormitory dean, award-winning basketball and football coach, athletic director, and assistant principal. In 2001, Tom became MSD’s first deaf assistant superintendent.

Ms. Judy E. Beedles-Miller is Assistant Superintendent for Elementary Education for Dodge City Public Schools, USD 443, where she has served as Director of Elementary Education, Coordinator of Title 1 and Staff Development, and a classroom teacher. Ms. Beedles-Miller has received many awards and recognitions, including Kansas Teacher of the Year. Ms. Beedles-Miller collaborated with colleagues to plan and build a leadership preparation academy at Kansas State University. The academy was an outgrowth of a special state department grant (Kansas Laboratory for Education Leaders/KLEL) aimed at developing leadership capacity and was funded by the Wallace Foundation.

Dr. Stephen W. Benson completed his Ph.D. in Administration and Planning at the University of Alabama. He has served as principal of Tuscaloosa County High School since 1995. He is past president of the Association of American Schools in Brazil, served for 8 years on visiting committees throughout South America for the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, and served for many years as a principal and superintendent in Chile and Brazil. Dr. Benson has been an active member of the University of Alabama’s Instructional Leadership Redesign Team since 2006. He has met with faculty and practitioners to assist in providing guidance and advisement in all phases of the redesign process of the A1 level certification program in educational administration.

Dr. Thomas R. Bice joined the Alabama Department of Education June 2008 as the Deputy State Superintendent of Education for Instructional Services. He has responsibility for the areas of Curriculum and Instruction; Assessment and Accountability; Federal Programs; Special Education; Prevention and Support Services; Instructional Leadership and Evaluation; Information Systems; the Alabama Reading Initiative; and the Alabama Math, Science, and Technology Initiative. He has served as a special education teacher, psychometrist, alternative school director, career technical director, high school principal, and local superintendent. He also served as adjunct professor at Auburn University and was the State President of the Alabama Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development and President–Elect of the School Superintendents of Alabama.

Ms. Jean K. Bonelli has served as a public school teacher, principal, and central office administrator. Currently, Ms. Bonelli holds the position of Program Evaluator at the Colorado Department of Education. In this role, she has been influential in leading district principals and teachers toward a vision for excellence in education through her work with developing strong district and school leadership teams. Ms. Bonelli has served as an adjunct instructor for the Educational Leadership and Policy Studies program for the past 6 years. Ms. Bonelli has received outstanding student evaluations in her work with doctoral students and administrator license candidates.

Dr. Charlotte Mandrill Boyle was unanimously nominated by the faculty of the Division of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at Arizona State University (ASU). Dr. Boyle is Superintendent of Creighton School District in Phoenix. She also has served as a classroom teacher, principal, and central office administrator during the past 25 years. Dr. Boyle has received numerous awards, such as Teacher of the Year, Principal of the Year, and Western New Mexico University Education Hall of Fame. In 2003, she was the ASU Outstanding Doctoral Student in School Administration. She currently teaches the superintendent course for doctoral students at ASU.

Dr. Monte L. Bridges is Superintendent and Chief Executive Officer of the Puget Sound Educational Service District in Renton, WA. A champion of effective governance, social justice, and quality education for all students, Dr. Bridges’ career includes over 27 years in classroom, support service, and administrative leadership positions in Washington state. His research interests include the public school superintendent, superintendent performance evaluation, and governance issues. Dr. Bridges is active in civic affairs in the Puget Sound region, Washington, and nationally. He has leadership roles or serves on boards for King County United Way, Northwest Dollars for Scholars, the Washington Association of School Administrators, the Washington State Arts Commission, the American Educational Research Association, and Scholarship America.

Bishop Frank J. Caggiano studied at Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut; Cathedral College, Douglaston, New York; and Immaculate Conception Seminary, Huntington, New York. He was ordained to the priesthood by Bishop Francis J. Mugavero in 1987. He served in two Brooklyn parishes before beginning 5 years of graduate studies in sacred theology at the Pontifical Gregorian University in Rome. In 2003, Pope John Paul II named him Papal Chaplain, bestowing upon him the title of Reverend Monsignor. In 2006, he was ordained Auxiliary Bishop of Brooklyn, Titular Bishop of Inis Cathaig. Bishop Caggiano has held various positions in the Diocese of Brooklyn, including Dean of Formation for the Permanent Diaconate Program, Censor Librorum, and Director of the Permanent Diaconate. Bishop has served in St. Agatha’s, St. Agatha’s, etc.
Athanasius, and St. Jude’s and as Pastor of St. Dominick’s parish. Bishop currently holds the title of Vicar General, Moderator of the Cuda, Diocese of Brooklyn, as well as Vicar for Evangelization and Pastoral Life.

Mr. Alan R. Cunningham is the Superintendent of Schools for USD 443 in Dodge City, Kansas. He began his teaching career at Northwest Elementary School in Dodge City in 1974 and became principal in 1981. From 1990–1992, he served as half-time principal at Wilroads Gardens Elementary School, while directing the school district’s implementation of instructional technology. In 1992, he became the district’s first Director of Research and Development and served in that position until being selected as Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum and Instruction in 1999. He was appointed Superintendent of Schools in 2006. Alan earned his BS in Elementary Education from Oklahoma Baptist University and a master’s degree in Education from Kansas State University. He completed his building and district leadership licensure through Ft. Hays State University. He is beginning his 35th year with the Dodge City Public Schools. Alan is a member of a number of professional and community organizations and boards as well as being an active member of his church.

Ms. Melody Dacey currently serves as a professional development specialist at the Mayerson Academy, an entity within the Cincinnati Public School System that focuses on professional development and training. In this role, Ms. Dacey helps the district to provide professional development to current school leaders. She is also an active member of the State Action for Educational Leadership Project, a grant provided by the Wallace Foundation to the state of Ohio to provide high-quality, online professional development. Ms. Dacey has been monumental in the development of these professional development modules for current urban school leaders.

Ms. Gracie M. Diaz is currently Assistant Superintendent of the School Board of Broward County. Ms. Diaz has worked for the past 5 years in partnership with Florida Atlantic University’s College of Education in planning, implementing, and enabling programs specifically designed to improve school administrator preparation within the Broward County School System. Ms. Diaz assisted in the design, development, and implementation of joint initiatives such as the Broward Educational Consortium and Urban Teacher Leadership Development Programs.

Mr. Joseph C. Dragone has served as Assistant Superintendent for Business of the Roslyn UFSD since 2004. Prior to coming to Roslyn, he served as Deputy Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent for Administration, elementary school principal, and special education director. Mr. Dragone has been honored by the Nassau-Suffolk School Boards Association with their Distinguished Service Award and by the New York State (NYS) Parent Teacher Association with the Jenkins Memorial Award. In addition to his role as school administrator, he has taken a leadership role in a number of professional organizations including vice-president and treasurer of the NYS Association of School Business Officials and comptroller of the NYS Association of Suburban School Districts. At the university level he has made a significant contribution through the design and implementation of the school district business syllabi for the Hofstra University’s Professional Diploma program. He is an adjunct professor at Hofstra University and Long Island University.

Dr. Robert J. Durón is a 25-year educator who is the 17th superintendent of San Antonio’s most historic school system. Dr. Durón is recognized for his leadership and his ability to inspire academic excellence. Prior to coming to San Antonio ISD for the start of the 2006–2007 school year, Dr. Durón led the fast-growing, 37,000-student Socorro ISD in El Paso, a post he had held since 2003. Under his guidance, student performance increased at the district’s 35 campuses. Dr. Durón previously was an assistant superintendent for 6 years at Clear Creek ISD in League City, where he oversaw 17 schools and nearly 13,000 students. He also served as an adjunct professor for the University of Houston in Clear Lake. His education career includes nearly 10 years spent in his native Waco as an elementary school principal and a middle school assistant principal. He previously was a teacher and coach for the Malakof and Allen school districts.

Dr. L. Kay Forsythe is Executive Director of the Prairie Lakes Education Agency and a former principal and superintendent. She serves as an adjunct instructor for both the principal and superintendent preparation programs at Iowa State University. Dr. Forsythe serves as a mentor for field experiences as well as an external advisor to the educational administration faculty when called upon to assist with program review or curriculum development.

Ms. Linda E. Fox has served as a public school teacher, principal, and central office administrator. Currently, she is Executive Director of High School Education in the Cherry Creek School District, Colorado. Ms. Fox has worked tirelessly developing principals in her district and throughout the state. In addition to her roles as a public school administrator, Ms. Fox has served as an adjunct instructor for the Educational Leadership and Policy Studies program at University of Northern Colorado in Greeley. Ms. Fox has been recognized for her outstanding work with doctoral students and administrator license candidates.

Dr. Robert E. Franklin, Jr. is a graduate of the Pennsylvania State University. He has served as the superintendent for Tri-Valley and North Schuylkill school districts in Pennsylvania, 1991–2007. He has taught several courses for Penn State and has proven to be an effective and innovative teacher.Over the years, he has encouraged many educational colleagues to pursue graduate work at Penn State in addition to support aspiring administrators in multiple ways.

Mrs. Anna M Garcia started her teaching career in the Rio Grande City CSD. After working for 5 years as an elementary teacher, she moved to San Isidro ISD, where she was employed as a district principal. The school district has earned exemplary designation for 75% or more of the time that she has led the schools. Additionally, Mrs. Garcia’s efforts have generated exemplary designations for 2 out of the 3 campuses every year; the other campus has earned no less than a recognized rating. An exemplary designation for all three levels has occurred 8 out of 11 years. Plaques that adorn display shelves and walls are testaments to the high expectations held by Mrs. Garcia and staff as she works to make San Isidro students competitive in academics, for scholarships, and as well-rounded future leaders. The school district enjoys a nationally recognized Blue Ribbon school designation. Mrs. Garcia earned her bachelor’s and master’s degrees from The University of Texas–Pan American.

Dr. Malinda Golden has demonstrated a sustained commitment to students, teacher, and school leaders in her 19 years as an
educator. As a principal, she successfully led three middle schools in Round Rock ISD, Texas. During her tenure as principal, she received The University of Texas Center for Performance Excellence Quality Award twice. Dr. Golden also provided assistance to aspiring principals as an original partner with the National Center for School Improvement at Texas State University. In her current position, Dr. Golden created and developed the leadership development program in the district that is offered to all principals and assistant principals.

**Dr. Gene T. Harris** is the 19th superintendent of the Columbus Public Schools and a Columbus native with deep roots in the local community and direct experience with public schools in areas as diverse as Ghana and China. Dr. Harris was admitted to Notre Dame as an upperclassman in the first year the school accepted women. After graduating, she returned to the district to teach English and drama, moving from the classroom to a supervisor of principals and then deputy superintendent. The recipient of numerous honors, Dr. Harris has received the Champion of Children; Children's Hunger Alliance Educator of the Year; and Buckingham, Doolittle, & Burroughs Stellar Performer awards. Described as articulate and approachable, Dr. Harris understands that strong public schools are essential to our nation's future. She asks staff, parents, and community members to “reach higher” so that every student achieves to the level of his or her full potential.

**Dr. Gregory E. Hicks** is a native North Carolinian, born in Durham and growing up in Orange County. Dr. Hicks has served as a teacher and assistant principal at two middle schools and was principal of Northern Middle School and Person High School, both in Roxboro, North Carolina. He serves as Assistant Superintendent for Human Resources and Finance of the Orange County Schools. Greg has over 28 years of service in public education, including 20 years in administration. Greg serves as an assistant teaching professor for North Carolina State University, where he has taught courses in school-based budgeting and personnel appraisal since 2006. He also works with administrative interns in the Master of School Administration degree program.

**Dr. Steven A. Hinshaw** joined Centerville School District as Chief Financial Officer in July 2004 and has worked in Ohio public school finance since 1993. One of only two school district treasurers known in Ohio with a Ph.D, Dr. Hinshaw also has served as an adjunct professor at University of Dayton and Miami University. He regularly teaches and lectures in graduate-level classes on school finance, human resources, and public school economics. Dr. Hinshaw is a regular presenter of papers at national conferences of the American Education Finance Association and AERA. He also has presented at national and state conferences of the Association of School Business Officials. Dr. Hinshaw's dissertation, *Assessing Efficiency of Ohio’s Public School Districts,* was a finalist for a national Outstanding Dissertation Award. In addition, he was invited to present those dissertation findings to Governor Taft's Blue Ribbon Task Force on Financing Student Success in 2003. His other published articles have appeared in journals throughout the country.

**Ms. Dorothea Irwin** is principal in the Metropolitan School District of Lawrence Township in Indianapolis. In addition, she works with the Center of Innovation teaching math workshops for preK–3 teachers throughout the country. Ms. Irwin partners with IUPUI and Butler University to ensure student teachers have a meaningful practicum and beneficial student teaching experiences. She and a team of teachers have presented on several occasions at the Indiana Urban Schools Association Summer Institute. Ms. Irwin works in partnership with a variety of community agencies throughout the urban school district, including Costco, Lawrence Township Fire and Police Departments, and Community North Health Network. Ms. Erwin, along with teams of teachers, administrators, and community agencies, facilitates off-campus school registration for families without transportation, providing donated school supplies and other needs. Ms. Irwin serves on several district-level committees including the Superintendents’ Advisory Council Committee and the Gifted and Talented Board.

**Dr. Richard W. Kisiel** serves as the Superintendent of Schools in Avon, Connecticut. He also is an adjunct professor in the Neag School of Education's Executive Leadership Program, where he prepares school superintendents. In addition to teaching and mentoring, he serves as a program planner, offering his expertise in local, state, and national policy and his 20 years of successful school leadership experience. Dr. Kisiel is President of the Tri-State Consortium Board of Directors and President-Elect for the Connecticut Association of Public School Superintendence. Dr. Kisiel also serves on the Governance Committee of the University of Hartford Magnet School.

**Mr. Alan Lee** is Lead Headteacher in the only Catholic Federation of Schools in the United Kingdom. In this role he offers leadership support to the three other headteachers within the system. In addition, he chairs his local area Extended Schools Headteacher Cluster group and is co-author with the Director of Education of the Local Authority’s Strategic Improvement Plan 2007, which contains a strand on improving leadership in schools. Mr. Lee contributed to the development and writing of the Northampton Dioceses’ Catholic Leaders for the Future Program and continues to teach future leaders in the program. In addition, Mr. Lee chaired the interschool group of leaders responsible for developing innovative approaches to leadership on Wirral. He has presented at the National Advisory Council on Religious Education and British Educational Research Association.

**Mrs. Lisa B. Light** has been credited with the profound academic improvements at Lonsdale Elementary School in Knoxville, Tennessee. She has implemented effective strategies in curriculum and instruction that have provided a complex structure of expectations and benchmarks to help Lonsdale students improve their learning. In the years that she has been principal, student scores on the Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program (TCAP) have increased by at least 13 percentage points in reading, math, science, and social studies. Her accomplishments as a principal led Knox County Mayor Mike Ragsdale to designate a Lisa Light Day. A frequent presenter on urban education, Ms. Light serves on the district's Urban Education Task Force and is a member of the advisory board for Project GRAD Knoxville, which promotes early involvement in improving the state’s graduation rate. Having coined the phrase that has since become the school's theme—“Remember, today is a great day for learning at Lonsdale”—Ms. Light is a beacon of academic leadership guiding her students toward a brighter future.
Dr. James C. Manley, Superintendent of the Pine-Richland School District, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, received his bachelor's and master's degrees from the University of Dayton and a Ph.D. in Education from the University of Pittsburgh. He served as a teacher and counselor in several districts in Ohio as well as Coordinator of Public Services and Assistant Superintendent in two Pittsburgh suburban school districts before being appointed Superintendent of the Northgate School District in 1982. Likewise, he has served as a consultant to more than 30 school districts on leadership and quality management. In 2000, Dr. Manley assumed the Superintendent position in Pine-Richland, the fastest growing school district in Western Pennsylvania. Dr. Manley is active with the Western Pennsylvania Forum for School Superintendents of the University of Pittsburgh and founded the Northern Alliance Against Highly Addictive Drugs. He serves on the Pennsylvania Association of School Administrator's Board of Governors. Dr. Manley was awarded the Distinguished Educator award by the Tri-State School Study Council of the University of Pittsburgh. The Pennsylvania Association of School Administrators named Dr. Manley the 2009 Pennsylvania Superintendent of the Year.

Mr. Richard E. Maxwell has a long career as a school administrator in the Ohio school districts of Cloverleaf, West Holmes, and Holmes County. He has served in a variety of capacities, including teacher, assistant principal, federal coordinator, and superintendent. In “retirement,” Mr. Maxwell continues to champion the cause of public education and make significant contributions to administrator preparation in Ohio, particularly in school finance. As a clinical professor at Ashland University, he has passed on the benefit of his experience by teaching courses in school finance, school law, and school facilities. Maxwell coauthored (with Scott Sweetland, Ohio State University) the definitive text used in many educational administration programs across the state: Ohio School Finance. Mr. Maxwell was called as an expert witness in DeRolph v. Ohio, in which the Ohio public school financing system was found in violation of the state constitution. This expertise led to consultations and guest speaking engagements at institutions and organizations across the state. His school finance workshops have been presented at over 300 schools and organizations over the past 25 years. Mr. Maxwell remains active as a Senior Fellow at the Buckeye Association of School Administrators and formerly served as Executive Director. He serves Ohio as an outspoken champion of public school finance reform, a clinical professor, and a provider of quality professional development for school administrators and school board members.

Dr. Timothy F. McNamee has been Superintendent of Schools in the Mohawk Area School District since 2002. Previously, Dr. McNamee served as the Assistant Superintendent of the Bedford Area School District for 5 years. Dr. McNamee served as Chief School Administrator for the Lawrence County Career and Technical Center, Director of Special Services in the Gateway School District, Supervisor of Adult Education, and Curriculum Specialist. Dr. McNamee has served as an adjunct faculty member in the Duquesne University School of Education for undergraduate and graduate courses. He has been a guest lecturer for Duquesne University, Slippery Rock University, and Shippensburg University. Dr. McNamee has mentored doctoral students in leadership programs at Duquesne and Shippensburg. Dr. McNamee is President of the Pennsylvania Association of School Administrators and serves as a member of the Governing Board of the American Association of School Administrators, the Board of Directors for the Pennsylvania Leadership Development Center, and the Board of Directors for BlendedSchools.net. Dr. McNamee currently serves on a committee selected and appointed by the Pennsylvania Secretary of Education to develop a model professional development plan for educational leaders as well as on the development team commissioned by the Pennsylvania Inspired Leadership program to create leadership standards for superintendents, central office administrators, and principals to improve the practices of school administrators.

Dr. Debra Serena Miller has served the Carbon Lehigh Intermediate Unit for 25 years and has contributed 10 years to the Parkland School District. Dr. Miller is an extraordinary administrator, providing exceptional leadership in the districts’ Curriculum Instruction, Assessment, and Professional Development Department. Dr Miller is a popular and in-demand speaker at workshops and conferences, sharing her expertise with humor and candor. She is a lifelong learner who recently completed her doctoral work at the University of Pennsylvania. Moreover, she is an agent for change and a consummate problem solver. In addition to national professional organizations, Dr. Miller is a member of the Kutztown University Principal Advisory Council, Lehigh Valley Business Education Partnership, Pennsylvania School Board Association, and Pennsylvania Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Dr. James A. Monaco is one of the longest serving superintendents in Texas. He also serves as an adjunct professor at Texas Woman’s University. He is a regular presenter on topics of management, leadership, motivation, and systems dynamics for educational and private corporations. His presentations on unity through diversity are regarded throughout education and industry as highly effective tools for promoting individual and institutional growth through self-understanding and mutual respect. He works closely with Texas Woman’s University by acting as a bridge between university professors and professional practitioners, not only bringing new, aspiring leaders into the leadership preparation program, but also providing entry for professors into the school districts. Dr. Monaco is valued as a bridge person by many in the various communities he serves.

Are You Moving?

Are you starting the year at a new institution?

Make sure you don’t miss the next issue of the UCEA Review or any of the other UCEA mailings.

Email ucea@austin.utexas.edu the following info:

Name: ___________________________

Previous School/Institution: ___________________________

New School/Institution: ___________________________

Address: ___________________________

City, ST: ___________________________ ZIP: __________

Email: ___________________________

Phone: __________________________ Fax: ___________________________
Dr. Robert T. Pinholster has been the principal of Fairview Middle School in Tallahassee, Florida, for the past 9 years. Pinholster was selected as Administrator of the Year in Leon County Schools in 2002 and received the Excellence in Science Education Award in 2004. Dr. Pinholster began his career as an educator in 1973 in Seminole County, Florida, as a teacher for the emotionally handicapped. He has served a variety of organizations as Middle School Guidance Counselor, District Coordinator for Student Services, Program Coordinator for Student Services, Assistant Principal for Student Activities and Attendance, and Assistant Principal for Curriculum. Dr. Pinholster was awarded the Florida Middle School Counselor of the Year Award, the Florida Master Teacher Award, and the Superintendent’s Expect the Best Award in 1988 and in 1992 from Highland County Schools. In 2008, he was selected for the First Principal Cohort of PROMISE, Florida State University’s program to train public school principals in the new math and science state education standards. In addition to presentations and published articles, Dr. Pinholster has taught college-level courses at Florida State University and University of North Florida.

Dr. Brian C. Ratliff is Superintendent of the Amherst County School Division in Virginia. Dr. Young is also an adjunct professor, teaching two administration courses through the University of Virginia off-grounds program. His evaluations always have been outstanding as have been his contributions to school divisions across Virginia. Bringing a wealth of knowledge and experience to his position, he has led his school division in a number of new initiatives and provided the inspiration and motivation that ultimately determine long-term success. Dr. Ratliff is a person of high moral character and integrity. His sense of humility allows him to empower others in all areas of decision making. In addition to his present positions, he has served as an administrator for Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment.

Dr. Robert (Bob) J. Rodosky earned his Ph.D. at Ohio State University in the area of Curriculum Foundation and Research. His career started in 1969. Bob has been an evaluator for the Columbus Ohio Public Schools and Assistant Director of the Evaluation Center at Western Michigan University. He is Executive Director of the Accountability, Research, and Planning Department for the Jefferson County Public Schools in Louisville, Kentucky. Under Dr. Rodosky’s leadership, the department’s vision is to provide reliable, valid, and useful information to decision makers in a timely manner. Over the years, he has held adjunct professor appointments at Western Michigan University and the University of Louisville.

Dr. Jeffrey S. Ronneberg has served as Assistant Superintendent of Spring Lake Park Schools; Superintendent-Elect since 2004; and Director of Teaching, Learning, and Accountability since 2003. From 1998–2003 he was a principal at Woodcrest Elementary. Dr. Ronneberg has served as an adjunct instructor at the University of Minnesota–Twin Cities since 2007 and as an adjunct professor at Capella University since 2003. Prior to working in Spring Lake Park, he was Dean of Students at Oak Grove Intermediate School, Bloomington Public Schools, and an administrative intern and sixth-grade teacher at Oak Point Intermediate School, Eden Prairie Schools. Dr. Ronneberg holds a doctoral degree in Educational Policy and Administration from the University of Minnesota–Twin Cities, a MS in Educational Leadership from Minnesota State University–Mankato, and a BA in Elementary Education from Augsburg College.

Dr. Wade Smith received his bachelor of education in chemistry and biology from Louisiana State University (LSU) in 1978. He taught for 11 years in Livingston Parish and, after finishing his MEd from Southeastern Louisiana University in 1985, became the principal of Denham Springs Junior High School 1986–1999. Wade received his PhD from LSU in 2000 and was appointed assistant professor of educational administration at Auburn University. Dr. Smith served in that position until 2002 until he was appointed Director of the LSU Laboratory School. Dr. Smith maintains an active research agenda focusing on self-efficacy, organizational structures, and organizational leadership. He has numerous refereed publications and presentations.

Mr. Gregory A. Springston is Assistant Superintendent for Secondary Education for Dodge City Public Schools, USD 443. Mr. Springston has served as a social studies teacher, football coach, high school principal, and Director of Secondary Education. Mr. Springston collaborated with colleagues to plan and build a leadership preparation academy at Kansas State University. The academy was an outgrowth of a special state department grant (Kansas Laboratory for Education Leaders/KLEL) aimed at developing leadership capacity and was funded by the Wallace Foundation.
LEADING FOR LEARNING:
Reflecting On Innovative Practices and Partnerships

UCEA Convention 2009
Anaheim Marriott, Anaheim, California
November 19-22, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Early (through Aug. 10)</th>
<th>Regular (through Oct. 26)</th>
<th>Late (through Nov. 21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UCEA University Faculty</td>
<td>$125</td>
<td>$145</td>
<td>$160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-UCEA Faculty</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$165</td>
<td>$185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicing Administrator*</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$165</td>
<td>$185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCEA Graduate Student</td>
<td>$45</td>
<td>$55</td>
<td>$65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-UCEA Graduate Student</td>
<td>$55</td>
<td>$65</td>
<td>$75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*One-Day Fee for Administrators: $80

REGISTER TODAY AT:
http://www.regonline.org/ucea2009

• EVENTS INCLUDE •
  • Keynote Speakers Barbara L. Jackson, James Koschoreck, Kevin Kumashiro, and W. James Popham
  • Annual Plenum Session, Wednesday, November 18, 1:00 - 6:00 p.m., and Thursday, November 19, 7:00 - 11:30 a.m.
    • UCEA Awards Luncheon, Thursday, November 19, 12:30 - 2:00 p.m.
  • Opening Convention Reception in honor of UCEA Past Presidents, Thursday, November 19, 7:15 - 9:15 p.m.
  • UCEA Annual Banquet with Keynote Speaker David Berliner, Friday, November 20, 6:30 - 10:00 p.m.

For More Information, Visit www.ucea.org
Dr. David Berliner, Regents’ Professor of Education at Arizona State University, will deliver the Brock Prize Lecture. Dr. Berliner is a member of the National Academy of Education, a Fellow of the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, and a past president of both the AERA and the Division of Educational Psychology of the American Psychological Association (APA). David Berliner is co-author (with B. J. Biddle) of the bestseller *The Manufactured Crisis*; co-author (with Ursula Casanova) of *Putting Research to Work*; co-author (with Sharon Nichols) of *Collateral Damage*; and co-author (with N. L. Gage) of the textbook *Educational Psychology*, now in its 6th edition.

Dr. James Koschoreck, UCEA President and Associate Professor at the University of Cincinnati, will deliver the Presidential Address, entitled, “Scholar Activism: The Politicization of a Profession or the Professionalization of Politics?” Dr. Koschoreck’s research focuses gay/lesbian issues in educational leadership. As a scholar and activist engaged in promoting issues of social justice, he challenges the taken-for-granted social normalizations in the public schools. He co-authored with Patrick Slattery *Meeting All Students’ Needs: Transforming the Unjust Normativity of Heterosexism*. Currently he is co-editing a book titled *Sexuality Matters: Paradigms and Policies for Educational Leaders*.

Dr. W. James Popham, Professor Emeritus, UCLA Graduate School of Education and Information Studies, will deliver the Pennsylvania State Miltiifer Lecture. Most of Dr. Popham’s teaching career took place at UCLA where, for nearly 30 years, he taught courses in instructional methods for prospective teachers as well as courses in evaluation and measurement for graduate students. Dr. Popham is a past president of AERA and the founding editor of Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, a quarterly journal published by AERA. His most recent books are *Unlearned Lessons; Instruction That Measures Up; Transformative Assessment; Mastering Assessment; Classroom Assessment: What Teachers Need to Know (5th Ed.); Assessment for Educational Leaders; America’s “Failing” Schools; Test Better, Teach Better; and The Truth About Testing*.

Dr. Kevin Kumashiro, Associate Professor and chair of Educational Policy Studies and the interim co-director of the Institute for Research on Race and Public Policy at the University of Illinois at Chicago, will deliver the Texas A&M Social Justice Lecture. A former K-12 teacher, he is the founding director of the Center for Anti-Oppressive Education and has served as a consultant for schools, universities, and state and federal agencies. Dr. Kumashiro has authored or edited several books, including *Troubling Education*, which received the 2003 Gustavus Myers Outstanding Book Award; *Restoried Selves: Autobiographies of Queer Asian/Pacific American Activists*; *Against Common Sense: Teaching and Learning Toward Social Justice*; and most recently, *The Seduction of Common Sense: How the Right Has Framed the Debate on America’s Schools*.

Dr. Barbara L. Jackson, Professor and Former Chair of the Division of Educational Leadership, Administration and Policy at the Graduate School of Education, Fordham University, the Jesuit University of New York City, will deliver the keynote address. She has served as dean of the School of Education at Morgan State University in Baltimore and associate dean of the School of Education at Atlanta University. In both of these historically Black institutions, she worked to establish new doctoral programs in educational administration. Dr. Jackson’s many publications include “Leadership Turnover and Business Mobilization: Changing Political Ecology of Urban School Systems” with J. Cibulka, “Black Women Role Models: Where Can We Find them?” and *Balancing Act: The Political Role of the Urban School Superintendent*. She has a chapter in *Sacred Dreams: Women and the Superintendency, “Getting Inside History—Against All Odds: African American Women School Superintendents.”* Her most recent article with C. Kelley is “Exceptional and Innovative Programs in Educational Leadership.”
ANAHEIM/ORANGE COUNTY: www.anaheimoc.org

Centrally located in Orange County, Anaheim is an excellent starting point for all your OC adventures. The city of Anaheim is home of the Honda Center, Angels Stadium, and The Anaheim Resort™ District. Encompassing Disneyland, Disney's California Adventure, Downtown Disney District, and the Anaheim Convention Center, The Anaheim Resort District offers an abundance of hotels, dining, shopping, and theme park fun, all linked by a modern visitor transportation system. Visit anaheimoc.org for more destination information.

ANAHEIM MARRIOTT: www.marriottanaheimhotel.com

Artful. Intimate. Unconventional. The Anaheim Marriott Hotel is located in the heart of the exciting Anaheim Resort district, sizziling with attractions and entertainment. Elegance begins with the soothing elliptical shapes of the hotel lobby, a perfect location for entertaining and networking. The hotel is walking distance to an outdoor promenade with restaurants, theaters, and shopping in a tropical setting. Within the neighborhood are Disneyland attractions, the Honda Center, Angels Stadium, and the Anaheim Garden Walk, Orange County’s newest hot spot for fashion, food, and fun.

The hotel recently completed a comprehensive room renovation that has taken the hotel to a whole new level. Each of the 1,030 guest rooms, suites, corridors, and concierge lung has gone through an artful transformation. Complementing the new lobby and meeting space, spacious guest rooms were enhanced with new carpet, fixtures, furniture, bedding, and a variety of unconventional touches throughout. The guest rooms are designed to meet the needs of the dedicated business traveler or provide the comforts of home during a family vacation. Each guest room features the ultra-luxurious Marriott bed and new Marriott Revive bedding; spacious, ergonomically designed workstations; and in-room entertainment. Most rooms have balconies. Outside their rooms, guest can take advantage of one of the on-site restaurants, a heated outdoor pool, fitness center, and knowledgeable Concierge staff.

Dining options at the Anaheim Marriott are varied. Starbucks Marketplace: Coffee, teas, specialty drinks, sandwiches and pastries. Café del Sol: An inspired mix of California cuisine, contemporary American with added touches of favorite comfort foods aimed to make your dining experience delightful (open for breakfast, lunch, and dinner). JW’s Steakhouse: Beautifully simple with touches of modern elegance along with a polished professional staff who know the menu and wine. The menu is arté with choices of filet, dry-aged New York, Kobe-style American Wagyu beef rubbed in spices and peppers, a beef eater’s dream. The menu is sure to please a variety of pallets (open for lunch and dinner). Degrees Wine and Patio Bar: A perfect spot to unwind after a long day of meetings and experience California’s finest wines, libations, food, and snacks either outside under the California sun or indoors in a relaxing atmosphere.

ANAHEIM GARDENWALK: www.anaheimgardenwalk.com

The nearby Anaheim GardenWalk is an oasis of outdoor shopping, dining and entertainment. Discover an abundance of retail stores, restaurants, an upscale bowling lunge, and state-of-the-art movie theaters in a truly unique environment of scenic waterfalls and luxuriously manicured gardens. Restaurant favorites Bubba Gump Shrimp Co., California Pizza Kitchen, Cheesecake Factory, Roy’s, McCormick & Schmick’s Grille, and P.F. Chang’s line the front of The Shops at Anaheim GardenWalk. Shops now open include Ann Taylor Loft, Chico’s, Whitehouse/Blackmarket, Fresh Produce, G stage, Harley-Davidson of Anaheim, Hollister, Lux Aveda Salon/Spa, Runway 5, Tommy Bahama, O’Neill, and The Body Shop. Great entertainment can also be found at CinemaFusion (IMAX), a 14-plex theatre and 300 Anaheim, an upscale bowling lounge, as well Bar Louie and Heat Ultra Lounge. The Fire & Ice restaurant will make its debut in Summer 2009.

For additional information about Anaheim, please visit the websites above or www.ucea.org/hoteltravel
UCEA WOULD LIKE TO EXPRESS ITS SINCERE APPRECIATION TO THE FOLLOWING SPONSORS OF THE 2009 CONVENTION:

Information Age Publishing
Iowa State University
Pennsylvania State University
Texas A&M University
Claremont Graduate University
San Diego State University
University of San Diego
University of Texas - San Antonio
University of North Carolina - Greensboro
California State University System
Duquesne University

THANK YOU!

SPECIAL INTEREST GROUP MEETINGS AT UCEA

If you provide leadership for a special interest group that has met or would like to meet at UCEA’s Convention 2009, please contact Christopher Ruggeri at cruggeri@austin.utexas.edu before August 1st.

UCEA will be providing a limited number of slots to SIGs on a first-come basis.
Contributing to the UCEA Review

If you have ideas concerning substantive feature articles, interviews, point-counterpoints, or innovative programs, UCEA Review section editors would be happy to hear from you.

General Editor:
Michelle D. Young (UCEA)
michelleyoung@austin.utexas.edu

Feature Editors:
Samanta Bartholomew (IUPUI)
ssbartho@iupui.edu
Andrea Rorrer (University of Utah)
andrea.rorrer@ed.utah.edu

Interview Editors:
Gerardo Lopez (Indiana University)
lopezg@indiana.edu
Laura McNeal (Georgia State University)
lmcneal@gsu.edu

Point-Counterpoint Editor:
Jeffrey S. Brooks (Auburn University)
jeffreysbrooks@auburn.edu

Innovative Program Editor:
Liz Hollingworth (University of Iowa)
liz-Hollingworth@uiowa.edu

Managing Editor:
Jennifer Ellen Cook (University of Texas)
jennifercook@mail.utexas.edu

2009–2010 Calendar

July 2009
Urban Leadership Curriculum Development Project meeting
July 22–24
UCEA Executive Committee & Leadership meeting, July 26–29

August 2009
NCPEA national conference, San Antonio, TX, Aug. 5–7

September 2009
UCEA Convention Program available online

November 2009
UCEA Convention, Anaheim, California, Nov. 19–22
2010 David L. Clark Nominations due, UCEA HQ

December 2009
National Policy Board in Educational Administration Meeting

February 2010
UCEA Convention 2010 Planning Meeting
UCEA Executive Committee meeting

April–May 2010
AERA annual meeting, Denver, CO, April 30–May 4
Jackson Scholars Workshop, Denver, CO
David L. Clark Seminar, Denver, CO