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Thank you for being here today. Our 2013 conference theme is “Seeking New Understandings of Persistent Challenges: A Call to Action to (Re)Unite Research, Policy, and Practice With Community.” Please join me in thanking our conference planning team, which includes President Mark Gooden, Samantha Scribner, Terah Venzant Chambers, and Muhammed Khalifi for their creativity, hard work, and vision.

As stated in the UCEA 2013 Call for Proposals, the conference theme acknowledges that “many of the challenges facing educational leadership are long-standing and have important historical contexts that must be considered.” Further, the call reminds us that there are “many definitions and perceptions of what counts as community.” Yet, “common to all of these notions of community is a sense of coming together for a purpose, such as seeking new understandings of persistent challenges.” I hope to build upon these points today and offer the challenge for us to continue thinking about how we can become more inclusive while adhering to our organizational vision, and to identify new ways that we could and perhaps should operate individually and collectively as part of the UCEA consortium. I hope that my remarks will spark questions for consideration over these next few days and that these conversations continue when we are at our own institutions. Further, I hope these insights cause us to ACT such that we better meet the needs of UCEA and our communities, and particularly the PK-12 students served by the school leaders we prepare.

As I look around this room today I am hopeful. Each of you brings a wealth of fresh ideas, experience, and expertise. Imagine what we could do collectively!

I would like each of you to think about the first time you attended a UCEA conference. Who encouraged you to attend? In what ways did you connect with others? How were you involved? I first attended UCEA as a new faculty member after being encouraged by my Auburn University mentor, Fran Kochar. Prior to becoming a faculty member, I had a career in K-12 as a teacher and administrator, yet I felt overwhelmed by the UCEA conference and somewhat intimidated by some of the researchers I met. Research on developing and sustaining partnerships and engaging in collaborative programming had been an important aspect in my first career, and
shared many special moments together, and during those times we spent nearly 6 weeks with my mom near the end of her life. We others that helps us to become who we are. I was fortunate enough to help you learn more about yourself and the interconnectedness with relationships. It is a way not only to keep that person in your heart but also to learn more about your family and our history and reflecting on it, I was (and am) able to better understand how I came to be the person I am today. I am most thankful to my Auburn and UCEA colleagues and friends for supporting me through that difficult time and for allowing me the gift of time with my mom as she embraced her final earth journey.

Thank you for indulging me and allowing me to share this story with you. I made the decision to share this personal insight today because I want to contextualize my passion for sharing UCEA's history with you. I feel a sense of urgency about reflecting on our organizational past while we can still thank those who led before us. We have an opportunity to be more intentional about learning from what worked in our past, as we consider our current and future contexts, and as we develop deeper understandings about strategies for leveraging our organizational effectiveness. Please make time to thank our past presidents, former executive committee members, and our current and former executive director for their service to UCEA while you are here at the conference.

We are who we are as an organization today because we are standing on the shoulders of giants.

Jack Culbertson, our second executive director, reminded us that histories have many sides, depending on who is relaying the narratives (Culbertson, 1995). I want to be very clear that the brief glimpse at our organizational history that I share with you today is missing many voices whose narratives would differ from the accounts that I offer. So, to broaden the base of the histories and herstories (Miller & Swift, 1976) that I share with you, I did three things to prepare. Past UCEA President Alan Shoho reminded us in his presidential talk that reading all of the past president's speeches is a mandatory first task for a UCEA president, so I did that. Second, I read through a number of other documents pertaining to UCEA's history, such as university archives, personal papers, and interviews, point/counterpoints, or innovative programs, UCEA Review editors would be happy to hear from you. The Editorial Team (see back page of the Review) meets twice a year. One to two features appear in each issue of the Review, which is published three times a year.

these are still important aspects of my work today. But, missing from that first UCEA conference I attended were conversations about the roles that school leaders could play related to partnerships with K-12 institutions, approaches for improving K-12 learning, or strategies for closing achievement gaps. I was not certain that UCEA would be my intellectual home until I had a series of conversations with several people, and in particular with UCEA's president that year, Malu' Gonzalez, who said to me, “You must keep coming to UCEA. We need more people who think like you do. Who knows, maybe you will be UCEA president one day.” So I kept coming to UCEA, and as you can see, the rest is history. I greatly appreciate both Fran and Malu' and their guidance related to staying involved with UCEA.

My point to this story is that we cannot underestimate the pow-
er of reaching out to graduate students, new colleagues, and others who can benefit from participation in UCEA. Participation in the UCEA Convention may serve as the open door that attracts people, but it is through the relationships that are built and the opportunities to become engaged that we keep people returning year after year. Our graduate student programs are encouraging active participation in UCEA now and ideally for years to come. There are many ways for students and faculty to become involved in UCEA, and there is a lot of work to do. There are spaces and places for everyone to be involved.

As some of you know, my mom passed away in September at the age of 88. She was an amazing woman, ahead of her time in so many ways. For those of you who have lost a loved one or close friend, you likely know the importance of holding onto your memories. It is a way not only to keep that person in your heart but also to help you learn more about yourself and the interconnectedness with others that helps us to become who we are. I was fortunate enough to spend nearly 6 weeks with my mom near the end of her life. We shared many special moments together, and during those times we
as Jack Culbertson's (1995) book, *Building Bridges*, which describes UCEA's first two decades; published articles and book chapters authored by former UCEA leaders; back copies of the *UCEA Review*; and original documents and correspondence. Third, I invited past presidents, one former and one current executive director, and a few other UCEA thought leaders to respond to 12 questions by survey or interview. Twenty-five individuals, nearly all of those who were invited, took me up on this opportunity to reflect about their time as a leader in UCEA. Although not all of them could attend this year's conference, I’d like to thank all of those individuals for their time, insights, and stories about UCEA's history, current challenges, and future opportunities. Please stand and be recognized.

The rest of my talk is organized into three segments.  
1. I begin with a brief review of UCEA's past and highlight just a few of the unique features and accomplishments of our organization. Unless otherwise noted, I relied heavily on Jack Culbertson's recollection of our organizational history and articles in past issues of the *UCEA Review* throughout this section of my talk.  
2. Part 2 of my talk is intended to develop a deeper understanding of four of the persistent tensions we have faced organizationally and the causes, coalitions, and communities we have valued or developed over time that are at the intersections of those tensions. It is my hope that consideration of these may help make some of our organization's persistent issues and challenges transparent—allowing us to learn from them and hopefully move beyond them.  
3. Part 3 includes thoughts about potential future directions and strategies that draw upon opportunities in our current social, economic, political, and environmental contexts and new ways of thinking about how we can and do function. In this section I also offer reflections on our relevance, relationships, and reach as an organization in today's complex, multinational context.

By developing deeper insights about our organizational past and the contexts within which events happened, we may be better equipped to avoid pitfalls and capitalize on opportunities as they arise. As George Santayana, a Spanish philosopher, said, “Those who do not remember the past are condemned to repeat it.”

**Part 1. A Brief Glimpse Into our Organization’s Past**

Nearly 60 years ago UCEA was founded by 15 universities, the Kellogg Foundation, and eight regional centers called Cooperative Programs for Educational Administration. Representatives from each of these groups recognized the potential power of, and need for, interinstitutional cooperation to build a knowledge base of research and effective practice that could improve the field of educational administration. Over the years, UCEA has evolved as an organization, continuing to tackle important social and educational causes related to leadership preparation, creating coalitions with other organizations in order to better leverage change and redefining itself as a community of researchers and practice that continues to be focused on quality leadership preparation and development. But our history also includes tensions and challenges.

We have faced questions about who was worthy of membership or what types of research or programs should be undertaken and where UCEA Headquarters should be located. UCEA's first site was at Teachers College, Columbia University, before we were officially an organization. From there, the headquarters moved to Ohio State University, where it remained for over 20 years. Other host sites have included Arizona State University, Penn State, University of Missouri–Columbia, the University of Texas at Austin, and the University of Virginia.

In 1954, Daniel Davies, head of the Teachers College Cooperative Educational Program for Administration, led an interim committee charged with the creation of a new cooperative organization to be focused on improving the preparation of educational administrators. Davies was appointed executive officer for this committee, which included prominent educational leaders such as Walter Anderson, Truman Pierce, and Virgil Rogers, who went on to become UCEA's first three presidents. Daniel R. Davies is considered to be our first UCEA executive director. He served 1954–1959.

At a meeting February 17, 1957, it was determined that the name of the organization should be University Council for Educational Administration, and 4 days later representatives from 32 universities officially approved the name. The membership criteria for the group were based on “whether the institution had the resources (funds, facilities and staff) to carry on significant research in educational administration, and whether the institution had demonstrated an interest in such research” (Culbertson, 1995, p. 48, citing Interim Committee Minutes from February 17, 1957). It was at this time that UCEA replaced the Interim Committee with an elected Board of Trustees. Daniel Griffiths worked part time as the Director of Research for UCEA from 1957–1959, while he was on staff as a professor at Teachers College–Columbia. According to Culbertson (1995), Griffiths viewed “UCEA as a means for making research more scientific and training programs more rigorous” and he had “great optimism about UCEA's potential” (p. 5). In May 1959, the Board of Trustees completed the first phase of UCEA's development by accepting a grant from the Kellogg Foundation, developing a set of by-laws, and selecting Ohio State University as the new home for UCEA. Jack Culbertson was selected as the new executive director.

There have been seven executive directors to date, including two who served as interim directors. Current Executive Director Michelle Young has been serving in this role since September 2000. Each was an assistant professor when hired by UCEA.

Each of these individuals brought many talents and ideas with them, and through their leadership, in collaboration with the Executive Committee members and plenum representatives, determined the course of UCEA's work. Because of their efforts and dedication to UCEA, our organizational agenda has been responsive to contextual changes reflecting societal, political, environmental, and economic flux. Therefore, as we consider our past and the contributions made, it is important to situate our stories and work within the times they occurred.

Many of UCEA's earliest leaders were well-established and connected professors and deans at prestigious universities. They were active leaders in the American Association of School Administrators, the National Council for Professors of Educational Administration, one of the eight Kellogg Foundation funded Cooperative Programs for Educational Administration centers, or they yielded influence on national and state educational policies through commissions such as the National Educational Policies Commission. In the 1940s–1960s, UCEA's early years, educational leaders were revered by the general public and policymakers, and their opinions and expertise were actively sought.
We have 52 UCEA past presidents and now have our 53rd president, Mark Gooden. The first seven presidents each served a 2-year term. This helped to provide stability and consistency as UCEA was developing. UCEA’s presidents have come from 32 universities, including two international institutions, the Ontario Institute for the Study of Education and the University of Alberta. Peter J. Cistone was our 16th UCEA president and first international president. He served 1976–1977. Eugene Ratsoy, who hailed from the University of Alberta, was our 20th president and served 1980–1981.

We’ve had a lot of firsts in UCEA. Our first female president was Martha McCarthy. Martha served as president 1985–1986. During her time on the Executive Committee, Martha identified the need for UCEA to host an annual convention as an avenue for increasing our diversity and as an opportunity for active engagement in the organization. Additionally, it was as an avenue for increasing UCEA’s visibility. The first UCEA conference was held in 1986.

Pedro Reyes was the first man of color who ran for and was elected president. He served his term as president 1992–1993. In 2000–2001, our first Latina president was in office, Maria Louisa Gonzalez. Her presidential speech was the first one to be delivered to the full conference. Prior to that time, presidential talks were delivered at the Plenum. In 2005–2006, Michael Dantley served as our first African American president. Then, in 2008–2009, James W. Koschoreck served as our first openly gay president. Each of these leaders helped to break down barriers and encouraged new conversations and research about gender, race, ethnicity, and sexual identity, but I want to emphasize that all of our past presidents made important contributions to UCEA. Ten years ago we had our first cohort of Jackson Scholars, and last year we had our first Graduate Student Summit—just look at how that is changing the face of UCEA!

Over time, our membership has grown from the original 33 member institutions in 1958 to 95 member institutions today. Our membership criteria have evolved to become more inclusive and have maintained high standards for preparation program quality. Our membership review process is complex and comprehensive. When conducting a membership review, we look for evidence of what we know reflects quality leadership programming based on significant research conducted by UCEA members and others. Our membership criteria now reflect UCEA’s respect for both knowledge production and knowledge utilization and our intent to promote issues of social justice. But these changes to our membership standards did not come without controversy and tensions.

UCEA has a proud history, and over the years there have been many accomplishments. I believe that our accomplishments are related to the causes we have addressed, the alliances and coalitions we have formed or in which we have participated, and our community—and how we have defined and redefined it over the years. I used the following simple but operational definitions for these terms as I discuss them throughout my talk:

- **Causes** are ethical ideals (principles or values) or beliefs in something whereby people are willing to donate or share one’s time, money, or energy towards resolving the underlying issues.
- A **coalition** is a pact or treaty among individuals or groups, during which they cooperate in joint action, each in their own self-interest, joining forces together for a common cause.

- **Communities** are social units of any size that share common values. Intent, belief, resources, preferences, needs, risks, and a number of other conditions may be present and common in communities, affecting the identity of the participants and their degree of cohesiveness.

### Causes, Coalitions, and Communities

The tensions throughout UCEA’s history that I have noted each relate to what has or has not been addressed as a cause, who we have or have not collaborated or aligned with, or how we have viewed ourselves as an organization—including who has been invited to participate. Due to space and time limitations, I will limit examples to just one or two illustrative explanations for each of the following ongoing tensions.

One of the first tensions that UCEA faced had to do with competing notions of cooperation and competition. As we think about how we view our UCEA community today, we should remember that from our organization’s beginning, there was an emphasis on interinstitutional problem solving and cooperation. That was our cause in the beginning: working together to improve the preparation of school leaders. But, there were also tensions around competition and trust. “How could university leaders who had long competed with one another for money, status, power and students trust one another in cooperative endeavors?” (Culbertson, 1995, p. 48). Because of this sense of competition and prevailing distrust, the member universities made it clear that UCEA must remain independent of the university where it is located. We viewed our community both as individual institutions that met our rigorous membership criteria and as an emerging collective. There were a relatively small number of member institutions, and the meetings included only those participants who were involved in the governance of UCEA.

As mentioned earlier, there were many coalitions in the early years of UCEA. In his book, Building Bridges, Jack Culbertson (1995) spoke of the informal relationships and influence that the leaders who created UCEA had with various foundations and the ease they had in securing funding for UCEA. Those relationships continued for many years. During my interview with him, Patrick Forsyth spoke of his involvement in the creation of a Blue Ribbon Commission to study Educational Administration in 1985 when he was UCEA’s executive director. Patrick told me the following about how he and Dan Griffiths secured the initial funding for the effort:

I was sort of introduced to foundation funding by Dan Griffiths. He was nearly 80 when he became the interim executive director. He had been dean at NYU when I was a student. He was 6’6” and gruff, but by all accounts, he was a real intellect. ... I was in my 30s, but he treated me as his equal because he was my mentor. He introduced me to all the foundation folks. He was a real player in education at the time.

Patrick continued, describing the process of creating the commission in this way:

Education was under attack. There was talk about the Rising Tide of Mediocrity [in secondary schools] and the idea that educational administration would be next. So we decided to establish a Blue Ribbon Commission to study Ed Admin in anticipation of critique. After that [EC meeting at AERA in Chicago], Dan and I ran over to McArthur Foundation and they gave us $10,000 and that got us started. Lat-
er we went to Ford and other foundations. Dan had these contacts and knew these folks. I don’t think we wrote a single proposal. It was all word of mouth and a handshake.

The Blue Ribbon Commission was clearly a powerful and high visibility coalition for UCEA, with Griffiths serving as the chair of the commission. There were 26 members including “outspoken critics of the status quo, such as then-Governor Bill Clinton, Roland Barth, Judith Lanier, Thomas Payzant, and Al Shanker” (Forsyth, 1999, p. 73). UCEA staff members were also included in the commission’s work. In Forsyth’s (1999) book chapter, “The Work of UCEA,” he stated that funding to support the commission’s work was raised from numerous foundations by Forsyth and Griffiths, including Danforth, McArthur, Johnson, and Ford as well as the Association of Colleges and Schools of Education in State Universities and Land Grant Colleges. Additionally, seven universities hosted regional hearings. Some of the questions posed to the Commission included these:

- How should we conceptualize the role of principals and superintendents as they address challenges?
- How could schools be organized for improved effectiveness?
- What components are critical to high-quality preparation programs?
- What support and development do practicing administrators need to remain competent?
- What role should professors play in this work, and how should they stay up to date on issues of practice?

The members of the commission debated back and forth about what to include in their report and how to word their eight recommendations. Forsyth (1999) described the tensions that were present, saying, “By the sixth draft, two prominent members of the Commission had decided not to sign the final report. Judith Lanier (then president of Holmes group) and Al Shanker both found the report too tepid for their tastes” (p. 75). But by the time the commission completed its work, over 1,300 people participated in some way and more than 30 papers were prepared for the commission.

Recommendations were made in the commission report including redefining educational leadership; modeling preparation programs after other professional schools; reducing the number of programs; increasing the numbers of ethnic minorities who were recruited, prepared, and placed; establishing partnerships with public schools; increasing professional development; and reforming licensure and certification (Forsyth, 1999). Don’t these recommendations sound familiar? Although the work was monumental in terms of the outcomes and relationships that were built, the recommendations were viewed by some as “a plot to monopolize educational administration by prestigious research universities” (Jacobson, 1990, p. 37). This has been another ongoing tension.

During her interview with me, Martha McCarthy described the Blue Ribbon Commission in this way:

The National Commission brought all the organizations back to work together again. When UCEA started in the 1950s, they worked together, but then went off on their own directions. The commission brought the associations together. No one would listen if there was a splintered voice. The commission had big players on it, including Al Shanker, Bill Clinton when he was governor of Arkansas, and others. The tradeoff was that you had to appease people so you couldn’t go quite as far.

One of the major outcomes from the commission report came from the recommendation to establish a national board to shape policy related to school administration. Shortly after the report was released, the National Policy Board was established. The board still meets today and continues to bring together national organizations that have an interest in school leadership. Although there were competing views and tensions, the Blue Ribbon Commission is clearly an example of how institutions and other associations can reap the benefits of cooperation and collaboration as all work together for a common cause. Patrick, thank you for your role in helping to create this important coalition and for your leadership in the Board. Michelle, thank you for your leadership and active involvement in the National Policy Board today.

A second tension is focused on our organizational relevance and competing views about what makes us relevant as an organization. We have had ongoing debates throughout our organizational history about whether our preference was for knowledge production or knowledge utilization. Coupled with this has been a struggle over the years as to whether or not it is better to prepare specialists or generalists. The theory–practice divide and even the revolt against the Theory Movement, which escalated after the infamous Griffiths–Greenfield “debates,” were representative of the underlying tensions about whose knowledge counts and who should control the knowledge base. As the public and policymaker criticisms of school leaders grew in the 1980s and 1990s, UCEA took on the cause of identifying the knowledge base for educational leaders. This was a major UCEA project, but it was controversial then and perhaps still is today. One past president described the project this way:

Seven domains were identified, and key scholars in each area served as domain leaders and assembled teams of faculty members with whom to work. Those involved in the project were not necessarily educational administration faculty or from UCEA institutions. Wayne Hoy served as chair of the Steering Committee. The product of this effort formed the basis for the ISLLC Standards.

But not all UCEA leaders felt that this informal coalition of researchers was an appropriate approach for addressing concerns about the field, and there were ideological factions within our UCEA community. One person described the situation this way:

The Knowledge Base project had just happened. The effort was a good idea, to develop a repository and identify the seminal pieces, but there were other pieces emerging and there was lots of pushback around Who gets to decide What and Who is included. It was all very traditional, and there was a distinct feeling of a lack of respect for those who pushed back.

A different past president described the project this way:

The idea was to have teams of experts on leadership, change, finance, and so on and to chart the knowledge domain and then pull together some examples of writings that were significant and communicated that part of the knowledge base. There was a big contract with a publishing house. By control of the knowledge base I think they were trying to define the field. ... There was a tension around that: Who knows best? We questioned the definition of knowledge: is it fixed or growing? Is it one direction or does it flow in many ways? The tension was very obvious in conferences and at the plenum. He who has knowledge has power.
Simultaneously, as UCEA’s leaders addressed our internal debates about relevance and what and whose knowledge counts, our organization was facing a fight for survival. The 1980s were a challenging time for educational institutions both politically and economically. Patrick Forsyth described the situation this way:

UCEA was really in a crisis, partly because of the history of things—UCEA had lost all of its major grants and had just moved to Arizona. UCEA was consuming its reserve funds at an alarming rate and membership was down to 38 or 40, something like that. ... The health of the organization wasn’t that good. ... UCEA made a decision to concentrate on K-12 programs and the original mission of UCEA.

The project that was clearly intended to provide legitimacy to the field and to UCEA while also addressing our financial situation had mixed results. Those who were involved with the project felt that it was relevant and important scholarship. Others who were not included on the research teams or the people who viewed knowledge as growing and multidirectional, rather than as a fixed commodity, did not find the project to be relevant.

A third persistent tension has to do with the notion of insiders and outsiders. UCEA was initially both criticized and heralded for being an organization comprised of the elite university preparation programs. But, by exercising exclusivity in membership, the diversity of people and programs was minimized. When membership requirements were modified to increase the types of institutional memberships, some of the earlier member institutions questioned the quality and rigor of programs at the new member institutions. When asked to identify one of the major issues or challenges facing UCEA, a past president stated,

One of the major issues was which higher education institutions had the stature to join UCEA. Regardless of their mission or vital contributions to the field of educational leadership, if the institution did not meet rigorous UCEA standards, they were rejected. Of course this left out all of the state universities that were certifying the most administrators across the nation. Also, people would say that UCEA needed to continue to be elite, otherwise the organization would simply be common with no distinction.

One of UCEA's causes has been the production of rigorous research to improve the field of educational leadership. With this in mind, another past president described the tension around inclusivity this way:

Membership is a tough issue. There have been debates on whether or not to expand membership beyond Research 1 universities. Younger, less known researchers tended to come from larger state universities, and they tended to be more accepting of expanding membership beyond R1s. So there have been debates around what constitutes research. What counts as research?

Increasing diversity and engaging in social justice research and practice are two of UCEA's core values today. The Jackson Scholars program is only one example of UCEA's initiatives in these important areas. While diversity was a concern to some degree in earlier years in UCEA's history, it does not appear to have been a priority. As one former UCEA leader said,

From my earliest days, UCEA was a White man's elite university club. There were a few women and perhaps several people of color. Having said this, there were many people of good will who were always trying to push the boundaries and membership of UCEA further.

Another past UCEA leader described the situation like this:

UCEA's diversity depended on its member institutions sending diverse representatives to the plenum. The Ed Admin professoriate was not diverse in the 1960s and '70s—nor were many other professional occupations. I don't see this as UCEA fighting diversity; to the contrary. ... UCEA was probably early to welcome female associate directors when they were available. UCEA established programs to encourage its member institutions to remove barriers to advanced study by women in school administration.

But, as we look around the room today, we can see that there have been many changes, and today's UCEA is far more diverse and inclusive. Describing our UCEA community today, Michelle Young said,

The membership has morphed so much over the years. Even the face of the president has changed—female, male, color, institutional type. There has been lots of change in the Plenum and who attends the convention as well.

A fourth and somewhat similar tension exists over questions about whose diversity counts and when. As illustrated earlier, our UCEA community has undergone many changes throughout our organization's history, and advocates for increased diversity have defined the cause in various ways. Culbertson (1995) described the period from 1974–1981 as having strong “crosswinds” as “UCEA moved toward greater equity for minorities, women, and the physically disabled” (p. 146). In 1959, there were no more than six women professors in UCEA's 34 member institutions. Throughout the years UCEA became more diverse and members advocated for greater equity for women, “minorities,” and in more recent years, for our LGBTQ communities. Yet as early as the 1970s, UCEA had a grant to conduct research on ways to improve women's equity and to develop curriculum supporting gender and minority equity. Martha McCarthy was a participant in that project. But, we also have had a history of othering (Kushamiro, 2000; Young, 2005) those who were not considered part of the mainstream.

One clear illustration of othering was offered when a former UCEA leader described her initial time as a plenum session representative:

The key decision makers were primarily White men. They came from privileged backgrounds and that contributed to the tensions. They were paternalistic, but it was more than that. They would come from places that were considered to be the field’s intellectual engines and they would always ask, “Where did you study and who was your advisor?” They wanted to get a sense of your lineage. It was fascinating. ...

UCEA was a small number of research institutions in the late '80s. We sat in a horseshoe pattern with name cards. Everyone could see each other and address each other by name. There were mostly Caucasian men, one Black man, a few Caucasian women. I felt like, Oh my! All of the fellas wore suits with white shirts and skinny ties—they all looked alike. They all wore the uniform.

A member of the Executive Committee during the 1990s described the diversity of participants within the UCEA community as scarcity within community. Very few African Americans and Latinos were included in the plenum leadership. Ethnic diversity was not completely missing but lacked any form of prominence or importance. People who represented intersections of race and gender in the membership were visible but marginal in the leadership. Barbara Jackson cre-
ated a quiet, strong presence, but the most visible leaders were White males and a few White women who had long been accepted as part of the rank and file. LGBT identity can best be described as silent. People with disabilities were infrequent, and today they remain marginalized. They may perhaps be described as invisible.

But another past president who began attending UCEA in the late 1990s described his experience in this way:

I think that we were really struggling as an organization to figure out our identity. We had opened up the door to talk about a lot of issues related to diversity, yet the folks there were not there in great numbers. We were seeing more of a balance along gender lines, but it was a real struggle to say that we are an organization that invites inclusivity. When you looked around, it was still a pretty White, straight group of people. I think the organization has done a lot to help with this, but it takes time.

Ideas about what is considered mainstream have shifted and perhaps we are now silencing some of our members who have been part of the UCEA community for many years. One of the past presidents I interviewed asked, “What counts as diversity—do we include research methodology?” Another past president offered these remarks: “In efforts to move forward, don’t neglect or disregard the history or contributions of the past. ... At some point we all become the old guard and no good work should be disrespected or disregarded, but rather, respected and built upon.”

Yet another aspect of our tensions around diversity relates to our level of international involvement. UCEA has a long but inconsistent history of engaging in international programming. During Jack Culbertson’s early years as executive director, an innovative coalition was formed, the International Inter-Visitation Program (IIP). UCEA offered its first IIP in 1966, and these occurred every 4 years between 1966 and 1978. The second IIP served as the impetus for the creation of the Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration. The IIPs produced new international understandings about preparing school leaders and their contexts. The IIPs also fostered the creation of new organizations, journals, conferences, and opportunities for research and networking. When UCEA faced difficult financial times, the executive director and the Executive Committee had to make the decision to stop funding the IIP and narrow the focus and projects supported by UCEA so that our organization could survive (Forstyth, 1999).

We have continued to have some international memberships over the years, but much of our work in UCEA has been U.S.-centric. In January 2008, UCEA created the position of Associate Director for International Affairs and appointed Bruce Barnett. Bruce did a great job, initiated a multinational research program, and re-established formal international relationships. We had our first International Summit as part of the UCEA conference held in Denver last year, and another was held in Indianapolis. Stephen Jacobson is our new Associate Director for International Affairs. He, too, will be continuing to increase multinational relationships and learning opportunities. I’m excited about the possibilities!

As you can see, the tensions around whose voices count and when has been ongoing throughout our organizational history, suggesting to me that we need to be even more proactive and ensure that no one is being silenced. As one of our past presidents said, “You can’t have a good box of Crayolas if the only crayon you have is white.”

### Part 2: Relevance, Relationships, and Reach: Thoughts About Future Directions and Strategies

Throughout all of our organizational history we have consistently addressed issues related to Our Relevance, Our Relationships, and Our Reach. I’d like to focus on each of these important concepts for just a few moments.

**Relevance.** Embedded within all of the examples I have offered today are considerations about UCEA’s relevance. As we contemplate our relevance, let's consider the language in our UCEA Vision (UCEA, 2013):

> UCEA Vision: UCEA is a community of scholars committed to the improvement of leadership and policy that supports the learning and development of ALL children. UCEA actively initiates and leads educational reform efforts through its high quality research and preparation programs. UCEA institutions work collaboratively with schools and educational agencies to positively influence local, state, and national educational policy. UCEA constantly questions and reevaluates its practice and beliefs to ensure its effectiveness and relevance. (para. 1)

Most of us have read these words before, but today I want each of us to think more deeply about what these words mean to us individually and collectively. How do we operationalize this vision and these values? How do we take these words and put them into practice in our own institutions and programs? How can we do better? The answers to these questions are part of what can help us to be more accountable to each other and to those we serve.

Our perceived relevance as an organization has ebbed and flowed over the years, depending on what causes we were addressing, how we defined our community, and who we embraced as allies or collaborators. When we reached across the boundaries of our membership and included multiple voices from within UCEA and beyond, we have achieved great results. Today we have ongoing collaborations with the Wallace Foundation, active engagement with ELCC revisions and a committee refreshing the ISLLC standards, and Michelle Young’s endless efforts as a leader of the National Policy Board for Educational Administration. In all of these coalitions, multiple perspectives are an expected part of the dialogues. Deeper insights and levels of respect are developed as new working relationships are nurtured while participants deliberate issues and collaborate around a common cause—improving the quality of leadership preparation and practice.

Concerns about our relevance are not new. The first Presidential Address that was delivered to UCEA’s plenum was Samuel Goldman’s speech in 1972. Goldman’s speech was titled, To Move a Profession, and in it he analyzed the role that UCEA should play in defining and moving the professional preparation of school leaders. His prophetic words were:

> The ranks of our critics swell each day and the veritable word bath of negative comment has the effect of drowning out the sound of any worthwhile achievements to which school people may legitimately lay claim. Instead, we have allowed ourselves to be overwhelmed by our critics so much so, that even our own confidence in our capabilities to meet our challenges seems to be deteriorating... Those of us who call education a profession must ultimately guide it and move it with determination towards solving the crises that confront and affront us. I firmly believe that if education cannot be helped by the many who call it a profession,
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Today, we have a clear call to action if we wish to remain relevant! Political conditions are far worse now than they were in 1972. Our public education and university-based leadership preparation programs are under attack and those attacks keep coming.

I asked the 25 UCEA leaders who participated in an interview or survey with me what they consider to be today’s challenges and issues and for advice they have for UCEA as we move forward. A number of them posed questions for us to consider:

- “How do we create educational organizations that can prepare students to lead in a flat and radically changing world?”
- “How can we make university-based leadership preparation programs credible to legislators and policymakers?”
- “It is more difficult for professors to engage in rigorous research today because there are so many fewer full time students. Can UCEA play a role in helping professors to continue being productive even under these circumstances?”
- “How can we counter the hyper-rationality taking over in assessment/evaluation of administrators’ work?”
- “How do we in the academy contribute to economic development? We are being challenged as to our means/ends. Are we readying administrators for schools that prepare young people for global change and economic competition?”

Nearly one third of those responding addressed the issue of the rapidly changing context for leadership preparation that is increasingly utilizing market-driven approaches. One of the comments illustrating this point was this:

There is an anti-public-education policy context in which we now live. The often erroneous portrayal of public education failure, the assumption that market competition will raise educational outcomes, and the onerous education accountability requirements put on public education are sapping valuable time and energy to accurately portray what is happening in education. In this information age, even the most accurate information is lost in the volume of rhetoric, marketing, and propaganda produced by well-funded anti-public-education advocates. In the meantime, alternative education approaches and providers are held to very few, if any, accountability requirements.

Other comments reinforced this emergent theme:

- “There is little-to-no discussion in the broader public discourse about preparing students for a politically astute, democratic citizenry. The narrative is narrowly focused and masked to cover its intent of commercializing education.”
- “A good number of us are going to have to spend more time in schools so that our work is relevant. These proprietary organizations are eating up our lunch!”
- “Neoliberal advocates are pushing to de-professionalize leadership preparation. The real fight is at the masters level. I’d like to see more cooperative ventures with NCPEA [National Council for Professors of Educational Administration] on issues where both organizations face such as the neoliberal threat to the de-professionalization of our field.”
- “Keep your eyes on access and equity of ALL students and professionals in our public schools. Public education is under threat from many quarters so we need to aggressively make the case for high quality public education and the importance of skilled leadership in schools.”

Advice

Our past UCEA leaders also offered other sage advice. I wish there were time to share all of it with you here, but I offer a few common themes that emerged from their responses.

**WE need to be inclusive.**

- “We need to bring everyone under a big tent—to a place where everyone feels valued and included.”
- “Create coalitions with foundations and professional organizations to advocate and enhance policy and practice.”
- “It is really important that we continue to stand for high quality programs. At the same time, we want to be open and provide a voice for a wide range of people and groups.”
- “Get involved. This is an organization that appreciates your efforts. When you commit you have an opportunity to make a difference and maybe even leave a legacy.”
- “Find ways to inform deans and provosts of UCEA initiatives and benefits to gain their support. Engage them in the work of improving educational leadership.”
- “Focus on what is best for the organization and pursue it with zest!”
- “Remember that although we are doing very, very serious work, we can still laugh!”
- “Listen to ideas and rebuff the ideas, but not the people. We need to row together—there are already too many external challenges.”
- “Dream big, plan strategically, and have faith in people. Nurture the future by nurturing new people.”

**Pursue specific strategies or approaches.** One example illustrating this theme focused on specificity is the following:

Create longitudinal or large-scale studies and have UCEA be a place where these studies on leadership can be coordinated. Continuing to do our research in a piece meal manner will not garner the organization or its members any respect or accolades like NSF or NIH receive.

Perhaps one area for this type of comprehensive and collaborative research might involve looking at school leader evaluation policies both longitudinally and state by state. Imagine the impact we could have if UCEA researchers from around the world were to release their findings on the same day through press releases, blogs, and other media outlets! Fen English reminds us that “if we don’t rock the boat, others will rock our boat.” He says that he would rather be in charge of rocking himself. I fully agree!

**Be accountable to ourselves, each other, and those we serve.**

- “Remember, what you do is important. Focus not on yourself, but on the impact of your actions and the example you are to others. We need to hold ourselves to a higher standard.”
- “Have persistence with a purpose. Remain engaged. Be engaged at the local, state, and national level. We are well poised to create collaborative relationships that leverage our influence in policy and practice.”
- “Rhetoric is nice, but change is better!”

Today UCEA is not only relevant, but we are needed—perhaps more than ever. Educational leadership is a key focus of educational reform and current policies. However, there are some well-funded “think tanks,” other nonprofits such as the American
Legislative Exchange Council, and alternative service providers who are having significant influence on business leaders and policymakers. We need to call these self-appointed “experts” on educational reform out because they are grounding their work in shoddy research and market-driven agendas rather than doing what is right for ALL children in our schools.

We have significant research about quality leadership preparation. We have developed many tools and resources that are so good, in fact, that other organizations have “borrowed” our resources and used them in their reports to justify the rigor of their work. We need to hold them accountable.

In my office we have a saying: Don’t just think outside the box, think as if there is no box. With this spirit in mind, Adrianna Kezar’s (2009) edited book, Rethinking Leadership in Complex, Multicultural and Global Environments: New Concepts and Models for Higher Education, may offer us important insights about how to proceed. She challenges us to pay attention to changing complexities, seek out multicultural perspectives, and nurture our communities. Further, she advocates that we need to pay attention to trends and adapt in ways that maintain high quality but that are responsive to new contexts and demands while remaining vigilant about who our audience needs to be. Incremental changes may work and feel comfortable, but there is a danger in not adapting to the growing complexity and interdependence in our worlds of work and life. Lack of changes or even incremental changes dull our senses and make us less likely to anticipate the dangers ahead. We all know the story of the frog in the pot of water—need I say more?

Kezar and Carducci (2009) challenge us to embrace what they call revolutionary leadership concepts, ideas, and practices that embrace a shift in organizational structures, core beliefs, processes, and focus of responsibility. They remind us that “historically, leadership has been used as a form of social control,” while encouraging our efforts to move beyond status quo by offering that we can “work to disrupt this cycle of oppression by helping organizations establish shared power environments that promote social justice and positive social change” (Kezar & Carducci, 2009, p. 7). If we look carefully at current educational policies, the policymakers, and the market-driven forces behind them, one can see that they are using their power as a form of social control. It is up to us, as educational experts, to disrupt this current policy environment.

Drawing on the lessons learned from UCEA's history, how might we change the ways that we engage with others within our organization and at our home institutions, as well as when engaging with those with whom we disagree? There have been points throughout our organizational history where our work promoted learning, empowerment, and change and created a context that embraced mutual power and influence. So what else might we do? And who do we need at our table to accomplish that work?

Relationships

Daniel Goleman’s (2013) book, Focus, reminds us that we have three ways of focusing as we make sense of the world. The first of these is inner focus. This is the ability to tune into our intuitions and guiding values in order to make better decisions. The second focus is on others. Our other focus “smooths our connections to the people in our lives” (Goleman, 2013, p. 4). The third focus, outer, helps us to negotiate the world. Goleman describes these three types of focus in this way: “A leader tuned out of his internal world will be rudderless; one blind to the world of others will be clueless; those indifferent to the larger systems within which they operate will be blindsided” (p. 4). Where we focus our attention (on ourselves, on others, or outward) determines what we will see.

So, in thinking about our relationships with others, how can we learn to see beyond what at first appear to be barriers to our ability to collaborate? How can we learn to be more intentional about who we align with and who is included in our coalitions? If we don’t include others with different points of view, then we are only preaching to the choir. So how can we identify organizations that have the capacity and will to engage in honest collaborations that have the potential to result in socially just, impactful work? As an organization, how can we be more adept at creating spaces and places for all UCEA members to be more involved and connected?

Reach

Michelle Young has been doing an amazing job increasing our organizational visibility, credibility, and reach these past 13 years, and Patrick Forsyth was very adept at getting UCEA to the table for large-scale commissions. But, we cannot expect an executive director to carry this load, nor can we expect our associate directors or even the Executive Committee to solely lead this work, especially when we consider the number of new and ongoing UCEA programs and initiatives that are underway. So, how do we broaden our reach and maximize our returns when engaging in important work? Paulus, McGuire, and Ernst (2012) remind us that “the most important challenges we face today are interdependent: they can only be solved by groups of people working collaboratively across boundaries” (p. 467). Consistent with Goleman’s (2013) research on focus, Paulus and colleagues claim that we must begin by developing leadership from the inside out. This requires us to engage in subjective meaning making and consider the core values, beliefs, identity, and essence of each individual. They suggest that there are four levels to this type of interdependent engagement: individual, group, organization, and society. Each level requires a different type of sense making.

UCEA’s rich history of research on important educational issues, combined with our efforts to advance quality leadership preparation and practice of educational leaders for the benefit of schools and children, should situate our organization as an important policy player, but we still have work to do collectively to make this goal a reality. Specifically, we need to continue working together to increase our organizational visibility and influence. Imagine the possibilities if each of us here would commit to at least one action that you will take when you return home from the convention. Imagine further the possibilities if each of us here would identify an action to take AND find collaborators from other UCEA institutions or other organizations who agree to work with you on one or more collective actions to improve the quality of preparation, policy, and practice. Finally, imagine the possibilities if we were to engage with multiple other individuals and groups and focus our collective energies on one societal issue that can impact the lives of children and their ability to learn.

So, as I wrap up this talk, let me pose two more questions to you for consideration:

1. How might we think together, dream together and act together to make a positive difference in the educational opportunities and realities for ALL children?
2. How can we have a greater influence on national and state policies and practices related to educational leaders, their preparation, and practice that promises to deliver equitable and exemplary practice?

Through creative and forward thinking approaches that contribute to a collective impact, we can accomplish great things. But be very clear—we need to step up, work collaboratively, form new and powerful alliances, and reclaim the field of leadership preparation. If we do not, others will continue to do so.

I hope that my comments today have provided you with new insights about UCEA and that I’ve been able to adequately share some of the wisdom shared by our earlier UCEA leaders. I sincerely appreciate the generosity of those who participated in an interview or completed a survey as part of my research for this speech. I learned so much from each of you and I look forward to sharing more of UCEA’s history in other venues. Paraphrasing a quote from Steve Jobs, former Apple CEO, I hope that everyone here has the sense that right now is one of those moments when we are influencing the future. Collectively, we have the brainpower, the resources and the energy to do so—all we need is the will and the discipline and commitment to join together for a common good. Thank you all for your kind attention. I hope that you enjoy the rest of the conference.
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T’was the Week of the Convention

Lieve Pitts

T’was the week of the Convention, when all through the Hyatt,
All the attendees were meeting in researchful quiet.
The tote bags had been given all out with care,
In hopes that great sessions would soon be had there.

All 884 attendees busily discussed leadership Ed,
While quotes from keynotes danced in their heads.
When out in Regency A-D there arose such a clatter,
UCEA staff ran to see what was the matter.

When, what to our wandering eyes should appear,
But 266 sessions rep’d by 12 countries here.
Exhibitor booths were met with great glee,
While gifts from local partnerships were given freely.

There was the election of President Gooden, so lively and smart,
But with President Reed, UCEA did sadly part.
Meanwhile Jackson Scholars received their pins,
Giving their mentors cheerful big grins.

More rapid than eagles the keynote sessions came,
While the attendees blogged, networked, and called them by name.
“Now Glenn, now Jeff, now Vanessa Siddle Walker!”
“On Wallace, on Award Winners, on Presidential Talker!”

The Graduate Student Summiteers were more than ever,
Ensuring that this was a worthwhile endeavor.
Folks piled in for the International Summit,
Wanting to collaborate with everyone in it.

The Convention done, the week came to its close,
Except for one last meeting to keep them on their toes.
There was a UCEA dance! A great gala!
A once-in-a-lifetime chance to see Dean Gonzalez salsa!

As attendees left for home by car or by plane,
They gave thanks to the sponsors who did deign
To provide an amazing Convention experience
That was UCEAwesome in every possible sense.

Future

UCEA Conventions

2014: November 13-16, Washington, DC
2015: November 20-23, San Diego, CA
Response to the 2013 Presidential Address

James W. Koschoreck
Northern Kentucky University

In Causes, Coalitions, and Communities: Learning From UCEA’s History to Develop a New Call to Action (the 2013 UCEA Presidential Address), Cindy Reed provides a historical overview of the tensions, political directions, and strategies that have emerged from the organization since its inception. As a past president who was charged not too long ago with composing my own presidential address, I am well aware of the rhetorical device of looking back on our organizational history and offering commentary on how we might proceed into the future to morph into an even better body of educators and policymakers. In this regard, Reed has successfully joined the ranks of a long line of colleagues who have provided the same sort of analysis year on year at our annual convention. Where she has excelled, in my opinion, is in her methodological approach to the task by utilizing qualitative interview methods to include the voices of past leaders of the organization. This has resulted in an interesting polyvocality that allows Reed to step back at multiple points of her address to allow the voices of others to come forth.

Offering an overview of the previous locations of UCEA headquarters, the executive directors, the past presidents, membership criteria, and the institutional membership over the years, Reed points out that UCEA has striven—at times more easily, at times not so much—to become a more diverse, inclusive organization while at the same time never losing sight of its commitment to quality. Due to the multiplicity of voices in the institutional governance body (i.e., the Executive Committee and the plenum) as well as in the organizational membership, there has never been unanimous agreement about what constitutes diversity and how to create a more diverse organization. This has led to one of the primary tensions that UCEA has faced over the years. Initiatives to increase diversity have sometimes met with resistance, with some expressing concern that this might lead to the production of less rigorous research. Even among those who supported the various diversity initiatives, there was not always agreement about how to manage the cultural change that would inevitably ensue. Some suggested colorblind solutions, others suggested a more multicultural approach, and still others supported an “all-inclusive multiculturalism” (Stevens, Plaut, & Sanchez-Burks, 2008, p. 116). Although colorblind solutions are often sought by organizations seeking to increase diversity, the focus on treating everyone the same tends rather to elide individual differences, thereby causing nonmajority individuals to feel even more isolated. Traditional multicultural approaches to organizational change, although acknowledging difference as strength within the organization, tend to fail over the long run because of the superficial focus on these differences, which usually results in disenchantment over time amongst the individuals within the association. An all-inclusive multicultural approach, as posited by Stevens et al. (2008), seeks to ameliorate the deficiencies of the other two approaches by both acknowledging the differences of the members of the organization and by applying the values and strengths of these differences equally across all groups within the organization, so that no one individual or group is made to feel excluded.

I first attended the annual convention of UCEA in the late 1990s as a graduate student. Later I served as a plenary session representative and then on the Executive Committee for two terms. In all those years, I witnessed firsthand the ongoing tensions over questions of diversity as the organization has inched forward in its attempts to become more inclusive. Some folks sought to embrace diversity as an important value of the organization but refused to give it primacy amongst the various values of the mission statement; others saw diversity initiatives as the very foundation upon which to ground everything else. It seemed that every Executive Committee meeting and every plenary session represented another opportunity to struggle through the various possibilities of organizational change around issues of diversity. But these changes have never advanced in a linear fashion, nor has the organization avoided setbacks in this regard. The lesson over time has been that every generation of leadership, as well as the members of the organization themselves, needs to continue to struggle with these tensions in order to ensure an ongoing commitment to diversity into the future.

At the end of her presidential address, Cindy reminds us that UCEA moves forward in achieving its goals—not just about diversity but about other important educational issues as well—through individual and collective commitment. She urges us to find new coalitions and new alliances in order to continue to improve leadership preparation. And finally, she reminds us that we must ACT in accordance with the principles of UCEA, both individually and collectively. If we remain passive, others will move in to influence educational politics and policies in ways that might not align with the vision of UCEA.
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Finding my Calling: A UCEA Convention Journey

Jada Phelps-Moultrie
Indiana University, Indianapolis

“Being here has exceeded everything that I would have ever imagined” - Vanessa Siddle Walker at the General Session V: Pennsylvania State University Mitsitifer Lecture, Symposium, 2013, 27th Annual UCEA Convention.

For the past 12 months as a 1st-year doctoral student at Indiana University, Indianapolis, I have second-guessed my scholarship and have been extremely doubtful if I would ever come to know how I would answer my “call to action” within educational leadership. However, after attending my first UCEA Annual Convention, I am convinced that this is my intellectual home, as it has helped me find my path toward my calling. The honorable and distinguished guest lecturer, Vanessa Siddle Walker, remarked that being at the UCEA Conference had exceeded everything that she had ever imagined, and I concur. To my surprise, those months of uncertainty finally had begun to subside within the days that I attended the 27th Annual UCEA Convention. This renewed sense of clarity can be attributed to the insightful sessions that I attended, inspiring lectures that I heard, and most importantly, the invigorating scholars that I met whose passion for education sincerely touched and renewed my spirit.

For example, Ronald Whitaker, Jackson Scholar and doctoral candidate from Duquesne University, began his presentation, Blame it on the System: The Exploitation of the “Conveyor Belt” and the Charge for Educational Leaders to Stand in the Gap, with showing a picture of the beaten and murdered body of African American teenager Emmett Till, along with a vignette detailing why Till’s mother wanted to have an open casket for her son’s funeral—which was to reveal to the world the ugliness of lynching. Whitaker used this striking and provocative opening to discourage scholars from hiding behind philosophical approaches and frameworks to bury the ugliness in education. Equally, like Whitaker, UCEA President-Elect Mark Gooden and Michael Dantley from Loyola University delivered a passionate and powerful session that jump-started my scholastic endeavors. Their session, Preparing Principals as Culturally Responsive Leaders, began with addressing the unequal landscape between racial groups using an analogy of a track race, specifically titled the “Unequal Race.” Dantley, a past UCEA president, and Gooden used the unequal race to argue that educational leaders need to be self-reflective by analyzing how life is influenced by race in order to effectively and equitably transform schools across the nation. Even more affirming as a doctoral student was witnessing the transcendence of work between scholars. For example, Amy Reynolds from University of Virginia utilized a methodology pioneered by Dr. James Scheurich, a respected and highly regarded educational leadership professor (and also my advisor). Reynolds utilized Scheurich’s methodology in her analysis of 80 years of historical school policy dating back to the early 1930s. Her session, Using Policy Archaeology to Reframe Practices for Selecting Principals: How Much Has Really Changed?, highlighted a stagnant trend over time demonstrating that the selection of school principals has been the same for the last eight decades.

In addition to these eye-opening sessions, what was refreshing about the annual conference that helped renew my scholastic spirit was how UCEA delivered the most current issues relating to educational leadership. For example, the Wallace Town Hall (see Burnam, 2013) uniquely brought a variety of discussants together to demonstrate how the current landscape within educational leadership has been vastly impacted by legislative policies. Another example was the showcase of films at the film festival where scholars such as Jennifer Friend and Jonathan Richard from University of Missouri, Kansas City portrayed how the superintendent has been influenced by the world of online learning in their film, E-Learning in Superintendent Preparation.

Moreover, my uncertainty of my academic journey was replaced with assurance by the encouragement that I and other graduate students received from a surmountable amount of support received throughout the convention. Specifically, the fireside chats with Vanessa Siddle Walker and Glenn Singleton gave graduate students the opportunity to ask advice from these renowned scholars. Opportunities like these seemed to be the standard at the UCEA convention. Over a dozen graduate-student-focused program sessions had been offered that connected graduate students not only with professors who had insightful and a profound amount of expertise to help them see the light at the end of that “dissertation tunnel” but also with each other. This support network created within the convention profoundly brought credence to the statement that convention committee member Terah Chambers Vanzant professed during the conference: “UCEA is really like a family.”

But the family affair was an overarching theme in this conference that was ever more enticing as an emerging scholar in the educational leadership field. This family atmosphere transcended across celebrations of triumphs, like the UCEA Awards Luncheon (see Phelps-Moultrie, 2013), and celebrations of lives, like that of Barbara Jackson. Nearly a year to date since her departure November 15, 2012, the UCEA Annual Convention celebrated her legacy at the Barbara Jackson Memorial Session and New Scholar Recognition ceremony. Exemplifying that family presence, many conveyed their favorite moments about “Dr. Mom.” Although the term of endearment of Dr. Mom may seem like a modest and playful name, the nickname ultimately revealed the deep adoration among those she touched. For over half a century, Jackson had been touching lives through her remarkable and everlasting leadership in educational administration. Even a year after her parting, she still continues to have a far-reaching impact. This was profoundly evident by the numerous presentations given throughout the conference from Jackson Scholars, demonstrating that this 2-year mentorship program, which is currently under the leadership of Gerardo Lopez of Loyola University–New Orleans, continues to trailblaze, like its founder.

This invigorating process that helped me see my purpose as a scholar would not have been complete without the words of UCEA President Cynthia Reed, who eloquently summarized the 2013 UCEA Convention theme, Seeking New Understandings of Persistent Challenges: A Call to Action to (Re)Unite Research, Policy, and Practice With Community, in her presidential address (see Reed, 2013) to not
just talk but act. Dr. Reed's declaration to all UCEA scholars, no matter where in their career, was a summons, a call to action. But to Reed, this call to action should be grounded in understanding the historical underpinnings behind what we do and deepening an understanding of the interdependent challenges that we may face. Moreover, this call to action, as summarized, must be charged through revolutionary leadership that disrupts and dismantles the oppressive nature of schools, and this leadership must be focused in an unwavering way that must empower others. These words of wisdom and insight brought me full circle as to why I left my 10-year tenure as a teacher and school leader—because I wanted to act, I wanted to be that revolutionary leader, I want to empower others. Thank you, UCEA, for exceeding everything that I would ever imagine UCEA to be.
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A Monograph Review
of Alternative Approaches to Educational Leadership Preparation: A Call for Integration
by Stephen P. Gordon and Michael Boone, Texas State University

Theodore B. Creighton  
Virginia Tech  
Brad E. Bizzell  
Radford University

Gordon and Boone believe the reasons for so many years of turmoil and waves of criticism in our profession to be both external factors (e.g., accountability movements imposed by state and national governance) and internal factors (e.g., our inability to reach consensus on new directions the field should take for our very survival). The authors begin their historical review with a “search for a unified theory” focusing on the significant work of Leithwood and Duke (1999), who identified our field’s approaches to school leadership by examining our field’s premier journals: (a) Educational Administration Quarterly, (b) Journal of School Leadership, (c) Journal of Educational Administration, and (d) Educational Management of Administration. Their historical review includes the work of Murphy; Leithwood and Duke; Berry and Beach; Glass, Mason, Eaton, Parker, and Carver; and McCarthy.

In their Chapter 2, Gordon and Boone make the case for examining all existing leadership approaches to ferret out much of the overlap and lack of sufficient influence over educational leadership in the present. They discuss in great detail their argument for considering the current existing approaches as (a) accountability, (b) school improvement, (c) social justice, (d) postmodernism, (e) instructional leadership, and (e) democratic society.

In their last Chapter 3, they propose compatible conceptualizations of each of the six approaches. They conclude that if “we heed their Call” for integration of approaches, programs would not simply present the approaches as alternatives, but rather would integrate them into a comprehensive curriculum intended to address the needs and purposes each approach is intended to explore and meet.

Alternative Approaches to Educational Leadership Preparation has been peer reviewed, accepted, and endorsed by the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration as a significant contribution to the preparation and practice of school administration. External reviewers: Sally Zepeda, University of Georgia; David Alexander, Virginia Tech; and Bret Range, University of Wyoming. NCPEA Press, a book publisher for NCPEA Publications, offers Alternative Approaches to Educational Leadership Preparation as an e-Book and bound print copy at www.ncpeapublications.org.

Note: Complimentary copies may be requested for instructional purposes by emailing a request to tcreigh@vt.edu
When you have thus formed the chain of ideas in the heads of your citizens, you will then be able to pride yourselves on guiding them and being their masters. The stupid despot may constrain his slaves with iron chains, but a true politician binds them even more strongly by the chain of their own ideas; it is at the stable point of reason that he secures the end of the chain; this link is all the stronger in that we do not know of what it is made and we believe it to be our own work; despair and time eat away the bonds of iron and steel, but they are powerless against the habitual union of ideas, they can only tighten it still more, and on the soft fibers of the brain is founded the unshakable base of the soundest of Empires. – J. M. Servan (1767)

State and federal education policies, as a product of intentional- ity, affect students’ freedom of thought (Fazzaro, 2006). As Lukes (2005) suggested, “What actors intentionally do always generates chains of unintended consequences and in it is implausible to deny that some of these manifest their power” (p. 76). The actors spoken of most directly are those in the state and federal policy-making arenas of education. Denise Airola (2013), during a UCEA plenary session, has found that “the increasing complexity and interconnectedness of factors impacting this [education policy] landscape have direct implications for preparing and developing leaders in education” (p. 3). Moreover, how students’ freedom of thought is affected depends on the type of discourse frame between the teacher and student and the discourse that allows the student to acquire the ability to achieve certain proficiencies while not losing his or her experiences and points of understanding.

These related perspectives have deeply troubling, unintended consequences that include teachers’ and, more importantly, students’ freedom of thought. Moreover, these unintended consequences are manifestations of power brought into being by three political artifacts: individual organizational interests, including private, public, and not-for-profit organizations in a given school’s community that have key points of convergence and divergence and relations in relation to the distribution of education; formal and informal institutions, including various forms of knowledge produced from an institution; and the day-to-day discourses of a classroom, as a result of the activities of these interests and institutions (Apple, 1993; Cooper, Cibulka, & Fusarelli, 2008; Lukes, 2005; Maxcy, 2013a, Shipps, 2008). In other words, unknown and unchecked, there are equity rights violations of students by the various institutions that envelop the learning environment, including the leadership of school principals, teachers of students, and the freedom of students (Airola, 2013; Fazzaro, 2006; Shipps, 2008).

The consideration of these equity rights violations has prompted this response to the 2013 UCEA Presidential Address by Cynthia Reed (2013) and a plenary session from the same conference presented by Airola (2013). Reed enacted a call to action for the UCEA community based on the vision1 of the organization. Additionally, Reed advised of several “tensions” within the community that have historically been challenges to the community in building to the call to action in addressing these same tensions toward the advancement of the UCEA vision. One tension that is relevant to this response is that which is focused on our organizational relevance and competing views about what makes us relevant. We have had ongoing debates throughout our organizational history about whether our preference was for knowledge production or knowledge utilization. (Reed, 2013)

It is submitted that the knowledge production and utilization of the student should be at the fore in considerations even at the level of educational administration, and perhaps another tension should be considered in the execution of the UCEA vision. The “utilization” of the knowledge that the student brings to the classroom in addition to the various banks of knowledge among the UCEA community should be considered simultaneously as a mutual production and utilization of knowledge.

Another tension is the community’s coming to grips with its advancement for “whose diversity counts” and “a history of ‘othering’ those who were not considered part of the mainstream” (Reed, 2013). In fact, this history of “othering” could be construed as a form of deficit thinking that Valencia (2010) spoke of that continues to maintain the educational status quo. In continuing to engage these “tensions,” UCEA becomes a part of the not-for-profit organizations contributing to the three institutional artifacts of students’ denial of freedom of thought and “the increasing complexity and interconnectedness of factors impacting the landscape having direct implications for preparing and developing leaders in education” (Airola, 2013, p. 3). Each relevant tension is a manifestation of power with unintended consequences as examples of its effects (Apple, 1993, 2012; Bartlett, 2009; Goldpink, 2007; Hoyle & Wallace, 2007; Lukes, 2005).

First, given there are many interpretations of the meaning of power (Apple, 1993, 2012; Coplan, Hughes, Bosacki, & Rose-Krasnor, 2011; Gordon, 1980; Horowitz, 1969; Lukes, 2005; Morris, 2002; Wedel, 2009), the framework that will be used here is that of Lukes (2005). The term power is interpreted and used, generally, in terms of one’s “power over” another or one’s “ability to have another or others in your power, by constraining their choices, thereby securing their compliance” (Lukes, 2005, p. 74). In terms of the classroom, teachers very easily can impose their “power over” students by constraining their choices for learning by focusing on study for preset standards for standardized tests. The question to be addressed, then, is the extent unintended consequences play into
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1UCEA Vision: UCEA is a community of scholars committed to the improvement of leadership and policy that supports the learning and development of ALL children. UCEA actively initiates and leads educational reform efforts through its high quality research and preparation programs. UCEA institutions work collaboratively with schools and educational agencies to positively influence local, state, and national educational policy. UCEA constantly questions and reevaluates its practice and beliefs to ensure its effectiveness and relevance.
a teacher’s actions. And lastly, it seems equally important to establish an interpretation for the term freedom.

Thus, I will develop an argument for the statement, “State and federal education policies, as a product of intentionality, affect students’ freedom of thought.” Given the aforementioned frameworks, the argument will develop through three phases: (a) an examination for the meaning of freedom, including a hypothesis based from an introduction to the ideal of intentionality as a perspective for the denial of one’s freedom of thought (Deely, 2007); (b) examination of the nature of social artifact, for example, power, interests, institutions, and discourse, of the politics of the classroom and its manifestations as power affecting the student and teacher in the classroom environment (Luke, 2005); and (c) a consideration of the implications of these findings on a student’s freedom of thought.

**Freedom (of Thought)**

The Oxford Dictionaries (2013) advised that freedom means “The power or right to act, speak, or think as one wants ... absence of subjection to foreign domination or despotic government ... the power of self-determination attributed to the will; the quality of being independent of fate or necessity” (para. 1, italics added). Power clearly directly affects freedom. To exercise freedom, one must not be restricted by some “necessity.” But, for example, standardized tests are a necessity in public education as dictated by state and federal regulations, which in turn weigh heavily on the actions of school leaders and ultimately teachers (Airola, 2013; Thorne, 2011). And of course, these dictates would seem to influence what and how a student learns (Court, 2004; Darling-Hammond, 2000).

Fazzaro (2006) added that public education “at base ... is about the role of education in the allocation of values through politics” (p. 12, italics added). The presumption would be that the various external institutions’ respective values and politics, and thus the interconnectedness and complexities, are the basis from which public education is distributed. Immediately and additionally, therefore, “the allocation of values” implies that a student’s existing values are supplanted, which presents a concern for the learning process (Airola, 2013). As many authors have found, a student’s lived experiences, established values, and beliefs are linked significantly to the learning process (Erickson-Nepstad, 1997). For example, “there are several ‘frame alignment processes’ that link individual ... interpretive orientations, such that some set of individual interests, values, and beliefs ... activities, goals, and ideology are congruent and complementary” (Erickson-Nepstad, 1997, pp. 471–472). And beliefs are directly linked to one’s exercise of freedoms (Erickson-Nepstad, 1997; Fazzaro, 2006), in this case the freedoms of those who are not the student.

The values and beliefs that contextualize the policies of state and federal entities, such as standardized test criteria, then are not the respective student’s own and thus not a vital link to prior experiences as basis for learning. The link between prior experience, values, beliefs, and learning is a relevant topic beyond the scope of this investigation but part of the public education environment (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Kalyuga, 2011; Reeve & Deci, 1996). Said another way, if one is a student of public education and “the role of education is the allocation of values through politics” (Fazzaro, 2006, p. 12), then students are not their values. The students’ values and the freedom to think as one wants are influenced by politics of the teacher and the environment of the public education system; the student is not exercising freedom—the teacher also is not, for that matter. However, the environment of the politics in which the teacher instructs now seems to require closer consideration. More precisely stated, what is the nature of the politics of the greater education system, and how do these politics dictate the relationships between students and their teachers? Going forward, there are two ways of considering relationships. The first is how one cognitively gains understanding of that which is experienced, or what will be considered in terms of intentionality (Deely, 2007; Erickson-Nepstad, 1997). A second form of relationship that produces correspondence between two persons will be considered from a perspective of discourse (Freire, 1970/2003).

**Intentionality.** When thinking of the nature of relations and the relationships thereof, Deely (2007) comes to mind from studies in the area of semiotics and semiosis. Deely spoke of relations in terms of intentionality. In short, the nature of intentionality seems to speak to the effects of relationships, the correspondence between entities (e.g., a student and teacher), and the importance that this correspondence has on the developing being of said entities.

How is correspondence possible? Here is the answer: correspondence is possible because thought consists essentially in the formation of relations, and it is of the nature of relations to be able to exist according to their proper being in thought and in nature indifferently! When a pattern of relations is judged to be the way it actually is in the order of ens reale, then that objective pattern places us in truth, otherwise in error. (Deely, 2007, p. 134)

An interpretation of Deely’s statement is that correspondence is possible when each entity brings a truth as a product of his or her respective thought. Ontologically speaking, each person has an established way of thinking that “something” is true; an understanding of what something “is” (Dewey, 1991). Lorde (2007) described “a freedom which allows the I to be, not in order to be used, but in order to be creative. This is the difference between the passive be and the active being” (p. 111). Moreover, the process for establishing these truths, the ens reale, is a product of the individual’s formation of relationships between and among experienced things in the world that have established meaning. Erickson-Nepstad (1997) further substantiated this position in terms of what she called “frame amplification, [which] aims to identify and invigorate particular values or beliefs presumed central to prospective constituents and then use them to interpret an issue, problem, or set of events within a particular light” (p. 472).

**Discourse.** Now in terms of the nature of the form of relationship that occurs between a student and teacher, the interpretation seems to evolve individual meanings through interaction or correspondence via an expression of each person’s different experiences that produces a new meaning of truth. Freire (1970/2003) comes to mind in terms of what seems to be his meaning of the word discourse. Freire alerted us to the phenomenon of inequality that correspondence inflicts on certain contributors. For inequality to be overcome, correspondence must consist of a discourse that produces truth that equally consists of that which each participant

---

1 *Ens reale* “Mind-independent reality consists of individuals (substances) with their subjective characteristics (inherent accidents) between and among these individuals consequent upon their (subjective) characteristics and interactions” (Deely, 2007, p. 133).
brings to the relationship (Court, 2004; Curtis, 2012; Darling-Hammond, 2000). Now again consider the typical discourse of a teacher and student, where the experiences, the meanings given relationships, the “truths” that each brings are skewed; collective truth is then lost by the political influences in the classroom.

The Politics of the Classroom

The politics of the classroom that affect the correspondence of teachers and students and the students’ freedom is a dynamic phenomenon whose nature is power as its three constituent social artifacts: interests, institutions, and discourses (Cooper et al., 2008; Fazzaro, 2006; Freire, 1970/2003; Hodgson, 2006; Horowitz, 1969; Lakoff, 2002; Lukes, 2005; Maxcy, 2013b). To set the stage, what students’ interests are in a learning environment is established—it is presumed that student learning that is the main purpose of “school.” Next, the institutions that influence the classroom and discourses that may occur in a school are presented. I then address the implications of these social artifacts as collective constituents of power as they come to affect students’ freedom of thought.

The convergence and divergence of interests. There are inherent tensions and contradictions in interests among the stakeholders of the public education system (Airola, 2013; Maxcy, 2013b). The complexities of the argument that students’ freedom of thought is affected by external institutions and interests exist from the pedagogical fact that student interests consist of the desire for guidance, correction, and affirmation (Booth, Lange, Koedinger, & Newton, 2013). The complexities stem from whether students’ prior experiences and ways of coming to understand and make meanings of relationships are engaged adequately if “corrected” or if not “affirmed” in the classroom. As stated by Maxcy (2013b), “Teachers’ interests consist of a desire to enable students to be self-directed and coachable, pliant and determined.” The complexity then would seem to lie in the characteristic of engaging pliancy upon the students. When engaging pliancy as an interest, a teacher would need to be talented enough to utilize the students’ prior experiences and places of understanding as a way of gaining additional knowledge without devaluing said experiences and places.

Tyack (1974) seems to have reiterated what Freire (1970/2003) and Deeley (2007) spoke to in terms of complications of interests under the auspices of “advanced knowledge.” Tyack spoke of the history of Blacks being held back from gaining advanced knowledge by not having the opportunity to an education equivalent to that Whites were receiving in America. An interpretation of Tyack suggests that advanced knowledge is required to succeed in life after schooling. This interpretation is drawn from a statement that “advanced knowledge” is linked to one’s being “liberated” (Erickson-Nepstad, 1997).

An interpretation of Paavola, Lipponen, and Hakkarainen (2004) suggests that in the 21st century, liberation is deliverable via knowledge creation. Immediately, the UCEA tension of “knowledge production and utilization” (Reed, 2013) comes to mind. Knowledge creation for Paavola et al. is derived from forms of metaphorical learning that consist of both the participatory and the acquisitional, whereas an acquisitional process is based on “certainty as a basis of knowledge” (p. 570), and a participatory process suggests that “more attention be paid to social and cultural aspects of knowledge advancement” (p. 570). Given Paavola et al.’s position, there may be another tension to consider for the UCEA community in its call to action, a dimension of tension that is student centered rather than a dynamic tension among UCEA community members.

Paavola et al. (2004) submitted, “It may be argued that conceptually well-founded approaches to knowledge-creation are needed to help people make the epistemological and ontological shifts required to participate productively in an advanced knowledge society” (p. 573). Airola (2013) added a layer of complexity to this challenge: “Education leaders in the 21st century are faced with greater complexity and a more unpredictable political landscape than leaders of the past” (p. 1). Knowledge creation, therefore, would seem to be indicative of a student’s opportunity to make that “epistemological and ontological shift.”

Discourse. Fazzaro (2006) presented three statements that exemplify the previous discussion of institutions as a transition into a consideration of discourse:

1. “The criticism of Modern thought, of metaphysics itself, from the standpoint of language, and in Foucault’s case, discourse broadly defined and represented as instructional practices” (p. 17).
2. “Derrida believed that we must demand that the sign signify incontrovertible meaning if a purported “truth” [e.g., the answers to standardized tests] is to be fully justified” (p. 17).
3. “The First Amendment, ratified in 1791, was to place one’s right to ‘think this or that’ beyond the reach of government” (p. 18).

Many authors have spoken to how discourse can affect respondents unequally based on the social artifacts of power (Apple, 1993; Ben-Porath, 2013; Fazzaro, 2006; Jenkins & Carpenter, 2013; Silva Dias & Menezes, 2013). Erickson-Nepstad (1997) borrowed from David Snow’s framework for types of discourse: frame bridging, frame amplification, frame extension, and frame transformation. For the continuity of this article, the term frame in each of these phrases will be substituted by the term discourse.

First, Erickson-Nepstad (1997) advised, “[Discourse] bridging is the process of linking ‘two or more structurally unconnected frames regarding a particular issue or problem’” (p. 472). Discourse bridges understandings in order for a correspondent to motivate the other correspondent to act. Engaging in this frame, however, requires consideration of the possibility that a dominant discourse influences the motivating correspondent (e.g., a teacher) and therefore must be handicapped for the motivated correspondent (e.g., a student). This dominant discourse is a form of power that is borne from sociohistorical pedagogies that are not in the overall best interest of either correspondent (Artiles & Lopez-Torres, 2003; Roth & Lee, 2007). Discourse extension seems to provide a potential to address the “handicaps” of the correspondent in that extension. When two persons engage in discussion freely expressing feelings and thoughts revealing some conflict, then it is more likely that an opportunity to reveal a mutually agreed-upon product for continued discussion may become evident.

Erickson-Nepstad’s (1997) next frame is that “[discourse] amplification aims to identify and invigorate particular values or beliefs presumed central to prospective constituents and then use them to interpret an issue, problem, or set of events within a particular light” (p. 472). The caveat here seems to lie in what is determined to be the “particular values or beliefs presumed central to prospective constituents.” Again, the dominant discourse seems to present an
example for being careful for engaging this frame of discourse. The ideal of identifying and invigorating is spot-on for incorporating the experiences and understanding of the student being motivated, perhaps through discourse extension; however, the other correspondents in the discourse must be careful to not be influenced definitely by the dominant discourse.

Lastly, for Erickson-Nepstad (1997), “The most comprehensive frame alignment process is discourse transformation, [which] occurs when the values and goals of a correspondent are not congruent and perhaps even appear antithetical to the frames of the mobilizing pool” (p. 472). In other words, the concerns about the dominant discourse persist, but the motivating correspondent, for example the teacher in the classroom, discards old values and beliefs (e.g., values and beliefs of the dominant discourse) for new values and beliefs that integrate the values and beliefs of the motivated correspondent or mobilizing pool (i.e., the student in the classroom).

Institutions and the dominant discourse. The dominant discourse is a sociological construct that is a product of institutional struggles (Berger & Luckmann, 1966; Lukes, 2005; Maxcy, 2013a). These institutional struggles are intratitutional, interinstitutional, or extratitutional in nature (Maxcy, 2013a). Intratitutional struggles consist of the discourses among actors or groups pursuing needs by reshaping policies. Interinstitutional struggles consist of discourses for control of activities. Extratitutional struggles consist of discourses over ideology and principles (Maxcy, 2013a). For this article, the dominant discourse will be presented from the social artifacts of intratitutional struggles: the interests of students, parents, teachers, teacher unions, principals, principal associations, superintendents, superintendents’ association, each school board member, city mayor, state agency, and federal agency. It seems feasible to categorize these actors and groups as follows (Hodgson, 2006):

- students (including parents);
- teacher unions (including teachers);
- school districts (including superintendents, principals, and their associations);
- city/county (mayor, city council, city Chamber of Commerce);
- state department of education (legislators and legislation, superintendent of education, courts, state Chamber of Commerce); and
- U.S. Department of Education (legislators and legislation, President, Secretary of Education, courts, U.S. Chamber of Commerce).

Each of these actors and groups represents an institution, or “systems of established and prevalent social rules that structure social interactions” (Hodgson, 2006, p. 2). And each institution has its respective interests and engagement in various discourses (Freire, 1970/2003; Hodgson, 2006). The dominant discourse is generated, supported, and persists given policies and sociohistorical structures. Currently, the dominant discourse is generated by the institution of the U.S. Department of Education and individual state departments of education. The standards and policies thereof seem to control the extent to which the dominant discourse persists through the policies and sociohistorical interests of these institutions.

Reed (2013) in her Presidential Address provides some basis from which the dominant discourse is derived in stating that each institution has its own set of “organizational structures, core beliefs, processes, and locus of responsibility” (p. 19), as emphasized often in literature (Checkoway, 2013; Conrey, Sherman, Gawronski, Hugenberg, & Groom, 2005; Goldspink, 2007; Hodgson, 2006; Jenkins & Carpenter, 2013; Lukes, 2005; Saiti, 2009). Again, the complexities are confounded by the fact that each community will have different public, private, and nonprofit institutions involved in the education process and to varying degrees on the spectrum of ideological position (Apple, 1993; Horne, 1992; Houser, 2012; Karabel & Halsey, 1977; Lazar & Nuijten, 2013; Shiller, 2013). These varying ideological positionalities and the organizational structures for which they stand begin to form the face of the interconnected complexities spoken of by Airola (2013). The school leader must be able to know or learn, navigate, and form relationships with these complexities in order to successfully advocate for public school students. Airola specified skills for school leaders in the form of the following challenges:

1. Need to react/respond to immediate external forces that may change the priority and/or focus of strategic work.
   a) New federal Executive Orders or changes to federal laws...
   b) Emergence of new federal initiatives (competitive and/or allocated) that impact funding...
   c) Changes to state statute, court rulings.
      i. Legislative bills that propose substantive changes for isolated components of educational system with little or no prior consultation with agency leaders.
      ii. Special interest initiatives that emerge in proposed bills with little or no prior consultation with agency leaders.
      iii. Term limits of legislators and annual legislative sessions require the agency to continually educate new lawmakers...

2. Time and agency capacity for
   a) Strategic actions beyond compliance and monitoring.
   b) Internal talent development to respond to changing roles and responsibilities.

3. Lack of formal transition of institutional knowledge when leadership changes in the agency.
   a) Loss of critical history of prior changes, gap in knowledge of rationales for existing processes, and loss of historical frame of reference for planning future initiatives. (pp. 2–3)

The interconnected complexities exemplify intratitutional tensions, which magnify the challenge of deciphering the dominant discourse and the interests that work together to deny students freedom of thought. The interests, policies, and standards of states and the U.S. Department of Education, for example, are based in global economic and social order needs (Dahl, 2003; Hodgson, 2006; Ravitch, 2010), presenting serious challenges to the needs and discourses among teacher and student interests, respectively (Ravitch, 2010). The policies and standards confine the actors and regulate actions that would most easily enable the exercise of transformative discourses in the classroom (Maxcy, 2013a; Weinstein, Deci, & Ryan, 2011).

Implications for a Student’s Freedom

Reed (2013) engaged the community of the 2013 UCEA Annual Conference through her Presidential Address with a call to action proclaiming.

Today, we have a clear call to action if we wish to remain relevant! Political conditions are far worse now than they were in 1972. Our public education and university-based
leadership preparation programs are under attack and those attacks keep coming.

An implication is engagement of students through relevant curricula and subject matter. Policies that negatively affect students’ freedoms of thought are manifest through these “attacks.” Future collective research among the UCEA community could contribute to eradicating this denial of rights to our students. However, Airola (2013) has provided a solid body of work and mindset from which to start.

For one to exercise freedom, one must not be restricted by some “necessity.” The dominant discourse, the policies of standardized tests, for example, and the interests of the state and the U.S. Department of Education potentially deny the freedom of thought by students because there is a necessity for the student to achieve a certain proficiency level, usually in complete disregard for the consideration of said students’ attained knowledge and experience as the basis for advanced knowledge and learning.

The implication is that how students’ freedom of thought is affected depends on the type of discourse frame between the teacher and student and the discourse that allows the student to achieve certain proficiencies while not losing his or her experiences and points of understanding. If discourse bridging is engaged, the implication is that a student’s freedom is denied because teachers and students must act out of the necessity of the dominant discourse and institutions. If discourse extension is engaged, the necessity of the dominant discourse and institutions remain, and thus a student’s freedom is denied. If discourse amplification is engaged, it is implied that students’ freedom is denied because the teacher presumes to know what values and beliefs the student brings to the discourse. This is problematic in that the presumption most likely is influenced by the dominant discourse and institutions within which the teacher must operate. The discourse transformation seems promising; however, the necessities of the dominant discourse remain and thus would also deny the freedom of student thought.

In closing, one could be left to summarize and wonder: Public education denies students’ freedom of thought, so what does that imply for citizenship? Fazzaro (2006) answered, Citizen knowledge must be the knowledge necessary for a citizen to ask questions so that informed judgments can be made relative to maintaining the delicate balance between the People and the self. In short, the fundamental nature of public education knowledge must lead to critique. (p. 25)

It is therefore submitted that in order for each student to have the opportunity for full citizenship and the opportunity for rewards of their freedom of thought, education must engage the implicit motivations of the student without exclusive restraints of policies and interests of social artifacts. This is an added tension that calls to be addressed by the talents of the UCEA community. A start would be in heeding Fazzaro’s warning: “Truth is by definition absolute, no ‘almost’ here, no interpretations, pure certainty. ... Standardized tests of knowledge imply that there is ‘Truth’ relevant to each question on each test” (p. 25). The next step would seem to be a consideration for discourses across social artifacts that are based from the creativity and knowledge that each student is capable of realizing and have that as the common interest across institutions.

As quoted in the address, Kezar and Carducci (2009) referred to “work to disrupt this cycle of oppression by helping organizations establish shared power environments that promote social justice and positive social change” (p. 7). Reed’s (2013) overall call to action speaks to a strategy for a relevant execution of the UCEA vision going forward: “Kezar and Carducci (2009) challenge us to embrace what they call revolutionary leadership concepts, ideas and practices that embrace a shift in organizational structures, core beliefs, processes, and locus of responsibility” (p. 19). These leadership concepts with the support and advocacy of the UCEA are called for perhaps more than ever in its history. Not only are we maintaining relevance by the execution of the UCEA vision, we also are called to preserve the rights of students and our future citizenry.
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Within the *UCEA Review* faculty have maintained a spirited debate over the kind of degree program and university experience district and other non-school-level leaders need. In the fall issue of the *UCEA Review*, Zacharakis and Thompson (2013) stoked this debate, raising concerns about recent efforts to distinguish the EdD and PhD. Given the ongoing debates in this area, one would expect for the conversation to have progressed a bit further than it has. Nonetheless, the continued interest and engagement is a very good thing.

One element common to the pieces collected in this issue of the *UCEA Review* is the focus on the learner. Programs should be designed for those engaged in the learning process and the outcomes those learners are seeking. If learners desire a career as a social science researcher, the program in which they enroll should be designed to provide them with the skills and knowledge necessary for success as a social science researcher. Similarly, if learners desire a career as a district-level leader, the program in which they enroll should be designed to provide them with the skills and knowledge necessary for success as a district-level leader. It sounds simple enough, but like many seemingly simple problems, we have yet to discover an acceptable solution.

Regardless of what we call the degree (e.g., Doctor of Philosophy, Doctor of Education, Doctor of Practice), the full compliment of learning experiences provided should build toward a well-defined set of outcomes. Perhaps the real problem here is that we are not clear on our end goals. What are the outcomes we are seeking? Specifically, in the case of the EdD, can we agree on what outcomes a successful graduate would exhibit? I have my doubts that we, as a field, can come to complete agreement; however, I do believe that we might develop consensus around a few key tenets.

**Tenet 1: Program Purpose and Design Matter**

Programs should be designed with particular purposes in mind. When it comes to leadership development, programs should be designed to reflect a set of principles about leadership as well as a theory of action linking elements of the program design to candidate leadership outcomes. In other words, programs should be designed purposefully to develop a specific kind of leadership.

In the case of EdD programs where the intent is to develop candidates for advanced leadership positions (e.g., the superintendent), program faculty should collaboratively identify the leadership principles that will anchor their program and then design the program to achieve those principles. For many engaged in the EdD debate, this may be the area of greatest contention. What is the purpose of a doctorate? What are the principles of advanced leadership? What role does scholarship and the generation of knowledge play? What role do skills play? How narrowly or broadly should we define our principles?

One other important consideration with regard to program purpose and design is the incorporation of partner (formal or informal) visions into the program principles and design. Perhaps one of the most consequential partnerships is that between programs and state departments of education. If as a result of participating in a program, a candidate might be recommended for certification or licensure, then the program has a significant responsibility to incorporate the state’s vision of leadership into its own. Other partnerships with districts, cities, or consortia will similarly influence the program’s vision or theory of action. If programs are developing leaders in partnerships, then graduates must enter their new roles aware of and prepared to meet the expectations of those partners.

**Tenet 2: Programs Should Reflect Adult Learning Theory**

There is a large and growing body of scholarship focused on adult learning, and those engaged in the preparation of educational leaders should be committed users of the theories and practices offered within this significant knowledge base. Adult learning theory suggests that learning in adulthood is significantly different than learning as a child, and while there is no one overarching theory or model of adult learning, the frameworks that do exist provide important insight into the work of educational leadership preparation programs. Specifically, learning experiences must be purposeful and the teaching strategies used should foster learning, learning transfer, and leadership identity formation (Kaagan, 1998; Knowles, 1980; Merriam, Caffarella & Baumgartner, 2007; Mezirow, 1997). As noted in the UCEA Curriculum Mapping Guide (Orr, O’Doherty & Barber, 2011), adult learners benefit from authentic, problem-based approaches that make explicit the purpose of learning, knowledge and build on prior experiences, provide practice in context, support self-directed learning, and require reflection.

What pedagogies count as authentic, problem-based, and so on? Case studies, simulations, and action research projects are a few examples of the kinds of teaching strategies that have the potential to spark powerful learning. Program faculty should inventory their current program practices to determine how effectively they support adult learning and the learning and leadership principles of the program, keeping in critiques, such as that offered by Joe Murphy in this issue of the *UCEA Review*, of common practices like the research dissertation.

**Tenet 3: Programs Must Take Candidate Outcomes Seriously**

Although learning is a personal process, it is also shaped by the learning experiences offered and the sociocultural environment in which it takes place. Thus, while a program faculty cannot take full
credit for any given candidate’s successes or failures, they are deserving of some of the credit (or responsibility). I don’t think the level of credit or responsibility is the most useful thing to focus on, however, as this is not an all-or-nothing situation; individual differences, program fit, and a variety of other factors would certainly confound an accurate “accounting.”

Understanding our responsibility as adult educators and developers of leaders is important, particularly given the high-stakes environments that many work within. How do we know that we have achieved our goals as a program? What do we do to ensure that we are assessing the impact of our program? How are we using such information to further enhance a candidate’s learning, and how do we use such information to review and improve the program? The clearer we are about what we are trying to achieve, the better we will understand our progress in achieving program goals.

Focusing on candidate outcomes has implications for the design and delivery of the program. The kind of leaders we hope to develop should influence who we invite to participate in the program, how they are chosen, how they are developed and evaluated, how they interact and engage with the learning environment and other learners, and how we know when they are ready to advance. In other words, concern about candidate outcomes does not emerge at the end of a program; it integrated into programs.

Conclusion

Critics of educational leadership development are plentiful, and the EdD is a particularly popular target. Why is this the case? The intention of the program continues to be ill defined, and when programs are ill defined the content and experiences offered through the program tend to be less coherent and impactful. The development of leaders is serious and consequential work, and our programs should be designed and delivered in such a way that this understanding is palpable.
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The CPED Argument: A Counter-Response

Jill Alexa Perry

In summer of 2012, I was invited by the editor of *Kappan Magazine* to write a clarification piece aimed at helping educational practitioners understand the meaning behind the Harvard Graduate School of Education’s action to rename its almost century-old Education Doctorate (EdD) to a Doctor of Philosophy of Education (PhD). For my piece, entitled “To EdD or not to EdD?” I was urged to keep my explanation straightforward and focused on helping practitioners understand the difference between the two degrees. Consequently, my aim was to comply with the editor’s request to ameliorate the confusion and concern that had swelled in the blogosphere. It is gratifying to note that a year later, my piece is contributing to the national dialogue started by the Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate (CPED), and myself as its codirector, and is broadening perspectives within the academy.

I appreciated the invitation to write a response to Zacharakis and Thompson (2013) and explain the work underway to distinguish the EdD from the PhD. I want to begin by thanking my insightful and eloquent colleagues (David Imig, Martin Reardon, Debby Zambo, Craig Hochhein, Rick McCown, Jim Schreiber, and Michelle Young) for their input.

**Valid Concerns**

In the fall issue of *The UCEA Review*, authors Zacharakis and Thompson (2013) raised concerns about distinguishing the EdD and PhD and the potential consequences of doing so. Such concerns are valid and align with a long history of inquiry from academics who have raised similar concerns as they critically examined each degree trying to determine the purpose and outcomes of each (Anderson, 1983; Brown, 1966, 1991; Clifford & Guthrie, 1988; Deering, 1998; Dill & Morrison, 1985; Eells, 1963; Freeman, 1931; Levine, 2005; Ludlow, 1964; Osguthorpe & Wong, 1993). From its inception at Harvard College in 1921, the EdD has had neither a clear nor distinct purpose (Perry, 2010), and by the mid-1900s, the EdD had been assigned many roles—liberator from constraining Arts and Sciences requirements, a means for professional preparation credential, entrance into the ivy halls of academia—by schools and colleges of education that were trying to establish themselves within the university as professional schools. It is no wonder that today we find PhD programs that train superintendents, EdD programs that prepare R-1 researchers, EdD graduates who lead community colleges, and PhDs who research and write extensively on problems of practice. The main difference between the two degrees has been that the EdD has been defined generically by “subtraction, with fewer requirements than the PhD and much less emphasis on full-time study and residency” (Shulman, Golde, Bueschel, & Garabedian, 2006, p. 27). This, in turn, has left the degree relegated to the status of “PhD lite” (Shulman et al., 2006, p. 27). As a result of this long history of “blurring in purposes,” Levine (2005) called for an elimination of both degrees.

What we can take away from Zacharakis and Thompson (2013) is that the waters are still muddy. The authors have clearly indicated the need to work harder to help schools of education battle the portrayal that rigorous research and scholarship belong only in PhD programs or that only practitioners can affect educational practice. Indeed, educational practice should be open to good ideas regarding educational reform whether they come from parents, politicians, or the students themselves. The concern, CPED argues, is not the consequence of distinguishing the degrees, but rather the consequence of not doing so.

In the article that founded the movement to create CPED, Shulman et al. (2006) cautioned that unless schools of education confront the problems of the education doctorate, they “risk becoming increasingly impotent in carrying out their primary missions—the advancement of knowledge and the preparation of quality practitioners” (p. 25). The claim was not without thought and evidence and emerged from two projects: the Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate was seeking to understand research doctoral preparation across six disciplines, and the Preparation for the Professions Program was investigating professional preparation in six fields.1 Findings from both projects confirmed the need to distinguish the education doctorate (EdD) from the research doctorate (PhD) in education and to clarify the purpose of the EdD.

Nationally, around this same time, concerns were being raised about the EdD. The American Education Research Association and the National Academy of Education came together to “conduct a systematic assessment of education research doctorate programs using the methodology of the National Research Council (NRC) Assessment of Research Doctorate Programs ... to improve education research doctorate programs nationally” (National Academy of Education, n.d.). At the start of this project, the EdD was removed from the taxonomy because of its confused nature. Also at this time, as mentioned above, Levine (2005) published a policy report that investigated U.S. education schools and called for the elimination of the EdD on the grounds that educational leaders could be prepared best with a “master’s degree akin to the master’s of business administration” (p. 92). Finally, the Council of Graduate Schools (2007) had released its *Taskforce Report on the Professional Doctorate*, which described professional doctorates as the highest degree for the “preparation for the potential transformation of that field of professional practice, just as the PhD represents preparation for the potential transformation of the basic knowledge in a discipline” (p. 6). Given these debates and influences, the atmosphere was ripe for addressing the degree confusion on a national scale, and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching took the lead and established CPED.

**The CPED Argument**

The CPED Consortium claims that the central distinction between the EdD and the PhD lies in the end result: the graduate. Those who graduate from a PhD program are oriented to research, service, and teaching in the academy. They are given an academic foundation, which places high value upon the production of research and generation of publications in their field. They are taught a certain set of skills to do their job—curriculum design and breadth and depth of their specific academic discipline. They are mentored in the hid-

1More information on both projects can be found at http://carnegiefoundation.org
den curriculum of the academy by those who already thrive in the culture of committees, grant seeking, and tenure so that they will similarly thrive. And they are measured by a specific type of criteria—the tenure and peer-review processes. The EdD graduate, on the other hand, is oriented to lead in practice, which requires a distinct set of skills such as the discernment of problems of practice and the use of data and research to address them, the building of consensus in politically fraught contexts, and the interpersonal skills that support leading schools and educational organizations among a diverse set of stakeholders. In their preparation, they are provided a foundation that stresses the merging of practitioner knowledge with scholarly knowledge to address localized problems of practice. And their academic work is measured not only by the quality but also by the impact of that work in practice.

Neither degree is better than nor more rigorous than the other; rather, they are different types of preparation that are equally rigorous. Appeals to maintain traditional forms of doctoral education, such as the argument put forth by Zacharakis and Thompson (2013), seem insufficient to weather the profound changes facing both our schools and our system of higher education, and they perpetuate confusion and ill preparation of the two professions. What is the point of having two degrees if both can supposedly do the same thing? The CPED response to this question is clear—one person cannot be adequately prepared by one degree program to be both a top-tier practitioner of educational leadership and an academic scholar. Each profession cannot gain what is needed from one kind of degree program. The jobs are quite distinct, as reference to position descriptions will clearly indicate.

To clarify the distinction, CPED is focused on the preparation of professionals, taking strategic measures to reframe their preparation to meet the emerging needs of society while holding firm on its commitment to principles of diversity and social justice. CPED promotes a new vision for doctoral education, one that is more responsive, better connected, and engaged with school and college communities and their leaders.

Regarding program rigor, though Zacharakis and Thompson (2013) acknowledge (and praise even) certain aspects of the CPED agenda, they suggest that programs affiliated with CPED fail to prepare candidates with extensive research skills and focus primarily on credentialing, and they imply that CPED programs seem motivated primarily by revenues and efficiencies associated with large enrollments, shortened programs, reduced faculty involvement, and redefined capstone requirements. CPED has been focused on matters of “rigor” in all aspects of program design since the inception of the initiative 7 years ago. There has been a constant concern about what constitutes “rigor” and how one could make such a determination. Instead of looking to “rigor” as defined by traditional academic or disciplinary departments, CPED members have sought to promote the idea that EdD recipients assume a vital role as stewards of a profession and must be grounded in an understanding and ability to affect professional practice. For example, CPED members have worked to strengthen the role of research preparation in EdD programs, tailoring the teaching of research so that practitioners possess the skills and abilities they need to engage research in practice setting and in multiple, diverse, and rigorous ways such as deciphering and debating current research findings and designing studies that produce results that impact their immediate context (Hochbein & Perry, in press).

Zacharakis and Thompson (2013) ultimately argue that the CPED distinction of the EdD from the PhD is a form of tracking. Respectfully, the CPED Consortium disagrees. The majority of people that enter into doctoral programs in education represent working professionals who intend to remain in practice settings upon graduation (Perry, 2012; Shulman et al, 2006). These students are usually at the midcareer point, which is the “inverse of other fields” (Shulman et al, 2006). They are more older (usually in their 40s), have between 10 and 20 years of professional experience in the field, and typically attend their program of study part time while they continue to work (Perry, 2012). In addition, these working professionals have historically viewed their scholarly work (the dissertation, for example) as a means to help them understand deeper and in more critical ways to solve specific problems of practice (Clifford & Guthrie, 1988; Deering, 1998; Ludlow, 1964) rather than for “discovering new truths” or theories (Freeman, 1931, p. 1).

More recently, a CPED research team investigated CPED-influenced programs at 21 member institutions with the support of a $700,000 U.S. Department of Education Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education grant. Part of this work sought to understand more about students in CPED-influenced EdD programs. Zambo, Zambo, Buss, Perry, and Williams (2013) questioned 296 EdD students and graduates (266 current students, 30 graduates). Of the 296 participants, 143 (65.9%) were from PK-12 education, 69 (31.8%) were from postsecondary education, and 5 (2.3%) were from professions outside of education (e.g., law). Leading change in practice settings was the most prevalent reason participants chose an EdD program (Zambo et al., 2013).

CPED claims are based on the reality that most students in doctoral programs in education are practitioners. What CPED-aligned programs want to do is to move away from the treatment of doctoral programs in education as a “fast track” (Wergin, 2011, p. 120) career credential and to create the clear lines of distinction that allow us to improve and strengthen both degrees as well as encourage each degree to be held accountable for its respective outcomes. By examining who our students are, we are not tracking them; rather, we are developing programs that best meet their professional needs.

Perhaps there is merit to the Shulman et al. (2006) suggestion that a new name be given to the EdD degree. They suggested the Professional Practice Doctorate, which we use within CPED but have found problematic at the university level. CPED recognizes that there exist many academics who were trained in research EdD programs, as there are many practitioners who were trained in research PhD programs. The CPED work is not intended to diminish or even redefine the past. Rather, we are oriented toward the future. Our work seeks to strengthen the EdD for the preparation of the next generation of practitioner experts and school (K-12) and college leaders in education—especially those who will generate new knowledge and scholarship about educational practice and/or related policies and who will shoulder with well-founded confidence the responsibility for stewarding the education profession. The hallmark of CPED is the active engagement of the member institutions with local school and college leaders in a mutual definition of local needs and the joint development of relevant and rich practitioner preparation programs. After 7 years of continuous examination and experimentation, CPED is at the forefront of an effort to make profound and meaningful changes in the practice of educational leadership.
Call for Nominees

2014 Excellence in Educational Leadership Award

Deadline: March 30, 2014

The Award

The UCEA Executive Committee is asking for nominees for the 18th Annual Educational Leadership Award, in recognition of practicing school administrators who have made significant contributions to the improvement of administrator preparation. This distinguished school administrator should demonstrate an exemplary record of supporting school administrator preparation efforts. This award, one of national recognition, provides a unique mechanism for UCEA universities to build good will and recognize the contributions of practitioners to the preparation of educational leaders. Funds to establish the Educational Leadership Award were originally donated to UCEA by the Network of University Community School Districts, a consortium of school districts in university towns. However, UCEA now fully funds this important initiative.

The Procedure

The UCEA Plenum Representative (PSR) at each participating university should consult with colleagues and other constituencies designated by faculty to identify a worthy recipient. The PSR (or a designee) should plan to make the award presentation at an annual departmental, college, or university ceremony. The nomination deadline is March 15, 2014.

After that time, UCEA will provide official certificates of recognition to universities who have designated a recipient and publish the names of the award recipients and their sponsoring university in the UCEA Review. Additionally, recipients’ names will be placed on the UCEA mailing list for 1 year. If desired, UCEA also will provide a boilerplate press release for announcing the award recipient to news agencies; however, the university may choose to coordinate this announcement through its public relations office in order to include additional information about the award presentation. To nominate a candidate, please complete the Nomination Form found on our website: http://www.ucea.org/the-excellence-in-educational/

http://www.ucea.org/the-excellence-in-educational/

Nominations due March 30, 2014

Questions? Call UCEA Headquarters at (434) 243-1041
Over the last 30 years, I have been puzzling through the questions and perspectives that have been surfaced in recent articles in the *UCEA Review*. I have examined issues of the education of professors and school practitioners with the academic lens and written extensively for university colleagues about these matters. Throughout the years, I have also had the opportunity to work on the preparation issue with policy, practice, and development lenses in a variety of states and with an assortment of professional associations. Over that time, I have arrived at an essential grounded conclusion that I hope can add to the discussion: The critical issue is the preparation for a specific line of work, to conduct academic scholarship or to lead schools and related PK-12 educational institutions. Equating the work to reach these two distinct positions is at best not wise, reflects naivete if not arrogance on the part of the professoriate, and is often unethical (see related article, “Of Questionable Value” in this issue of *UCEA Review*).

What is the essence of the problem—and the solution? In its simplest and most powerful form, it is illustrated in Figure 1. Model 1 therein reveals the architecture we use currently to prepare both future academics and future leaders of PK-12 educational institutions. The ground for the model is the “academic disciplines,” such as economics (school finance), political science (politics of education, school–community relations), sociology (organizational theory), and so forth. In effect, the answer to the question of “why do students get what they do?” is this: “Because this is what people at the university know and can do.” This is a reasonable answer if we are preparing future colleagues to assume professorial roles. It has proven to make almost no sense when we are preparing colleagues to work as leaders of PK-12 educational institutions. It is actually dysfunctional. It has produced a robust set of myths (e.g., the never-built bridge between theory and practice) and resulted in the marginalization of practice in universities.

The issue that needs our attention and our labors is what is a more appropriate ground for the preparation of school and district leaders? The anchor for preparation of school leaders should be the practice of schooling—the challenges, opportunities, and ongoing activities of leadership. We see this reflected in Model 2 in the figure. Here, the wisdom and skills of the university accompany learning the art, science, and craft of leading. An example to illustrate the issue might be helpful here. When we interview superintendents, we generally ask them this question: “What is the most important aspect of your job?” The nearly universal reply is “working with the board of education.” When we studied a sample of all the EdD programs in the country a decade or so ago, we found no program with a course on this aspect of the job (or any related topic). How is this possible? It is possible because we honor the social sciences and then move to teach what we know and can do rather than the knowledge and skills needed to do the work of school leadership. And then we pass off responsibility for “transfer” to the students, asking them to construct a bridge to usefulness that very few of us at the university have ever built.

The idea that good education should prepare people for both roles is conceptually and empirically odd. Flip the argument. There are very few research-prepared colleagues in the university who as a former district and state administrator I would trust to lead a school. Does this make them “lesser” colleagues? Not at all, why would I expect someone who has spent almost all of his or her time learning the methods of scientific inquiry and growing deep knowledge in a specific domain (e.g., second-language instruction for my current research assistant) and sitting on my hip for 4 years to learn to conduct research to successfully run a school?

The logic runs in the opposite direction as well. Why would we expect a colleague who pursued and mastered a broad general knowledge base (e.g., working with the media, evaluating teachers, keeping the school in good repair, mastering interpersonal skills and teamwork, understanding special education law, etc.) to be equipped to earn high-impact scores (e.g., h-index ratings) in the area of research? I wouldn’t. That does not make him or her a “lesser” colleague.

When the story of preparation is unpacked, it is the EdD students who are consistently damaged. Here is the real inequity in the narrative. These students routinely are provided with courses that are of very little use to them. We ignore even the most obvious absurdities in our programs. We provide “methods” that almost no practitioners will use on the job simply because we are unable (and unwilling) to see beyond our own world. Pick the next 25 principals or superintendents (not in a preparation program) and ask them when is the last time they

---

**Figure 1.** Ground for preparation programs in educational leadership.
grappled with a regression equation. We assign work that only makes sense using our lenses. For example, you can safely bet your retirement account that you will not find a single principal (not in a preparation program) who has written more than two pages at one time in the last 10 years. We require students to take bundles of material that bear almost no relation to the work they do in leading educational institutions. Then we send large numbers of these students (I think in the 25–40% range, but we keep these numbers buried) into the wilderness of the ABD because they cannot complete a completely meaningless, dysfunctional, and painful assignment (i.e., the dissertation). Surely, we can do better for our EdD students.

Academic colleagues are often unhappy with me when I weigh in on the preparation issue. For sure, the landscape is much more nuanced than can be treated in this short essay. Yet regardless of their unhappiness, the essential point holds. The ground of programs and degrees for educational practitioners, whatever the names or titles, must be practice. What might this look like? Pick a district in your area that is closing a school. Use it as the “courses” for a semester. Bring academic wisdom in a just-in-time manner as students struggle with issue of parental involvement, finances, collecting meaningful data, fairness, organizational analysis, and so forth. How about a semester devoted to working with/on a school that was recently rezoned and finds itself with unfamiliar groups of students? How about a course in creating hybrid models of schooling that serve the increasing number of homeschooled children in a community? How about spending a semester developing tools to measure the degree of pastoral care in a school through the eyes of students? The essential charge is to create opportunities to infuse what we have to offer in the context of grounded challenges, opportunities, and problems, not in artificial and often meaningless boxes.

New UCEA Member: University of Denver

The vision of the University of Denver (founded in 1864) is to be a great private university dedicated to the public good. The Morgridge College of Education actualizes this vision by preparing highly competent, socially responsible, ethical, and caring professionals to promote learning in diverse settings. The Educational Leadership and Policy Studies (ELPS) program offers in-context learning through high-quality content and research, authentic projects and field experiences, and individualized support from a team of experienced school leaders and university faculty. The program offers two certificate program models (in-person and blended online) for principal preparation. Both models feature deep partnerships with schools and school districts and internships supported by mentor principals. The university also offers master’s and doctoral (EdD and PhD) programs in ELPS. The program’s signature pedagogy integrates the work of real educational contexts within every course and expects all students to apply learning to support leadership and improvement efforts in their educational settings as they develop their own personal leadership capacity.

The ELPS faculty are full-time university professors and other experienced educators who are currently employed with districts, schools, and other related professions in the region. The goal of the faculty is that ELPS students develop a strong commitment to core values essential for ethical, visionary, courageous, transformative, and responsible leaders as well as the skills and abilities necessary for success as leaders in educational settings.

http://morgridge.du.edu/
Of Questionable Value: The EdD Dissertation —An Essay

Joseph Murphy
Vanderbilt University

For many years now, I have argued that the dissertation requirement for colleagues preparing for senior positions of leadership in the practice arm of the profession makes very little sense. Worse, it actually corrupts doctoral preparation for school and district leaders. In this essay, questions about the validity and appropriateness of the EdD dissertation are surfaced. The objective is to throw a rope into the quicksand of our illusions about the dissertation, to help us rethink this requirement in the portfolio of doctoral work for practitioner colleagues.

My critique extends to the entire EdD program of study. While the focus here is squarely on the dissertation dimension of those programs, some of the general criticism leaks into the narrative. This is not an empirical analysis, although many of my assertions are easily verifiable. The tools in use here are common sense, logic, and comparative analysis. To set the stage, here is my definition of the EdD dissertation: “Work that need not be done by those who should not be doing it.” It is a less-than-useful (softer interpretation) or foolish (harsher interpretation) obligation imposed on students by managers of the program caravan who should know better. The chronicle is presented in four chapters below, all centered on the lack of validity for the assignment: ersatz uniqueness, program corruption, marginalization of practice, and absence of an appropriate ethic.

Are We That Special?
The essential question here is that if the dissertation is such an important instrument in the toolbox for educating practitioners, would we not expect the other professions to include it in their programs? A quick trip around any large university will reveal that they do not, not in human or veterinary medicine, not in business or law schools, not in the dental school, and so forth. Education is the only “professional school” that includes this particular program requirement. So, why do we follow this singular strategy? A number of scholars have devoted attention to this question over the years (Clifford & Guthrie, 1988; Culbertson, 1988). The consensual answer is that it has more to do with promoting the academic credentials of colleges of education and the cherished badges of identity of its professors than it does with the needs and interests of the students in those colleges. The theme these analysts develop is that education colleges (and departments of school leadership) patterned themselves on models found in the arts and sciences rather than in the professions. This, of course, is a general problem that has produced a distorted framework for doctoral programs overall, but our attention here is devoted to the dissertation. We have dissertations because the arts and sciences have dissertations. The answer is almost as simple as that.

Now if we had the courage to admit this, that would be one thing—a wrong thing, for sure, but at least one we were willing to defend. But such courage is in short supply. And we have tricked ourselves into accepting a range of less-than-satisfactory (softer interpretations) or foolish (harsher interpretation) answers as legitimate. So let us begin again with another essential question. Does the EdD dissertation help colleagues be more effective practitioners? Of course, as with many important dimensions of our programs, we have no evidence that this is the case, so we have created an assorted variety of platitudes and a Niagara of verbiage to support our claim about the linkages here. Some of these are tautological in nature, justifications that assign blame for our own poor decisions to others (e.g., this is an important aspect of “doctoral work,” the graduate school requires it). Many of these claims (softer interpretation) or nostrums (harsher assessment) pivot on the role of the dissertation in helping students learn in a general sense and/or lead more effectively. In essence, the dissertation is good for them. The point is not that these claims are false, but anemic. Anything can help people learn. Taking up a new sport or learning to write poetry, for example. My own assessment is that most practitioners would “learn to think” more effectively by learning to ski than they would developing a dissertation. The important question is how much capital for such a limited payoff should be invested? There is a considerable range of experiences that get us to the objective of helping students learn to learn and lead to learn much more productively than the dissertation.

If not of significant benefit to the individual (and we properly discount the ersatz prestige to departments and faculty), then perhaps the body of knowledge being generated through dissertations in our EdD programs is benefiting the profession of school leadership writ large. This is a standard argument for the dissertation; new deposits are being added to the vault of professional knowledge. The evidence here is decidedly underwhelming. I am aware of none beyond the exceptional case. The evidence that is pushed out is generally the result of corrupt accounting, scant of data and overserved by ideology. This is not a difficult assertion to confirm. Pick 100 EdD dissertations at random, say 10 per year for 10 years, and see what, if any, contribution has been made to the knowledge base. At best, what you will find is that these dissertations are on the outskirts of influence.

So, if the dissertation is of marginal value to the individual and provides a less-than-creditable harvest for the profession, it seems wise to rethink its place of honor in our programs. If we cast a broad gaze over the knowledge base of how people develop the art and craft of a profession, an array of more effective alternatives is available.

Dissertation as Viral Infection

As is the case with its arts and science cousins, the social science disciplines, the dissertation exerts a penumbra of dysfunctional influence on the balance of learning opportunities in our EdD programs. It infects the curriculum. It reinforces the discipline-based planks that anchor EdD programs, planks that have a precarious fit with the field of practice. Even more troubling, it infuses a series of questionable methods courses into the curriculum. You need, the argument is advanced, these “methods” in order to undertake the scholarly assignment of completing a dissertation. In short, the delusion of the need for a dissertation leads to the illusionary cor-
ollary of the need for methods courses. The problem here is not with the importance of methods. It is that these are the methods of the academy, what academics need to do their work, not methods culled from the work of practice, or at least adapted and fit to that context.

So the upshot of all this is that we require a noticeable portion of the EdD program be devoted to the completion of an assignment that provides a very thin form of nourishment for leaders. Together, these two distortions (i.e., the dissertation and accompanying methods courses) consume in the neighborhood of 30% of the entire EdD program. My assessment is that this is the high water mark of inappropriateness. I also believe that the cold air of a new world is beginning to blow over the profession. Surely it is time to address these relics of the past and cleanse the ancestral tapestry of doctoral programs for colleagues in practice.

The Marginalization of Practice

Scholars for some time now have documented and explored the gap between the geography of administrative practice and the culture of universities (Bridges, 1977; Erickson, 1977; Goldhammer, 1983). Nowhere is our disregard (soft assessment) or disrespect (harsher view) more obvious than in the context of the EdD dissertation. The flow of work here generally bears scant resemblance to the activity rhythms of school leaders. We have already noted the (generally prideful) misspecification of methods in EdD programs. Additional silliness in preparing leaders is widely on display in and around the dissertation as well. We would do well to remind ourselves:

1. The dissertation is about specialization and becoming an expert in a defined domain of learning, whereas the people we are helping develop are generalists.
2. The dissertation honors writing, apprenticeship writing for a career of publication, yet the colleagues we are assisting rarely write (80% of the work is interpersonal exchange), and when they do, the writing bears very little resemblance to the academic writing in a dissertation.
3. The dissertation features the consumption of research articles and the conducting of an “original” piece of research, yet the students we are educating will rarely if ever read a research article (at least as defined by us) and will almost surely never conduct another research study in their careers.

It seems reasonable that we create learning opportunities with better fits to the world of practice than those found in dissertations. When we fail to do so, we marginalize practice.

A Question of Ethics

One of the issues associated with the EdD dissertation that is largely (generous interpretation) or completely (harsher view) ignored in the literature is the matter of noncompleters, especially the All But Dissertation (ABD) colleagues. The impoverished nomenclature here alone (defining people by what they lack or their failures) is telling, is it not? There are a number of issues that merit attention. To begin, while I lack the firmness of numbers, it is accurate, I believe, to claim that the pool of these “failures” is not insignificant. A fair number of our colleagues finish programs of study but are unable to complete the dissertation requirement. This is an opportune moment to remind ourselves that in nearly every other profession the relationship between finishing coursework and earning a degree is isomorphic. Only we seem to have been wise enough to add a massive requirement beyond the accumulation of necessary courses, a model that is completely foreign to learners based on 25 years or so of the previous schooling they have had.

Nearly every domain of the leadership profession (e.g., the finance scholars, social justice colleagues, school improvement analysts) holds that blaming young people for failure in school is wrongheaded. Yet a similar ethic of care is generally conspicuous by its absence when it comes to our failures, i.e., ABD colleagues. In all my time in the profession, I have never heard a university assume accountability for the failure of an EdD student to complete his or her degree. The idea of refunding at least the financial capital that these students have invested is completely off grid of consciousness. Almost always, the finger of blame is pointed directly at the student, with remarkably little self-analysis. My assessment is that this is morally suspect.

Conclusion

The EdD program in educational leadership is in need of serious analysis across the board. We have too much of this good thing. We educate all the veterinarians in the United States in 29 schools, and there are as many of them as there are principals and superintendents. We graduate 44,000 attorneys a year from 201 law schools. We prepare all our medical doctors in 141 schools, and there are more than 8 times as many of them as there are of principals and superintendents. The EdD curriculum also leaves a good deal to be desired. Much of it is simply a rehash of what students received in their master’s coursework. Practice-anchored work in our doctoral programs is even less visible than in master’s programs.

Perhaps most troubling though is our unthoughtful use of the dissertation to educate practitioners. It has produced marginal gains for individuals and for the profession writ large. There is remarkably little justification for its use. It is neither valid nor appropriate. It relies for support on miasma of ideology. It amounts to little more than the hauling around of old habits for us and a crucible of hardship for many students. The capital invested by students and universities could be much better employed. It was an astonishing misjudgment for the profession to have chosen this pathway. The time is at hand to lean upon some courage and sweep loose from the old moorings.
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The Interment of Edd Disser

Joseph Murphy
Vanderbilt University

It was only a line in the paper. Dr. Edd Disser was to be buried today, in a pauper’s grave in the charitable section of the municipal cemetery. No marker was to be placed.

I felt a peculiar need to attend. Closure perhaps to our long struggle over the years? Some notion of finality?

I did not expect a large crowd given the distasteful time before the trial and the subsequent plea bargain—events that pushed friends and supporters away, all quite taken aback by their own sins and the frailness of their own grip on the educational reins.

But the fact that I was the lone spectator was unexpected. It certainly would have surprised Edd Disser himself for we were ferocious adversaries. I had long considered him the seminal figure in an unseemly and fraudulent enterprise, one whose stench was scented over with the perfume of power and money. He, of course, had little use for me and grew exceedingly antagonistic over the years.

Still, that no one was present was a shock. After all, he was from the most noble of university families. His brothers and sisters ruled over all the sciences and the arts. Their forefathers, and their forefathers, and all of those before them had for nearly 1,000 years held similar roles. Not one of them was visible today, however. Given the damage the Edd had caused the family through the years I should, perhaps, have been less surprised. Royalty’s grasp is often more tenuous than we are led to believe I think.

But that not a single friend or ally was on hand was, I would suggest, ungracious at best and cowardly at worst. After all, more than a few score of college presidents had courted Edd in the hope of employing his bounty to enhance the status of their institutions and, of course, indirectly themselves. They knew full well that Edd could ensure them a seat at the table of doctoral-granting institutions, and they enticed him somewhat shamelessly. Entire PR departments were kept busy documenting the wooing process and the growing relationship. And all of this in spite of the fact that these leaders neither liked Edd nor held him in much regard.

Not one from the multitude of provosts and deans who had used their friendship with Edd to access his considerable wealth in the service of noneducational ends was present either. With the power of his imprimatur and the protection of his mantle, Edd had led many faculty members toward organizational respectability. But none of these beneficiaries wished to be seen graveside either.

After the cemetery staff had left, I walked to the fresh earth that covered Edd. I replayed the events of the last years that had ended Edd’s position of influence and thought about how we had arrived at this end, one that would have seemed beyond probability when he started to change for Edd, I think it would be when those he enticed on his grand voyage and then abandoned with so little regard began to coalesce. For as long as anyone could remember, those who were denied entrance to the kingdom were told, and came to believe, that they, not Edd and his cartel, were responsible for their being cast aside. The brush of inadequacy was often applied—limited dedication, intellectual shortcoming, and so forth. At more charitable times, failures were allowed to pass as consequences of changing conditions—growing families, increasing work responsibilities, and so on. Generally, the discarded were too embarrassed to respond, simply putting the entire distasteful experience behind them. But no longer. By the turn of the new century, many of these casualties had begun find their voice.

The entire chain of events was surreal and shockingly brief. It was in 2009 that Edd had been arrested. Racketeering and mail fraud were the dominant charges. And because Edd had shifted such a significant portion of his business to online platforms over the previous decades, he had opened himself to even greater prosecution. As the case against Edd was picking up increasing momentum, the defense, clearly worried, pressed for a plea bargain.

A deal was struck. Edd would be given probation and be free to leave in the mornings to take care of personal affairs but was prohibited from going within 100 feet of any college or school property. He lingered longer than most thought he would, finally falling prey to an infection from the mold that inexorably crept across his lungs. It was only a line in the paper. Dr. Edd Disser was to be buried today, in a pauper’s grave in the charitable section of the municipal cemetery. No marker was to be placed.

I suspect that Edd himself was the first to realize that the narrative was about to make a sharp turn, although no one, least of all Edd, knew just how dramatic that shift would turn out to be.

Complaints about Edd began to surface with less caution. More people began to listen. His Achilles heel of irrelevance was growing more visible. While still on the top of the world, you could feel that Edd was becoming a bit uneasy. Rather than offering up the usual array of cosmetic changes (e.g., dropping the strict requirement of adherence to the five-chapter format) and appeals to the gods of routines (e.g., nonnegotiable constraints imposed by the graduate school), Edd and his friends began to reference more moderate ideas. Edd was going to create a more “professional” version of himself, an “alternative” Edd, if you will. It had a nice ring to it and was consumed by increasing numbers of universities with some relief. Life as it was could continue and standards, such as they were, would be held at all costs.

In retrospect, if we need to locate the point when fortunes started to change for Edd, I think it would be when those he enticed on his grand voyage and then abandoned with so little regard began to coalesce. For as long as anyone could remember, those who were denied entrance to the kingdom were told, and came to believe, that they, not Edd and his cartel, were responsible for their being cast aside. The brush of inadequacy was often applied—limited dedication, intellectual shortcoming, and so forth. At more charitable times, failures were allowed to pass as consequences of changing conditions—growing families, increasing work responsibilities, and so on. Generally, the discarded were too embarrassed to respond, simply putting the entire distasteful experience behind them. But no longer. By the turn of the new century, many of these casualties had begun find their voice.

The entire chain of events was surreal and shockingly brief. It was in 2009 that Edd had been arrested. Racketeering and mail fraud were the dominant charges. And because Edd had shifted such a significant portion of his business to online platforms over the previous decades, he had opened himself to even greater prosecution. As the case against Edd was picking up increasing momentum, the defense, clearly worried, pressed for a plea bargain.

A deal was struck. Edd would be given probation and be placed under house arrest in the library, surrounded by the thousands of his offspring that lay unopened on the shelves. He was free to leave in the mornings to take care of personal affairs but was prohibited from going within 100 feet of any college or school of education. He was also forbidden from having any contact with graduate students.

He lingered longer than most thought he would, finally falling prey to an infection from the mold that inexorably crept across his offspring.

As I turned to leave his burial plot, I saw what looked to be a very young Edd running toward the grave site.

When he arrived, he placed some plastic flowers on the mound of earth and, in hand, mumbled some phrases that had no meaning to me. When he was finished, I inquired into his purpose there. Why, I am Dr. Disser’s son, he said, Capstone Disser.

I left less sanguine than when I arrived.
Innovative Programs:
Preparing Practitioner-Scholars to Lead Urban Schools: Howard University’s Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies

Hans W. Klar
Clemson University

This Innovative Programs column features Howard University’s Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies (ELPS). Howard University is one of the newest UCEA members, having been accepted as a full member at the Plenum Session held during the 2013 Annual Convention. In addition to being a new UCEA member, ELPS is being featured for its focus on preparing educators and policy makers who are strongly connected with the urban communities they serve, while having an awareness of international approaches to school leadership.

The Department of ELPS

ELPS offers three programs: a Master of Education (MEd) and a Certificate of Advanced Graduate Study (CAGS) in Educational Administration and Supervision, as well as an Educational Doctorate in Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, which is affectionately called EAGLE (Educational Administration and Guided Leadership Experiences). Each of these programs is focused on understanding and resolving educational leadership and management issues in urban settings, particularly those issues that relate to the needs of African Americans and other traditionally underserved groups.

The ELPS faculty has sought to fulfill this mission by tailoring their programs to meet the needs of local schools. This has been accomplished in part through the content of the programs. The chair of ELPS, Dr. Dawn Williams, noted that potential students often query her about the lack of a course offering specifically focused on urban education. Her response to such questions is that each course is focused on meeting the needs of schools in urban settings. As an example, Williams explained that the content of the Financial Management course is concentrated on the unique challenges of financing schools in an urban environment.

Designing its programs to meet the needs of local schools also has been accomplished by collaborating with a neighboring district, Prince George's County Public Schools. In addition to working with local school and district leaders to identify areas of need, university faculty work with school and district leaders to select candidates for enrollment in ELPS programs and coteach courses to provide students with content thoroughly grounded in both research and practice.

MEd and CAGS in Educational Administration and Supervision

The MEd and CAGS programs are intended to prepare both aspiring and practicing school leaders seeking to enhance their professional knowledge and skills in leading change in urban schools. They are looking forward to expanding this offering to include a primary focus on educational policy in order to prepare policy professionals with key knowledge about students living in communities of color, an important aspect of ELPS programs given the university’s close proximity to the U.S. capital.

EdD in Educational Leadership and Policy Studies (EAGLE)

ELPS began offering an EdD in 2000 through its EAGLE program. With the assistance of external support, the EAGLE program has expanded to offer three different strands. EAGLE is a traditional, campus-based doctoral program. Participants in EAGLE are typically practicing principals seeking a district-level leadership position. However, up to 10% of seats in the cohort is reserved for individuals with other career aspirations. This 10% of students may include teachers, central office staff, staff from nonprofit organizations, or other individuals interested in developing the knowledge and skills to support urban schools.

EAGLE II, supported by the U.S. Department of Education, was a program focused on the legal aspects of special education leadership. EAGLE II coursework had a strong focus in special education law, and although it provided some logistical challenges, students were able to take courses through ELPS and Howard University’s School of Law.

EAGLE III, a field-based doctoral program offered in collaboration with a local school district, was established to prepare practitioner-scholars to help address the district’s most pressing issues. EAGLE III students are admitted through a collaborative selection process and courses are taught with input from the district. In some cases, ELPS faculty and district representatives coteach courses. Williams explained that in the case of the Human Resource Management course, students learn theory and research related to the human resource processes and the link to the organization’s infrastructure from their Howard University professor, while learning about personnel practices pertinent to their own district from a district administrator. This coteaching arrangement means students are able to apply research-based practices to their immediate school contexts.

Elective Courses

As part of the collaboration between ELPS and the local district, the elective courses that are part of the EdD are designed to meet pressing needs determined by the district whenever possible. Examples of such courses include leadership for science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) education, leadership for diverse learners, and community-based leadership. The emphasis on leadership for STEM education was developed in part due to the recognition that principals without STEM backgrounds are increasingly finding themselves assigned to STEM-focused schools. The emphasis on diverse learners includes leadership issues associated with meeting the needs of students who receive special education services. Interestingly, this also includes
attention to gifted education, which does not traditionally receive a lot of consideration in African American communities, according to Williams. The emphasis on community-based leadership addresses ways school leaders can connect with and recognize the strengths of the communities they serve.

The EAGLE Dissertation
As in most other doctoral programs, students in the EAGLE program must complete a dissertation. ELPS students work with their faculty advisor and a district representative to choose a problem that requires further research from within the district. The students then receive guidance from both the faculty member and the district to complete their study. In this way, students receive guidance in both coursework and their dissertations from Howard University faculty members and practicing district leaders. This combination of scholarship closely embedded in practice is helping to prepare practitioner-scholars able to critique current practices and apply research-based solutions to improve the education for the children they serve.

International Connections
Though ELPS has a strong commitment to preparing practitioner-scholars equipped to address the educational and political challenges of educating students in their immediate, urban settings, the department is also focused on preparing students who have a global perspective of school leadership. ELPS recently cosponsored an international leadership conference in India entitled Invigorating the Role of District Education Officers for 21st Century Leadership with a focus on the role of leadership and leadership preparation from a variety of national and cultural perspectives. ELPS graduates are able to consider a wider range of approaches to meeting the needs of local schools by considering the experiences and perspectives of educators from around the world.

For more information about the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at Howard University, please contact:

Dr. Dawn G. Williams
Chair, Associate Professor
ASA 223
(202) 806-7342
dgwilliams@howard.edu

New UCEA Member:
Howard University

Howard University is a private, doctoral, research-extensive university comprised of 13 schools and colleges with more than 10,000 students. The university is ranked by the National Science Foundation as the nation's top producer of African American PhDs in STEM fields.

The Howard University School of Education traces its history to the founding of the university in 1867 and graduated its first class in 1890 from the Department of Pedagogy. Today, the university offers bachelor's, master's, and doctoral (PhD and EdD) degrees through three departments: Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Leadership and Policy Studies (ELPS), and Human Development and Psychoeducational Studies. Accredited by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, five degree programs hold national recognition status from specialized professional associations: early childhood education (NAEYC), elementary education (NAESP), special education (CEC), educational administration (ELCC), and school psychology (NASP).

The school's seminal research organ, the Journal of Negro Education, examines issues incident to the education of Blacks throughout the diaspora. With more than 80 years in continuous publication as a refereed, scholarly journal, the Journal of Negro Education ranks 15th (out of 123) among all U.S. social science and cultural journals. The school houses four auxiliary units: Upward Bound-TRIO; the Early Learning Program (ELP), a NAEYC-accredited prekindergarten-kindergarten school; the Capstone Institute for School Reform; and the Center for Academic Excellence, a university service unit providing supplemental and tutorial instruction in math, writing, and study skills.

The ELPS currently serves approximately 130 graduate students, guided by a conceptual framework designed to prepare engaged researchers, reflective practitioners, and leaders of change. The ELPS has robust partnerships with Prince George's County School District, the nation's 16th largest school district. Through its Educational Administration and Guided Leadership Experience (EAGLE) III program, ELPS assists the district with its leadership succession and development by providing an EdD degree program to cohorts of rigorously selected, seasoned district administrators. EAGLE III is supported by Prince George's County School District through funding from the U.S. Department of Education and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation.

The program faculty includes Dawn Williams Salters, Melanie Carter, Lois Harrison-Jones, Re Saravanabathan, Peter Sola, Zollie Stevenson, Jr., and Leslie T. Fenwick.

http://www.howard.edu/schooleducation/
Point/Counterpoint:

Needed: The Law and Spirit of the Law in Overcoming Persistent Racial Divides in Gifted and Disabled Programming

W. Kyle Ingle
Bowling Green State University

It is incumbent upon educational leaders to seek and promote the success of all students under their care, embracing differences and creating educational environments that facilitate learning regardless of their first language, income, race or ethnicity, or enrollment in special education or gifted education. Certainly, federal and state laws mandate the pursuit of this goal. Researchers have shown that advocates who challenged the inadequacies of educational opportunities for children with disabilities took inspiration and borrowed strategies from the civil rights movement and Brown v. Board of Education (Smith & Kozleski, 2005). Advocates for the plaintiff in Mills v. Board of Education (1972) and early special education scholars such as Lloyd M. Dunn noted racial and ethnic disparities as both characteristic and problematic for education. Now we have the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), amended and reauthorized in 2004, which seeks to ensure that children with disabilities have the opportunity to receive a free appropriate public education. However, disproportionate enrollments of students of color in special education and gifted education persist in spite of the law and subsequent regulatory guidelines.

UCEA, among others, is an organization that explicitly values and supports the learning and development of all children and diversity, equity, and social justice in all educational organizations. Organizations such as the National Policy Board on Educational Administration have worked to establish and revise research-based standards and elements for educational leaders. Among others, these revised standards and elements promote accountability, democracy, equity, diversity, and social justice. Graduate programs in educational leadership are cognizant of the need to evaluate what they teach and how they teach it, as evidenced by the work of our own Hackmann and McCarthy (2011), but programs in educational leadership continue to struggle with the inclusion of content related to special education and special education law. These also remain a major source of litigation for schools and districts.

So there is the law and there are people, the organizations that they are a part of, and the actions (or inactions) that they take individually and collectively. The following two essays reflect on the persistence of racial divides in gifted education and special education. The first of these focuses on the legal bases for remedying the persistence of racial divides in gifted education and special education law. The second addresses the need for social awareness and change that leadership continue to struggle with the inclusion of content related to special education and special education law. These also remain a major source of litigation for schools and districts.

Education Law and Equity

Charles J. Russo
The University of Dayton

Due to a history of inequity in many corners of the United States, the law has tried to address the needs of students of color (aka non-Whites), some of whom are also identified as exceptional students, regardless of where they fit on a continuum ranging from gifted to profoundly disabled. The term exceptional means students with special needs associated with being gifted and/or learning disabled, for example.

In response to the needs of special education and gifted students, two federal statutes come into play, IDEA (2004) and the Jacob K. Javits Gifted and Talented Act, a law that has since have been incorporated into the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB, 2002).

The development of the IDEA, the older of the two statutes, originally known as the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, was spawned by the mandate in Brown v. Board of Education (1954) to provide equal educational opportunities for children of color. Moreover, a case predating the IDEA that served as a major catalyst in its enactment, Mills v. Board of Education of the District of Columbia (1972), addressed the claims largely of students of color. More specifically, Mills was filed by the parents of seven named exceptional children, most of whom were minorities, in the federal trial court in Washington, DC. The parents filed suit on behalf of perhaps as many as 18,000 students with disabilities who were not receiving programs of specialized education. Most of the children were classified as having behavioral or emotional problems and disorders, mental retardation (now referred to as intellectual disabilities), or attention deficit disorder or attention deficit and hyperactivity disorder.

In Mills, the court rejected the claim of officials that the school board lacked resources for all of its students, deciding that it had to spend its funds equitably to provide all children with educational opportunities consistent with their individualized needs and
abilities. The court ruled that school board officials could not deny services to children with disabilities or exclude them from school without affording them and their parents with due process. The court ordered official to provide due process safeguards before any children were excluded from school, reassigned, or had special education services terminated while outlining elaborate due process procedures that essentially formed the foundation for the due process safeguards that were included in IDEA.

More than 30 years after Mills, Congress finally took steps to address the inequities that led to the overidentification or disproportionate representation of students by race and ethnicity in special education programs. In IDEA (2004), Congress directed state officials to develop policies and procedures to prevent the overidentification or disproportionate representation of students by race and ethnicity (§ 1412(a)(24), 1418(d)(1)(A)(B). This part of IDEA requires local school officials to record the number of students from minority groups who are in special education classes while providing early intervention services for children in groups deemed to be overrepresented.

In a case interpreting IDEA’s overrepresentation provision, a federal trial court in Pennsylvania rejected the request of parents who sought class certification based on their claim that their school board practiced systematic and intentional racial segregation against African American students with learning disabilities (Blunt v. Lower Merion School Dist., 2009). The court found both that the proposed class of students was too broad and that any such claim had to be filed by individuals rather than by members of a group.

Turning to gifted education, which has not been litigated and scrutinized as much as special education, the only applicable federal law, the Jacob K. Javits Gifted and Talented Act, the culmination of years of federal efforts in this area, was, as noted, incorporated into NCLB (2002). Following the example of states such as Ohio, which requires school board officials to identify but not to offer funding to develop programs to serve students who are gifted (Ohio Revised Code, §2013), NCLB encourages local school boards to create programs for deserving children but does not provide funds to do so.

States, of course, are free to offer programs for children who are gifted and talented. Even so, few jurisdictions, such as Pennsylvania, have such a law in place. The Supreme Court of Pennsylvania unanimously affirmed that under a commonwealth statute and regulations requiring an Individualized Education Program for each gifted student, a child had the right to gifted education (Centennial School District v. Commonwealth, Department of Education, 1988). Further, an appellate court in Pennsylvania affirmed that a school board was required to provide an education sufficient to confer a benefit on a gifted student that was tailored to his unique needs pursuant to his Individualized Education Program (York Suburban School Dist. v. S.P., 2005). However, another appellate court in Pennsylvania clarified that this the law did not require boards to provide children with individual tutors or exclusive programs exceeding existing, regular, and special curricular offerings (Abington School District v. B.G., 2010).

A case from the Supreme Court of Connecticut continues to be typical of the treatment of children who are gifted (Bradley v. Board of Education of City of Meriden, 1994). The court unanimously affirmed that the state constitution did not confer the right to special educational programming on a student who was gifted. The court determined that the legislature’s failure to mandate a program for a child who is gifted did not violate his rights under the equal rights or equal protection provisions of the state constitution. Similarly, a federal trial court in Georgia rejected the claim of a student and her parents because she lacked a statutory right to gifted education (Long v. Fulton County School District, 2011). Clearly, the law can only go so far, raising the much-needed question of how best to ensure implementation.

The Right Attitude

Donna Ford
Peabody College, Vanderbilt University

An overview of laws designed to protect the rights of students in need of special educational programming, whether they are disabled or gifted, is in order as we seek equitable solutions to both overrepresentation and underrepresentation. It is one thing to have laws designed to protect the rights of disenfranchised individuals and groups, but another issue and challenge is how to ensure implementation of said laws. Despite the infamous notion of segregation that Brown v. Board of Education (1954) sought to eliminate, on which so many other cases and laws have been grounded, educational equity for two groups of students of color remains elusive. Black and Hispanic/Latino students continue to be sorely overrepresented in special education and gravely underrepresented in gifted education.

Each year, the U.S. Department of Education, under the auspices of the Office for Civil Rights, collects data valuable and invaluable to educators, decision makers and policy makers in understanding trends and making informed decisions about students. As of 2009, our nation’s two largest groups of “minority” students comprise 44% of public schools (Aud et al., 2012). By now, this number is higher, given ongoing demographics projections. This increasingly diverse student body is by no means matched by three other demographics, namely those of teachers, special education students, and gifted education students. Regardless of the year and existing laws, these three statistics have yet to change.

Regarding teacher demographics, Whites consistently comprise some 85% of the nation’s teaching force even though they represent little more than half of the U.S. school population. It cannot be denied that their attitudes about and expectations of Hispanic and Black students are significantly influential. Deficit thinking contributes to special education overreferrals and gifted education underreferrals and subsequent representation in both programs (Ford, Grantham, & Whiting, 2008).

Given federal mandates, special education demographics is under constant scrutiny as witnessed in the U.S. Department of Education Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services annual reports to Congress on the implementation of IDEA. Considering all special education categories, overrepresentation in high-incidence areas of disability is a significant and legitimate source of contention due to problems regarding subjectivity, testing, stigma, and outcomes for several special education labels or categories.

In the 2012 Civil Rights Data Collection Report, the Office for Civil Rights (2012) revealed that Black students were 19% of the sample but more than double those in special education. Hispanic students were 25% of the sample and also overrepresented.
among students receiving special education services but at a lower percentage than Black students. In this regard, it is important to note that 1 out of 8 students in the Civil Rights Data Collection sample (12%) had a disability—4.7 million served by IDEA and over 400,000 served by Section 504 only. Further, nearly 18% of these are African American males—even though they represent only 10% of the student population.

- In 2007, the percentage of the resident population ages 6–21 served under IDEA, Part B, varied by ethnicity. The percentage served under IDEA, Part B (i.e., risk index) was large for Black students (11.95%) and Hispanic students (8.44%).
- Black students ages 6–21 were 2.64 times more likely to be served under IDEA, Part B, for intellectual disabilities and 2.29 times more likely to be served under IDEA, Part B, for emotional disturbance than students aged 6–21 in all other racial and ethnic groups combined.

In this discussion, we must not overlook suspensions and expulsions in the context of equity, the law, and implementation. The Office for Civil Rights (2012) reported that across all districts, Black students are over 3 times more likely to be suspended or expelled than their White peers. In districts reporting expulsions under zero-tolerance policies, Hispanic and Black students represent 45% of the student body but 56% of the students expelled under such policies. Losen and Skiba (2010) identified subjective rather than objective patterns, revealing that subjectivity plays the major role in referrals to special education and for suspensions for Black students—males in particular.

The data regarding gifted education also are troublesome and inequitable, as access is denied to what is deemed our nation’s most rigorous school programs and services. In the 2012 Civil Rights Data Collection Report, Black students were only 10% and Hispanic students were only 16% of identified gifted students; thus, they were underrepresented by about 50% and 35%, respectively.

Singly and collectively, these data are telling and beg the questions: How effective are laws designed to promote equity if they are not implemented as intended? Why does de facto segregation exist throughout our educational system, especially in gifted and other programs designed to increase the probability of access to higher education such as Advanced Placement? Conversely, why is access to special education (as well as suspensions), often referred to as the school-to-prison pipeline, composed disproportionately of Black and Hispanic/Latino students—predominantly males?

Lack of access to equity in education has a long, disturbing history, as presented by Russo. Year after year, law after law, the outcomes remain stubborn to change and resistant to progress; this is somewhat akin to Sisyphean mythology. King Sisyphus was made to roll a huge boulder up a steep hill. However, before he could reach the top, the massive stone would roll back down, forcing him to begin again. The harder the law pushes for change, and just when we think there is progress, we take a few steps backward. Laws accompanied by equity-minded attitudes can help tackle ways to implement the law.

Joint Recommendations and Conclusions

(Russo & Ford)

As important as the legal system can be in helping to shape educational and social transformation, being the blunt instrument that it ultimately is, the law can only go so far in carrying out its desired effects. Put another way, as important as Brown v. Board of Education (1954) was in ordering an end to segregation based on race in American public education, it could only serve as the harbinger of the educational and societal change necessary to bring about integration, the positive coming together of individuals rather than desegregation’s mandating an end to the pernicious, unlawful practice of race-based separatism in schools by helping to move from the letter to the spirit of the law. Since the law can only go so far, educational leaders charged with preparing professionals to administer programs designed to eliminate over- and underrepresentation, acting in conjunction with administrators in the field might wish to consider the following three suggestions. In this short piece, we briefly address three recommendations.

First, in light of the changing demographics in the United States, leaders should restructure teacher and administrator preparation programs to focus more on cultural sensitivity and better means of identification and assessment. Put another way, given the range of ways in which children of color differ from their peers in other ethnic groups, educational leaders must develop holistic preparation programs, rather than one-shot workshops and colorblind degrees and courses. Our collective experiences in education and law have shown us that doing so is ineffective when it comes to equity-based change. More specifically, programs should be designed to provide school officials with the best possible means to identify, assess, and serve the educational needs of minority students who are in need of special education or gifted classes and opportunities.

Second, preparation programs, again, in light of current and projected population shifts, must recruit more educators of color so that children have more positive role models who are akin to members of their own communities. This is not to imply or state that White educators are incapable of working effectively with Hispanic/Latino and Black students. We advocate for any educator who is culturally competent and equity minded. As noted, insofar as the data reveal that the number of educators of color is disproportionately low (some 15%), it is imperative that such students be exposed to positive educational role models, especially males (e.g., Ford, 2010, 2013; Ladson-Billings, 2009).

Third, we believe that school leaders must develop improved school–community partnerships so that parents and caregivers can play a larger and more integral role in meeting the educational needs of their children. If educators can actively engage parents and caregivers in the education of their children, whether they are disabled, gifted, or both, then perhaps our young people will be better prepared to move to the next level, higher education, in their quest to become productive members of society.

If educational leaders can develop programming that focused on the needs of their students, regardless of their racial and educational needs as to disability or gifted status, then perhaps they can avoid the difficulties associated with the over- and underrepresentation of these two groups of students of color for the betterment of all. We urge for equity, which entails the merging of law and equity-minded attitudes. Doing so is a win-win for all of us.
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New UCEA Member: University of Michigan

The University of Michigan’s School of Education provides top-ranked programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels. The School of Education is home to faculty members and students who are advancing educational improvement through their research contributions, instructional activities, collaborative involvement with the education profession, and other service.

Among the current priorities of the School of Education is an effort to reconceptualize and redesign its graduate programs in Educational Leadership and Policy. This effort is being lead by Donald J. Peurach and Angeline Spain, assistant professors who joined the School of Education in 2011.

Approved by the Michigan Department of Education in September 2013, the newly redesigned Master of Arts in Leadership and Policy is centered on the collaborative practice of continuous improvement. The core focus of the program is to develop the capabilities of leadership teams to support systemic improvement in underperforming schools.

The MA is a full-time, 10-month, residential program that brings together a diverse array of graduate students with ambitions to improve educational opportunities and outcomes for all children. Some of these students pursue building-level leadership certification. Others pursue specialized knowledge central to school improvement: for example, instructional coaching, assessment, data analysis and use, community outreach, educational entrepreneurship, and more.

Efforts will soon begin to initiate a complementary redesign of the doctoral program, with a specific focus on system-level leadership supporting school-level improvement. With that, faculty in the Leadership and Policy program are excited to draw on the rich experiences of UCEA members in advancing professional preparation and research in educational leadership.

http://www.soe.umich.edu/academics/doctoral_programs/

Grad Student Column & Blog: Submissions Welcome

Two elements of the UCEA website are focused on issues and information relevant to the graduate students of UCEA. The Graduate Student Column typically features scholarship written by graduate students at UCEA member institutions. Column entries explore a variety of topics and allow the authors to present developing research and to the UCEA graduate student community. The Graduate Student Blog is a more discussion-oriented format encouraging conversation between graduate students via posts and comments. Topics addressed in the blog include discussion and links to educational leadership and educational policy news relevant to graduate students, as well as updates and information about ways graduate students can be more involved in UCEA. Graduate students are invited to send in contributions for both the Graduate Student Column and the Graduate Student Blog. To find out more, please e-mail uceadr@africa.edu.

www.ucea.org/graduate-student-column/
www.ucea.org/graduate-student-blog/
Interview With Suzanne Eckes

Lisa Bass
North Carolina State University

Suzanne Eckes is an associate professor in the Educational Leadership and Policy Studies Department at Indiana University. Suzanne has published over 75 school-law related articles and book chapters, is a co-editor of the *Principals Legal Handbook*, and served on the board of directors for the Education Law Association. She currently writes a monthly education law article for *Principal Leadership* magazine. Prior to joining the faculty at Indiana University, Suzanne was a high school French teacher and an attorney. She earned her Master’s in Education from Harvard University and her law degree and PhD from the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

**LB:** Thank you for agreeing to participate in this interview. Our interview will focus on special education and educational leadership. How did you become involved in legal literacy?

**SE:** You work with Matt Militello?

**LB:** Yes. We are in the same department.

**SE:** Ok. So I got involved with legal literacy as, it seems, through him, through his work as a former principal and his belief on how practicing principals—and he’s a former, I can’t remember if it’s an assistant principal or principal, I think it was a principal. Well, we would start talking at conferences about the importance of school leaders to have some legal literacy. And, you know of course I had always thought this, but I had never written specifically about legal literacy. And he and Dave Schimmel, Dave Schimmel was teaching at Harvard, a school at Harvard at the time, and they wrote an article, and I think they wrote it with another, with a school administrator. I can’t remember if it were just those two or if they had a third author. But they published a piece in the *Harvard Educational Review,* and I think it was 2007 on the importance of legal literacy, and it included special education but included lots of other topics. So that’s how I started writing about legal literacy. Sure, I had written lots of articles in the past about “Yeah, school leaders need to know about special education” but never under the umbrella of legal literacy.

**LB:** Please speak to your current role in the promotion of legal literacy.

**SE:** I wrote a book with David Schimmel and Matt Militello that highlights the importance of legal literacy for school leaders (Schimmel, Eckes, & Militello, 2010). Within this book we stress the need for principals to understand the importance of providing an equitable education to students with disabilities. We even provide a lesson plan for principals to use in an in-service session with teachers on the topic. David, Matt, and I are now working on a new book focused entirely on special education literacy with Janet Decker, Kevin Brady, and Gina Umpstead. This book in particular will help promote special education literacy.

Also, I teach a school law course to aspiring principals and an advanced school law course to aspiring superintendents. Within these courses we cover special education law and policy. We begin with an analysis of how the *Brown v. Board of Education* decision also opened the door to an equal protection analysis for discrimination of this marginalized group. During these sessions, we also examine compliance with the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), the Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA), and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act as well as state disability law.

There are several other topics that are covered in these school law courses (e.g., teacher/student speech rights, legal right of English language learner students, discrimination in employment). As a result, we do not devote enough time to special education. Janet Decker is developing a course devoted specifically to special education law for the program. We hope to eventually make this a requirement in our leadership preparation program at Indiana. Federal and state disability law is extremely complex and requires a more in-depth examination than what we give our current students. We are hopeful that this course will help fill this void.

We also offer a Director of Special Needs Licensure in Educational Leadership. The students in this cohort are involved in more in-depth study of special education law and policy. Unfortunately not everyone in our educational leadership program pursues this license.

**LB:** That’s impressive! You have discussed your interest in and the need for legal literacy, but to what extent do you believe practicing educational leaders, including principals and central office leaders, should be prepared to address special education issues in schools?

**SE:** I think it is imperative that school principals and other district administrators understand the need to provide services to students with special needs. In addition to understanding legal requirements, there are many ethical issues at play that are highlighted in recent research and policy. To give a few of many examples, we know from both the literature and federal policy reports that students of color are overrepresented in special education courses. We also know that students with disabilities are bullied and harassed at higher numbers than their nondisabled peers. The media, recent research, and governmental reports have documented the overuse of restraint and seclusion with students with disabilities and the underrepresentation of students with disabilities in athletic programs. In our program we have tried to assist school leaders in interpreting the case law and federal/state guidance in order to establish policies that provide for greater equity in public schools.

Beyond the important ethical dilemmas, school districts often spend thousands of dollars per year on litigation related to providing appropriate special education services. School personnel also spend a lot of time addressing legal issues that could have been avoided if they had received instruction in this area (see Andren, 2010; Schimmel et al., 2010).

Also through working with Matt Militello and Dave, we all collaborated on a book on legal literacy for principals (Schimmel et al., 2010). And I included that in my first response to you. But the book is actually 10 legal lesson plans for principals to use with their teaching staffs. So the teaching staffs become more legally literate. And one of the lesson plans is focused on special education law. And we know from the research, and we know from data that we’ve collected, and separate data that Matt and Dave collected, special education is probably the most litigated area in education law.
so that led to a second book, which they asked me to be a part of and I had absolutely no time to commit to it, so I said no. They are now writing a book: Matt, Dave, and Kevin Brady from North Carolina State and Janet Decker from Indiana State University, and, you know, I have other names in that file, too. They are now writing 10 lesson plans for special education law, which I think is fantastic.

**LB:** Yeah, this sounds very practical and very usable for ed leadership professors. I think it’s especially good because a lot of people who teach school law and special education law are not lawyers. I actually used to teach Special Ed Law and Ed Law myself, but I had no formal legal background. So this text would help people who are just pushed into teaching these courses and don’t have the background that you do.

**SE:** Yeah, yeah. And I think too, you know, these are just 1-hour lesson plans to generated to just spark the conversations; they are very legal focused. But, I think from there, they can be a jumping board into important policy, ethical, and moral discussions on special education leadership and issues related to them—specific lesson plans that they cover in their book. So I think it will be a good practical book for school leaders. I’m pretty sure this book’s getting published by Teacher’s College.

**LB:** In your opinion, what would preparation look like in an ideal program?

**SE:** Ideally it would be embedded into the law course as well as other courses within the program (e.g., ethics courses). The courses should be taught by instructors with experience in this area who have a deep understanding of the complex laws. In addition to embedding this topic in our courses, a stand-alone special education leadership or special education law course would be ideal. Of course, there is always the question about what will be removed from the required list of courses to provide space for this important topic.

**LB:** In your opinion, how does this compare to how they are actually prepared?

**SE:** Unfortunately, I think many programs struggle with finding a place for such a course.

**LB:** OK, good. Can you think of any examples of when, that you know of personally, of when educational leaders were not prepared properly and they were thrown into a situation dealing with special education law and it didn’t end well?

**SE:** Probably a lot. There are hundreds of cases every year, within special education. There are lawsuits that are filed typically by parents, against school districts and often the principals, sometimes principal superintendent is named or the school district itself. But literally hundreds of cases a year. And many of those cases do not end well for school leaders. And some of those cases, and I have argued, as well as Matt Militello and Dave Schimmel have argued, a lot of the cases could have been avoided, not all of them, but a lot of them could have been avoided, if the school leader had a higher level of legal literacy.

**LB:** What do you believe the role of educational leadership programs should be in addressing issues surrounding special education?

**SE:** Some programs might need to reconsider their audience. In my 10 years at Indiana University, I have seen more charter school and private school leaders enter our program. Some of these students have not gone through traditional teacher education programs and as a result many know less about special education law. Implementing these laws becomes problematic because some charter and private schools do not have the equivalent structure, resources, or support that traditional public schools have. It was not surprising that two recent studies note that charter schools experience many difficulties with fulfilling their legal obligations to students with disabilities (Drame, 2010; Wolf, 2011). Likewise, the Department of Justice recently investigated claims that private schools receiving vouchers in Wisconsin were serving a much lower percentage of students with disabilities than the traditional public schools.

And, as I’ve said, it’s difficult for programs to cover everything. Even we could do better here at Indiana University than what we are doing. We have a school law course for principals and an advanced school law course for superintendents, but that’s, you know, just one topic of many that we cover. And you’ve taught special education law, so you know, you could have two or three courses on special education law. It’s such a difficult area to understand because of all these complex federal laws, state laws, federal regulations, state regulations. The different, you, your colleague letters that are coming from the U.S. Department of Education, and other guidance from the U.S. Department of Education. You know, it’s just a constantly evolving area. And be able to not only teach that in a principal prep program, but then give principals the tools of how to stay current.

There was guidance coming out about establishing new policies, school districts establishing new policies regarding restraint and seclusion. Well if you took school law 4 years ago, you don’t know about these new things. We certainly have to teach in our classes, and I didn’t write this down in what I sent you, but we not only have to teach about the current law, but also how to stay current on the law.

**LB:** In an effort to close gaps in legal knowledge, I know that our colleagues Kevin Brady and Mark Gooden actually go out and facilitate workshops for schools. Maybe others will put their services out there and say, “This is something I want to do to help you stay abreast, even after you’ve graduated.”

**SE:** Yeah, yeah! Kevin Brady Skyped me into a professional development session he was doing. I think it was called Granville County North Carolina. And it was really great. He was there in person with a bunch of central office administrators and I Skyped in. And it was a free-for-all. They could ask me any question that they wanted. And all their questions were in special ed. Even though it wasn’t a special ed session, it was a school law session.

**LB:** Yeah, because I think that’s the area where they get sued the most. Either that or something dealing with finances, so definitely.

**SE:** Right, right!

**LB:** To what extent do you believe practicing educational leaders including principals and central office leaders should be prepared to address special education issues in schools?

**SE:** Oh, I just think it’s such a necessity. But as I say this, I know there are so many things on their plates. And so many important issues related to teacher evaluation, and other areas, so I’m just adding one more thing to their plate in special education and special education law. And how best to equip these leaders, you know it’s—I’m sure there are many approaches that we can take to better equip these school leaders. Through the practicums and doing stints
within special education and working with special education directors could be helpful, and then of course through coursework as well. When I responded to your document, I typed pretty quickly, I only had about 20 minutes, in between students. But a couple things I didn't put down, that maybe you want to note. This is kind of, somewhat innovative at Indiana University, we just last month got an online, 15-credit Certificate of Education Law approved.

LB: Sounds like a great idea!

SE: Yeah! So we’re marketing this not only nationally, but internationally to students in China who, we’ve got students in China who major in law as an undergrad then they come into our PhD program interested in school law. So we are doing this 15-credit certificate program for international students as well as students nationally and for our own students. I didn’t even think of offering it to our own students, quite honestly, and over the weekend some of our EdD students said, “We found it on the website. We want to get an Ed Law certificate.” And I never even marketed it to them or thought about it because they had school law in their principal program and then they had advanced school law in their EdD program, so I just thought, “Oh! They’ve had quite a bit of law.” And they all are interested in it and within that certificate is a special ed law course.

LB: Wow, I think, I mean, having that certificate is something tangible they can say, “Ok I have specialty, I’m not a lawyer, but I do have enough specialty to know when to be able to weigh in when things happen.” I think that would make them much more marketable. So do you know if there are any other schools that offer something similar, or was this your baby? Your idea?

SE: I think it’s ours. I don’t know of any other certificate programs in school law. Not that I’m aware of, anyway. And then we developed another partnership last year with the Law School where, in our law school there are a lot of former teachers, Teach for America and people who went through the traditional route. And they have a really strong interest in educational policy. So we also have this new minor for only law students. And the law students can come over and minor in Education Policy at the Ed School. And special ed law is one of those requirements as well.

LB: Wow, you’re definitely doing your part!

SE: Oh we’re trying, we’re trying. I don’t know if we’re doing enough, but...

LB: What do you view as the challenges faced by educational leadership programs in educating practicing administrators in the area of special education?

SE: Teaching in this area requires a deep understanding of the many complex federal/state laws, federal/state regulations and other policies. Not every program is able to hire someone with this level of expertise.

You know, I think we get these administrators for snapshots in time. I started 10 years ago at Indiana University, and I taught special education law. The way I teach special education law now is quite different because of the Reauthorization of IDEA in 2004. I started in 2003, so that changed things. And all these different federal, the different guidance that’s coming from the U.S. Department of Education. And so the law is constantly changing. So even though we get them for the semester that we get them for, you know, that was 10 years ago for some of my students. And a lot has changed and now what are they going to do? And they are working already, how many hours a week, 60, 70, 80 hours per week?! You know, one thing I think, I don’t know if this is specifically answering your question. You know, everything is tied to credits, in these 3-credit-hour classes. For universities to offer more professional development, kind of like what at Kevin Brady is doing. Where it’s not linked to credit, where you go out to schools and give updates to school districts on recent changes to the law—I think is so important. In 2009, there were big changes to the ADA and who falls under the ADA. Do people I taught in 2003 know that? I don’t know!

And there’s all these lawsuits I’ve been studying. And I just published a piece in the Journal of School Leadership, with Jesulon Gibbs. She was at the University of South Carolina, now she’s at the Department of Ed there. And it was all about how all these parents are bringing lawsuits under IDEA and they’re arguing, “Because my kid who was receiving services under IDEA, was bullied and harassed, they were denied, my child was denied FAPE, my child was denied a free and appropriate public education, because you didn’t respond teacher to the harassment.”

LB: Wow, yes, with proper training, some of this could have definitely been avoided.

SE: And some of the parents are suing under Section 504 in the ADA arguing disability discrimination. And so, when I first started looking at this, there were a few cases in 2006-2007, you know, a few more 2008-2009. And Jesulon and I wrote the article in 2010, I don’t think it came out—we finished it in like 2009-2010, but you know the lag time of journals. It didn’t come out until like 2012, I don’t think. So I just did a search before UCEA this year, because I was speaking on special education in general at UCEA. I wanted to see how many more cases have progressed through the system since a colleague and I wrote the article. And there were, I can’t count, probably 20–25 new cases in the last 2 years.

LB: Wow, that’s significant!

SE: You know, I think, Did my students learn about this from me 10, 9, 8, 7, 6 years ago? No. And are they aware of it? Probably not, unless they’ve been sued or they are reading legal journals.

LB: Which they probably don’t have time to do (laughs).

SE: Right, right! You know, they get Principal Leadership. Some of them get Principal Leadership, and I write a little monthly column in there. Sometimes it’s about special ed and sometimes it’s not. So, how are they learning about this? Well, they need these professional development sessions to really be helpful to districts.

LB: Definitely. So how would you suggest that we overcome some of the challenges faced by ed leadership programs, in getting people enough legal literacy and special education in general?

SE: I think we need to be more flexible in the way we deliver courses. That if you’re in a rural area, or teachers are in a rural area, or principals are in a rural area and they can’t get to your school, your university to learn about special education law. That we have rigorous and meaningful online opportunities and hybrid opportunities, and that’s beyond the coursework, because not everybody wants to come in and take a 3-credit course because they already have their degrees. They’re not going to come to Indiana University and pay $1,500 for a 3-credit refresher. That we should rethink delivering professional development, either at the school district, partnership with districts to provide this type of legal literacy that I think they need.
LB: Mm hmm. Definitely that. Because I think people see the necessity, but it's hard for them to fit it in the way it's currently delivered. So it's up to us to say, we see the need, they see the need; now let's think of a way (that's not their job, that's our job), let's think of a way to make sure they get what they need.

SE: Right, yep. Mm hmm.

LB: I have a question on your last one, it had slipped my mind and it came back. How many of the bullying cases (just out of curiosity) are actually successful against the FAPE claim?

SE: You know, I would say there have been fewer cases involving IDEA, most of them. They avoid IDEA because they have to exhaust administrative remedies first. So they go straight for Section 504 and ADA, because those are easier to bring, because you don't have to exhaust administrative remedies. So within those cases and the IDEA cases, you know, they are pretty mixed. I would say if I had to count, probably the school districts are prevailing slightly more than the—you know, this isn't scientific—but based on my readings before for UCEA, I think school districts are slightly prevailing in these suits. Because with the Section 504 and ADA cases you have to show that the school acted in bad faith and gross misjudgment, and that's a pretty high standard. And with the IDEA claims, and sometimes whether it's under IDEA, 504, or ADA, the standards that courts are using are all over the map. Some circuits are using the Davis standards under Title 9. And they're applying it to special ed and they're saying, “School districts can be liable if some school official knows about the harassment against the kid with the disability. That they're deliberately indifferent and that the harassment is severe, pervasive, and objectively offensive.” So that's one standard that some courts use, and then some courts use this bad faith and gross misjudgment. Well both of them are pretty difficult standards to satisfy if you're a parent bringing these lawsuits, because even if the principal and teachers do something to stop the harassment, where they suspend the harasser or you know move his or her lunch period to a different time where the harassment's occurring, then the court might find that they aren't deliberately indifferent, that they're responding to this harassment.

LB: Mm, hmm. OK, I was just curious. It's amazing how many parents are beginning to sue because of their children being bullied at school.

SE: Yeah. So I think—oh, here's another thing we are doing at Indiana. We bring a lot of lawyers into our program, so we. … It's like Wisconsin, but we don't have a joint JD/PhD program, but we welcome a lot of lawyers into our PhD program, and a lot of that group. A lot of those students are former teachers, and then they naturally come in and they are very interested in special education law.

LB: Suzanne, thank you for your time. This has been very informative. Do you have any closing thoughts? I know you mentioned you have something, a quote from Schimmel, Eckes, and Militello.

SE: Yes. According to one veteran principal, “In a society that has become increasingly litigious, a solid understanding of basic principles of school law is not only necessary, but it may also save your job” (Schimmel, Eckes, & Militello, 2010, p. vii).

LB: Did you have any other things you wanted to add before we closed?

SE: No, I just, I don't want to come across as the know-it-all of education law. I'm trying to do my best to educate school administrators to be legally literate. And I think I could still learn a lot. I think this is why this is really good that you see a review and you do these things. Because I read it, and then I find out what other programs are doing. And I think we can all improve. So, although I think we are headed in the right direction, I think there's a lot that Indiana University and other educational leadership programs can do to better address special education law.
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The Politics of Educator Preparation: Indiana’s New Licensure Laws

Kristina Brezicha  
Pennsylvania State University
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On November 7, 2013, the UCEA plenum attended a session on examining the policies, politics, and implications of Indiana’s recently enacted legislation, HR 1357. The act eliminated the requirement that Indiana’s superintendents possess an educational leadership license or prior educational experience. Dr. Sheneka Williams, assistant professor of educational administration and policy at the University of Georgia, facilitated the panel, which consisted of Dr. Frank Bush, the executive director of Indiana School Boards Association; Dr. John Coopman, executive director of the Indiana Association of Public School Superintendents; and Dr. Gerardo González, dean of the School of Education at Indiana University—Bloomington. All three presenters have had long careers in education, and all fought the newly enacted measure because of deep concerns about the potential negative repercussions the act may have on Indiana schools and students. The purpose of this piece is to review the panelists’ key points and respond to their comments with an eye towards broader implications in the educational leadership field. We conclude with recommendations for UCEA members as teachers, researchers, and advocates on behalf of the field of educational leadership.

Key Points From the Panel

A broader market-based education reform agenda. HR 1357 did not just appear on the legislative landscape. Rather, as Dr. González deftly summarized, this bill resulted from a policy agenda that included an aggressive campaign by the previous Superintendent of Public Education, Dr. Tony Bennett, and a Republican administration that sought to deprofessionalize and undermine public educators and consequently public education. The ethos of these policymakers included the marketplace ideology, which suggests that by allowing the market free rein, maximal efficiency and improved educational results will occur. The state superintendent and governor of Indiana supported a series of legislative items that increased flexibility by lowering standards for educators. They revamped the Rules for Educator Preparation and Accountability (REPA) by reducing teacher certification qualifications and allowed for greater flexibility in teacher hiring practices. They enacted a statewide school-grading system on an A–F scale under the assumption that greater information about the quality of education would increase competition and stimulate school improvement. Therefore, as Dr. González pointed out, HR 1357 did not herald any new policies; instead, it followed a series of policies that emphasize market-driven approaches to education reform.

Broader implications of HR 1357. All three panelists noted that HR 1357 has a range of implications for practice in Indiana and raises serious questions regarding the direction of public education more broadly. The panelists mentioned the potential loss of human capital, as talented Indiana educators may leave the state in search of employment in states where the education field is more hospitable to their credentials and are willing to compensate these educators for their experience and expertise. Another implication is the continued difficulty in recruiting talented young students who may enter other fields rather than considering a career in education, because of the ongoing contentious debates and many unknowns regarding certification, evaluation, and tenure of educators in Indiana and elsewhere.

In addition, this legislation raises questions regarding the competence and capacity of leaders within schools. The leaders of today’s schools are compelled to meet students’ needs by policies that emphasize system-wide accountability. Many accountability approaches stress principal assessment and evaluation as a means of encouraging principals to become more effective leaders. A key premise of these accountability systems is that the evaluators possess the knowledge and expertise necessary to judge the performance of those being evaluated. This assumption is clearly called into question by HR 1357. If districts hire superintendents who possess neither experience working in schools nor licensure, this calls into question their ability to evaluate principals on their performance in a valid fashion. For example, Dr. Coopman suggested that a superintendent without any educational experience would likely find it difficult, if not impossible, to readily evaluate principals’ instructional leadership skills. This is particularly problematic considering that the research literature indicates that the most important leadership skill sets are unique to the field of education and do not translate outside of the education sector (e.g., learning-centered leadership, instructional leadership).

Adoption does not equate to implementation. All three panelists reiterated that while HR 1357 was officially enacted, none of Indiana’s 289 local school boards have hired an uncertified superintendent to date. This may be a value statement by local school boards—they value hiring district leaders who possess a license and/or are seasoned educators. Or it may simply be that the legislation is still relatively new, and not many school boards have conducted searches and hire superintendents without certification. Time will tell.

Support for HR 1357 less than unanimous. While HR 1357 passed, it did so by a very thin margin. Dr. González noted that for the first time since 2005, the 25–25 tie vote in the Indiana senate was broken by the state’s lieutenant governor, who favored eliminating licensure requirements. Even though the bill became law, half of the state senators opposed eliminating the requirement that superintendents possess an educational leadership certificate or, at the very minimum, a temporary certificate if recently hired. This indicates that many legislators do value the preparation provided to superintendents by schools of education and also suggests a window of opportunity to rally support to resist this trend.

What Can UCEA Members Do?

The panelists stressed that academics have a key role to play in the current policy debates. Dr. González poignantly stated that the
burden is on us, the Academy, to professionalize education. While certainly complex, the panelists provided a number of suggestions regarding the specific role the professoriate can play.

Our role as teachers of educational leadership. Legislation like HR 1357 should prompt all professors in educational leadership programs to pause and consider the structure and content of our licensure programs. In today’s political and educational context, it is important to think about the skills and competencies our school leaders need to be successful. For example, Dr. Bush emphasized the importance of helping educational leaders develop stronger interpersonal, public relations and civic leadership skills that will help encourage leaders to advocate for both the merits of public education and the education profession.

Our role as researchers. All three panelists stressed that the questions raised by this legislation highlight the need for continued cutting-edge research by the education leadership field. Thus when debates arise, researchers can offer clear, cogent arguments grounded in methodologically rigorous research. Research should be at the forefront of any policy debate, and it is up to us, as researchers, to make our research relevant to policymakers. Dr. González stressed that the burden is on us to demonstrate to decision makers, like the Indiana legislature, that the results of our research should inform policy decisions.

Our role as advocates. As Dr. Bush reminded the audience, education scholars have a civic duty to remain active in public debates. Stepping into the role of advocate can be somewhat challenging for scholars who strive to conduct unbiased nonpartisan research. However, when our advocacy is rooted in the research literature, it is much more akin to structured research dissemination. Dr. González encouraged academics, particularly those with tenure, to speak “forcefully and publicly” when advocating for what the research literature supports. Indeed, as Dr. González noted, we are compelled to do so, if we accept the privilege of membership in the academic community.

New UCEA Member: Loyola Marymount University

Loyola Marymount University (LMU), a premier Catholic university rooted in the Jesuit and Marymount traditions, is located in Los Angeles. LMU’s School of Education prepares the next generation of education leaders through strategic partnerships, research, and academic programs at the doctoral, master’s, credential, and certificate levels. The LMU School of Education reflects and acts on the core philosophy of REAL:

- Respect and value all individuals.
- Educate by integrating theory and practice.
- Advocate for access to a socially just education.
- Lead in order to facilitate transformation.

The Department of Educational Leadership and Administration (EDLA) offers an EdD in Educational Leadership for Social Justice and master’s, credential, and certificate programs in educational leadership and administration. The EdD program provides experienced educators and community leaders with the tools, theories, and experiences necessary to transform educational settings into inclusive and equitable learning environments. Combining theory with practice, the curriculum instills in candidates a better understanding of the complex issues impacting education and student success and prepares graduates to become change agents in organizations and communities. Dissertation research integrates leadership and social justice.

The Institute of School Leadership and Administration (ISLA) offers preparation programs for public, charter, and private school leaders. LMU is recognized as an innovator in charter and Catholic school leadership through its Charter School Leadership and Catholic School Leadership Academies. The ISLA programs prepare students to serve as ethical, respectful, and transformative educational leaders.

LMU’s faculty demonstrates extraordinary commitment to the field of educational leadership for social justice. The 16 full-time EDLA faculty members represent diverse research interests and professional experiences, affording a broad and deep knowledge base to address critical issues in school leadership.

http://soe.lmu.edu/

UCEA International Summit

Sunday, November 23, 2014

During the 2014 UCEA Convention, the 2014 International Summit will be on Sunday, November 23, 2014, from 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. in Washington, DC. This year’s planning committee is Tom Alsbury (Seattle Pacific University), Lars Bjork (University of Kentucky), and Thu Suong Nguyen (Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis). Plans are being made to involve scholars from around the world to share trend in policies and research on leadership development and preparation.

If you have questions or suggestions for the summit, please contact Stephen Jacobson, UCEA Associate Director of International Affairs (eoakimli@buffalo.edu) at the University at Buffalo.
UCEA 2013 International

Stephen Jacobson
University at Buffalo

UCEA 2013 International Summit

On Sunday, November 10, following the 2013 UCEA Convention, the second annual International Summit was held at the Hyatt Regency Hotel in Indianapolis, Indiana. Registrations for this year’s event increased to 58, following the first year’s attendance of 34 people. The planning committee (Tom Alsbury, Bruce Barnett, Lars Bjork, and Thu Suong Nguyen) created a program allowing participants to share diverse perspectives on leadership preparation and development, examine existing international research collaboratives, and identify critical issues for future international research. Participants attended from many countries, including Australia, Brazil, Burma, Canada, Israel, Kenya, Nepal, New Zealand, Philippines, Sweden, Thailand, the United Kingdom, and the United States. Highlights of the day included the following:

- Ayehlapphyu May Oo Mutraw, director of the Burmese Community Center for Education (BCCE) in Indianapolis, gave the keynote address, “Liberation Education.” She shared her transnational experiences working in conflict zones with children in Burma as well as work with former refugees in the United States. She noted that resettlement can, counterintuitively, be an “unkind experience” for those resettling from a country dominated by civil strife and where education is a luxury afforded very few to a country where education is essential to securing the good life. She posed the challenges students encounter when relocating to a new country, which was reinforced by several students from the BCCE who attended the session. They described both their fragmented and inconsistent educational experiences in refugee camps as well as their experiences in the USA. Reflecting on the latter, they noted difficulty engaging with and reluctance to initiate conversations with peers and adults. In part, this resulted from language barriers but also as a result of peers’ and teachers’ expressed impatience. They also commented on a perceived lack of curiosity among peers and teachers regarding their lives and experiences. The keynote presentation and comments from students can be accessed at http://www.bcceindy.org/advocacy.

- Participants had the opportunity to learn more about the BCCE during the morning roundtable discussion in which students shared their community-based research focused on the BCCE’s efforts to assist former refugees in the transition to the United States; support the educational development of school-aged children; and to advocate for, engage with, and empower the community as a whole.

- In addition to the BCCE, roundtable discussions were conducted with researchers involved in three international research projects: International Successful School Principal Project, International Study of the Preparation of Principals, and International School Leadership Development Network. Colleagues shared their experiences managing and sustaining international research projects, understanding different cultural contexts and concepts, designing studies to obtain comparable data, and explaining how others can become involved in these projects.

- Following a world café lunch format intended to expand professional networks, several UCEA Center directors, including Tom Alsbury (Center for the Study of the Superintendency and District Governance), Christopher Branson (Centre for the Study of Leadership and Ethics), and Lauri Johnson (Center for the Study of School Leadership), facilitated discussions about the international projects their centers are sponsoring and how others can become involved.

Participants acknowledged important insights they gained about the complexities of engaging in international research and development projects. In particular, they expressed having a greater understanding of their global responsibility for education and appreciated learning about international projects being conducted by various networks and centers. Suggestions were made about ensuring the International Summit highlights projects beyond what was presented during the UCEA Convention, allowing participants to expand their network of professional colleagues, and considering ways in which UCEA can support international collaboration.

Based on the growing interest in this event, the third annual International Summit will be held at the 2014 UCEA Convention in Washington, DC. President Mark Gooden and Executive Director Michelle Young have agreed that next year’s International Summit will be on Sunday, November 23, 2014. More information about this event will be distributed as the details are known. If you have questions or suggestions for the summit, please contact Stephen Jacobson, UCEA Associate Director of International Affairs at the University at Buffalo: eoakiml@buffalo.edu

International Research and Development Sessions During the 2013 UCEA Convention

The annual UCEA Convention is becoming an excellent venue for supporting and publicizing international research and development projects. The 2013 Convention was no exception, with dozens of sessions and presentations devoted to leadership practice and preparation in different cultural contexts, particularly in these regions of the world:

- Africa (Botswana, Ghana, Nigeria),
- Asia (China, Taiwan, Thailand),
- Australasia (Australia, New Zealand),
- Europe (Republic of Georgia, Spain),
- Middle East (Israel),
- North America (Canada, Costa Rica, Mexico),
- Scandinavia (Denmark, Finland, Sweden),
- South America (Brazil, Chile), and
- United Kingdom (England, Scotland).

A variety of important issues surfaced in these international studies, many of which were comparative analyses between two or more countries. These studies fell into four major areas (with examples of topics):
• student learning (English as a second language students, homework, indigenous learners),
• leadership preparation (distance learning, ethical leadership development, problem-based learning),
• school-based leadership strategies (school improvement, turnaround schools, equity-oriented leadership), and
• school–community leadership approaches (partnerships, teacher–parent alliances, democratic community participation).

Our knowledge base is growing about how school leaders around the world are addressing these important issues. Not surprisingly, many of the same concerns facing American school leaders, such as preparing ethical and culturally responsive leaders, advocating for marginalized students, determining how school improvement affects all students, and ensuring authentic community partnerships, confront school leaders and those who prepare them in many nations. To better understand the leadership trends and approaches in various cultural contexts, the UCEA Convention will continue to showcase comparative studies of leadership preparation and practice. Besides sharing their work during the convention, scholars and practitioners can broaden our understanding of critical global issues facing educational leaders in the 21st century by disseminating their work in UCEA journals (Educational Administration Quarterly, Journal of Cases, Journal of Research on Leadership Education). In addition, many of the UCEA centers are engaging in international research. Please contact center directors for more information.

For suggestions about increasing UCEAs support for international research and collaboration, please contact UCEA Associate Director of International Affairs Stephen Jacobson at the University at Buffalo: coakiml@buffalo.edu

---

Flagstaff Seminar: Educational Leaders Without Borders

Rosemary Papa & Fenwick English

A second meeting of the Flagstaff Seminar was held in San Francisco in collaboration with the American Educational Research Association on May 1, 2013. A group of 18 prominent, international scholars recommitted themselves to confront issues of poverty faced by schoolchildren in the world and to work towards global improvement in the education of girls. These urgent matters are a worldwide problem with over 100 million children not in school, the majority being girls. The two primary thrusts surrounding how to enable Flagstaff Seminar research to activism were seen as a clear call to action for the participants to continue their work towards ensuring that education is a basic human right and that educational leaders can and must become emboldened to seek solutions that go beyond the school house door, even if this means confronting historic cultural and political forces that act as barriers to basic improvements in the reach and quality of education in the world.

Reaction to the concept paper (Papa & English, 2013) framed the discussion, namely, how do we extend what we do beyond leader preparation? Points of discussion included the following:

1. A document of intentional work provides a call to action and activism.
2. Three issues—access, quality, and equity—all must be addressed.
3. Education, all in education, must tackle them together.
4. Shortages of teachers—What values are held? Should there be a smaller focus? What could be a narrower focus? The quality of preservice and in-service training is critical.
5. Holistic language in education—What is missing becomes the notion of the purpose of education. Going beyond schools, comprehensive reform gets co-opted by language used by educational researchers.
6. Food scarcity exists for 25% of children in the world; they go to bed hungry. What does this mean just to the United States? And to the education system that really teaches the whole child? What is the role of the school in that community? How do we promote sustainable development?
7. Leaders in schools want to know how to do educational sustainability development. Leaders without borders know what is happening elsewhere. They must know the how but also the moral why.
8. How do we extend what we do beyond leader preparation and focus on purpose, not just the how?
9. There are lots of borders, not just geographical. Our responsibility is to prepare educational leaders.

Discussions and commitments focused on the compelling needs of education worldwide: the de-professionalization of the teaching profession; the increasing poverty gap between the haves and have nots; and the political world issues that address political issues, including resource allocation, partnerships with organizations to leverage political clout, global marketization and how not to feed the beast, access to technology and the generation of knowledge, and how we organize to address the policies over which we do not have much leverage. We concluded this meeting with the following actions:

1. Develop networks with individual scholars and professional organizations worldwide.
2. Continue to identify the issues.
3. Identify the opportunities for action.
4. Identify the efforts to work for locally based solutions.

The collective research and scholarship of the group spans four decades of national and international work and exceeds 100 books, handbooks, and encyclopedias, as well as hundreds of research journal articles in most major North American, European, Australian, and African nations. The Flagstaff Seminar scholars have set the next meeting for August 2–3, 2015 in collaboration with the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration.

Reference

UCEA Announces 2013 Award Recipients

UCEA’s annual awards were presented at the 27th annual convention in Indianapolis, IN, November 7-10, 2013.

Roald F. Campbell Lifetime Achievement Award: Robert Crowson

The Roald F. Campbell Lifetime Achievement Award was instituted by UCEA in 1992 for the purpose of recognizing senior professors in the field of educational administration whose professional lives have been characterized by extraordinary commitment, excellence, leadership, productivity, generosity, and service. At the same time, the award celebrates the remarkable pioneering life of Roald F. Campbell, whose distinguished career spanned many years and exemplified these characteristics. The 2013 recipient of the Roald F. Campbell Lifetime Achievement Award is Robert Crowson of Peabody College, Vanderbilt University.

UCEA Master Professor Award: Paula Short

The UCEA Master Professor Award is given to an individual faculty member who is recognized as being an outstanding teacher, advisor, and mentor of students. The recipient of this award has taken a leadership role in his or her academic unit and has aided in the advancement of students into leadership positions in the K-12 system while promoting and supporting diversity in faculty, students, staff, programs, and curriculum in the field of educational leadership. The 2013 UCEA Master Professor recipient is Paula Short of the University of Houston.

Jay D. Scribner Mentoring Award: Ed Fuller

The Jay D. Scribner Mentoring Award honors educational leadership faculty who have made a substantive contribution to the field by mentoring the next generation of students into roles as university research professors, while also recognizing the important roles mentors play in supporting and advising junior faculty. This award is named after Jay D. Scribner, whose prolific career spans over four decades and who has mentored a host of doctoral students into the profession while advising and supporting countless junior professors. The 2013 recipient is Ed Fuller of Pennsylvania State University.

Jack A. Culbertson Award: Morgaen L. Donaldson

The Jack A. Culbertson Award was established in 1982 in honor of UCEA’s first full-time executive director, who retired in 1981 after serving 22 years in the position. The award is presented annually to an outstanding junior professor of educational administration in recognition of contributions to the field. The 2013 Jack A. Culbertson award recipient is Morgaen L. Donaldson of the University of Connecticut.

Paula Silver Case Award: Carol Karpinski

The Paula Silver Case Award was instituted by UCEA in 1999 to memorialize the life and work of Paula Silver, former UCEA associate director and president-elect, who made significant contributions to our program through excellence in scholarship, advocacy of women, and an inspired understanding of praxis. The 2013 recipient is Carol Karpinski of Fairleigh Dickinson University for “Why Do They Hate Us?: Leading Amid Criticism, Crisis, and Disrespect.” Carol Karpinski responds,

I would like to thank the members of the selection committee, the JCEL editorial staff, and Michelle Young for her congratulatory letter. Education and educators have regularly been subject to scrutiny and criticism. Today, criticism seems to be particularly severe and widespread. Such a troubling environment can be debilitating for educational leaders. I hope that my case study will contribute to a discussion of how educators can lead in troubling times and how we can prepare effective leaders to meet the challenges they face. Thank you for this honor.

Distinguished Service Award: Linda Skrla, Richard Fossey, Bruce Barnett, & Cristobal Rodriguez

On occasion, UCEA’s leadership has found it appropriate to honor UCEA faculty for their outstanding service to the organization and the field. This year UCEA honored four such individuals. Linda Skrla of the University of the Pacific served as editor of JCEL 2009–2013; Richard Fossey of the University of North Texas served as editor of the Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership 2011–2013; Bruce Barnett of the University of Texas at San Antonio served as UCEA Associate Director of International Affairs; Cristobal Rodriguez of New Mexico State University served as UCEA Associate Director of Graduate Student Development.

Edwin M. Bridges Award: Perry Zirkel

The Edwin M. Bridges Award recognizes significant contributions to the preparation and development of school leaders. The award recognizes contributions to preservice preparation as well as continuing professional development aimed at school leaders broadly defined, and the locus can be in universities or in the field. The 2013 recipient is Perry Zirkel of Lehigh University.

Exemplary Educational Leadership Preparation Program Award: University of Illinois–Chicago & University of Texas at San Antonio

A growing body of research connects how candidates are prepared to career outcomes, leadership practices and school improvement efforts. Further research shows that exemplary programs have outstanding, relevant content, learning experiences and field experiences. To celebrate exemplary programs and encourage their development,
UCEA has established an Award for Exemplary Educational Leadership Preparation. This award complements UCEA's core mission to advance the preparation and practice of educational leaders for the benefit of all children and schools. Awards for 2013 went to the University of Illinois–Chicago EdD program in Urban Educational Leadership and to the Urban School Leaders Collaborative at the University of Texas at San Antonio.

Looking Ahead

It's not too early to think about honorees for the 2014 convention. The next cycle of UCEA awards begins in late spring with selections completed by the end of summer. Additionally, each April UCEA announces the recipient of the William J. Davis Award. The Davis Award is given annually to the authors of the most outstanding article published in Educational Administration Quarterly during the preceding volume year. Please refer to future announcements in UCEA Review; in UCEA Connections, and on the website. Nominations for UCEA's 2013 awards competition are due May 31, 2014. Please see www.ucea.org for information on criteria and the nomination process.

Contributions to the award fund are welcome and should be sent to UCEA, the University of Virginia, Curry School of Education, 405 Emmet St., Charlottesville, VA, 22903.

New UCEA Member:
Southern Methodist University

The Annette Caldwell Simmons School of Education and Human Development at Southern Methodist University promotes excellence by preparing researchers, leaders, and policy makers in Prekindergarten through Grade 12 and higher education settings and engaging in and disseminating rigorous, scientifically based research. The Department of Education Policy and Leadership currently offers three master's-level programs. It provides students with two different programs through which to obtain a masters in prekindergarten through Grade 12 administration and leadership: the Accelerated School Leadership Program and the Urban School Leadership Program. The master's degree in Higher Education Leadership is geared towards preparing students for leadership roles in a variety of higher education settings. Cross cutting these programs is an increasing focus on the interconnections and need for smoother transitions between the nation's primary/secondary and higher education sectors. Finally, Simmons offers a school-wide PhD program that prepares students for a variety of research-intensive careers. The PhD program provides students with strong empirical and theoretical grounding in the areas of teaching and learning, leadership, organizations, and policy.

http://www.smu.edu/Simmons/

2014 Clark Scholars

Erin Anderson, University of Virginia
Matias Arellano, Florida Atlantic University
Patricia Bauner, Southern Methodist University
Risha Berry, Virginia Commonwealth University
David Brackett, University of Nevada, Reno
Kristina Brezicha, Pennsylvania State University
Joshua Childs, University of Pittsburgh
Wonseok Choi, University of Minnesota
Seena Chong, University of California, Berkeley
Elizabeth Chu, Teachers College, Columbia University
Colleen Cleary, University of Missouri
Kevin Crouse, Rutgers Graduate School of Education
Matthew Della Sala, Clemson University
Amanda Dillon, Rutgers University
Jeffrey DiScala, University of Maryland
Anna Egalite, University of Arkansas
Erica Fernández, Indiana University–Bloomington
Lindsay Granger, New York University
Tara Haley, University of North Florida
Christopher Harrison, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
Katie Higginbottom, University of Toronto/OISE
Kirsten Hill, University of Pennsylvania
Anne Hoisington Hutchinson, University of Illinois at Chicago
Marie Hurt, Ohio State University
Tonja Jarrell, University of California, Berkeley
Kala Lougheed, Montana State University
Yanira Madrigal-Garcia, University of California, Davis
Joel Malin, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Monica Mansor, Bowling Green State University
Rebecca Miner, Washington State University
Chase Nordengren, University of Washington
Steve Ortiz, California State University, Long Beach
Robert Przybylski, University of Alabama
Robyn Read, University of Toronto/OISE
Kenya Reese, Clemson University
Kailey Spencer, University of Pennsylvania
Elizabeth Leisy Stosich, Harvard Graduate School of Education
Ruirui Sun, University at Albany, SUNY
Margaret Vecchio-Smith, University of Minnesota
Terry Wilkinson, York University, Toronto, Canada
Rebecca Wolf, University of Maryland
P. Brett Xiang, University of Missouri–Columbia

Are you a Clark Seminar alumnus? Join our growing David L. Clark Scholars and Faculty alumni network on LinkedIn!

www.ucea.org
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19th Annual Values and Leadership Conference
Towards Transformational Leadership:
Values and Ethics for Educational Advancement and Sustainability

September 18 - 20, 2014
Deerhurst Resort, Huntsville, Ontario, Canada

Please join us for the 19th Annual Values and Leadership Conference. The Annual Conference of the International Consortium for the Study of Leadership and Ethics in Education (CSLEE) is hosted this year by Nipissing University. The Conference will be held at the world class Deerhurst Resort in the heart of the Muskoka Lakes District, about 2 hours north of Toronto by car or coach.

We encourage you to help promote the conference by sharing this flyer with all interested colleagues and students. More detailed information about the program, featured presenters, and registration is available on the Conference website: http://cslee19.nipissingu.ca/.

The Call for Papers will be posted on the Conference website in early January 2014. The deadline for proposals will be May 15, 2014. Please submit your proposal or any questions you may have about the conference to the Conference Planning Team at: valuesandleadership@nipissingu.ca.

The Conference theme will be explored through a variety of lenses including:

- The power of emerging media and technology
- The development of participatory cultures
- The juxtaposition of local and global perspectives
- The centrality of relationships and communities
- The pressures from political interests

Featured Speakers:
Dr. Paul Begley, Nipissing University (retired)
Dr. Charles Burford, Australian Catholic University
Dr. Steven Jay Gross, Temple University
Dr. Kathy Hibbert, Western University
Dr. Pauline Leonard, Louisiana Tech University
Dr. Anthony Normore, California State University
Dr. Jackie Stefkovich, Pennsylvania State University
UCEA Convention 2014 Call for Proposals

Righting Civil Wrongs: Education for Racial Justice and Human Rights

I. General Information

The 28th annual UCEA Convention will be held November 20-23, 2014 at the Washington Hilton in Washington, DC. The purpose of the 2014 UCEA Convention is to engage participants in discussions about research, policy, and practice in education with a specific focus on educational leadership. Members of the 2014 Convention Program Committee are Noelle Witherspoon Arnold (University of Missouri–Columbia), Sarah Diem (University of Missouri–Columbia), Azadeh Osanloo (New Mexico State University), and Michael Dumas (New York University).

II. UCEA Convention Theme

The 28th Annual UCEA Convention theme, Righting Civil Wrongs: Education for Racial Justice and Human Rights, is intended as an occasion to talk, meet, think, and organize for a renewed vision and renewed coalition-building on the role of education and educational leadership in fostering intentional purpose and action for racial justice and human rights. Education has been identified as fundamental civil and human right, essential for the exercise of all other human rights. Yet millions of children and adults remain deprived of educational opportunities, many as a result of racial injustice and poverty.

Our focus on racial justice demonstrates our intentional decision to foreground race and racism and the role it plays in fostering disparate treatment, impact, and opportunity. We consider racial justice as those critical interventions against racism, hegemony, White privilege and supremacy, structural racial inequity, and “resistance to public investment in solutions to this problem. The concept of solutions relates not just to past wrongs, yet are obviously based on the foundation of history.” (Scott Nakagawa, 2013). It is our contention that in order to “right civil wrongs,” our work must focus on civil liberties and human rights, which extend to issues of gender, sexuality, poverty, immigration status, nationality, religion, language, and ability. To address the 2014 UCEA Convention theme, “Righting Civil Wrongs: Education for Racial Justice and Human Rights,” we invite submissions that (a) offer analyses of “civil wrongs” in education, to help us more incisively analyze how we got to where we are; (b) contribute to our understanding of how we educate for racial justice and human rights, in PK-12 schools, graduate preparation programs, as well as in professional development; (c) identify priorities for social and educational policy and practice that will help us do what is “right” to ameliorate racial and human injustice; and (d) support advocacy work directed at policymakers and elected officials.

This year, UCEA celebrates its 60th anniversary with other milestones of Brown v. Board of Education (60th), ESEA (50th), Civil Rights Act (50th), Milliken v. Bradley (40th), and Lau v. Nichols (40th). This annual conference and its location in our host city of Washington, DC, offers a unique opportunity to engage scholars of every discipline, practitioners, policymakers, legislators, and community members in examining research, practices, and policies impacting educational contexts. We also encourage proposals addressing P-20 issues of racial justice and human rights that engage scholars attending ASHE and other scholars from areas of study including, but not exclusive to, fields such as social foundations, law, public policy, history, cultural studies, global and international studies, and economics. The following suggested topics and related questions are provided to stimulate thinking about the 2014 UCEA Convention and theme, Righting Civil Wrongs: Education for Racial Justice and Human Rights, although proposals addressing related themes are welcome.

A. Civil Rights, Racial Justice, Human Rights, in Educational Contexts. The educational context is a particular complex notion in global rural and urban environments, which offer an opportunity to consider complex, multilayered challenges in a large scale context. Indeed, “community” may be most important in these settings. Thus, we ask how might educational leaders foster a sense of community in these multifaceted environments. At the same time, in what ways must school leaders juggle the competing demands of diverse communities within their schools as well as surrounding neighborhoods?

B. Education, Social Justice, and Democracy in the Global Society. As technology advances, the idea of human rights with global community becomes more meaningful. In what ways do educational leaders, researchers, and other constituent groups create international community, and what can we learn from our international neighbors that might inform the work we do in our unique communities? In what ways are community ties created and sustained internationally?

C. Leadership for Civil Rights and Racial and Human Justice.

a. What does it mean to be and/or prepare a leader for civil rights/social justice? What responsibility do we have to encourage future leaders to cultivate meaningful coalitions for justice in educational and policymaking environments?

b. Educational leadership and policy are currently espousing neoliberal interests and the “hybrid” leader—one focused on straddling the entrepreneurial, privatized, and managerial interests. In what ways can leaders and policymakers form more democratic educational contexts and engage in social advocacy for an equitable and democratic system of schooling?

c. In what ways can we better prepare education, leadership, and policy scholars and foster dispositions to have them engage, navigate and negotiate in policy arenas for justice and advocacy?
D. Partnering for Civil and Human Rights. Educational leaders have to develop partnerships with organizations across multiple sectors, including educational organizations across the P-20 continuum, community and faith-based organizations, businesses, and educational reform networks. How do educational leaders and policymakers reaffirm the common good and build alliances to leverage “justice capital” and create empowered communities? How do leaders effectively develop and sustain such partnerships? How do schools and communities benefit from such partnerships? What are the measures of effective partnerships? How are leaders prepared to ethically and effectively navigate partnership work?

E. Politics and Policy for Equity and Civil Rights. Local, state and federal policies shape and are shaped by the social context of national and international environments. What do the sociological and sociocultural milieu appear today compared to the initial days of Brown v. Board of Education, ESEA, etc.? How do educators negotiate the educational policy environment in the interest of developing equitable and high-quality programs for all students? How are certain interests represented in local, state, and federal politics? How are educational leaders prepared to navigate the intersections of school/district policies with other local politics and policies (i.e., housing, immigration, law enforcement, etc.)?

F. Action-Oriented Research and Scholarship. A focus on reconnecting research, policy, and practice to justice-building concerns requires action-oriented research and scholarship that engage all educational stakeholders. How are scholars collaborating with nations, communities, organizations, practitioners, or other constituents to engage in justice-based educational research? How is collaborative research carried out ethically and in the service of civil, racial, and human rights? How is technology utilized to enhance collaborative research? What kinds of products emerge from such research? How are marginalized voices represented in this work?

The 2014 UCEA Convention Call for Proposals encourages submissions that explore the above themes as well as proposals focused on the landscape of quality leadership preparation; research and engaged scholarship on connections to leadership in the global rural and urban contexts; research on global issues and contexts influencing the field of educational leadership and policy; effective preparation program designs and improvement efforts; successful coalitions that enhance leadership, policy work, and politics; collaborative research that really enriches the community; and other issues that impact the current and future practice of educators and policymakers.

III. UCEA Convention Session Categories

A. Paper Session. These sessions are intended for reporting research results or analyzing issues of policy or practice in an abbreviated form. Presenters are expected to provide electronic copies of papers or paper handouts summarizing their research. The proposal summary should include a statement of purpose, theoretical framework, findings, and conclusions. For research reports, also describe data sources and methods. A discussion leader will be assigned to facilitate dialogue for the session.

B. Symposium. A symposium should examine specific policy, research, or practice issues from several perspectives; contribute significantly to the knowledge base; and allow for dialogue and discussion. Session organizers are expected to chair the session and facilitate discussion. Symposium participants are expected to develop and provide electronic copies of papers presented during the session.

Special Topic-Driven Symposia. These symposia should feature policy, research, or practice addressing a specific topic listed below. During these special symposia, session presenters and the audience will interact with Washington D.C. policymakers and stakeholders. If you are submitting a special topic-driven symposium we ask for your involvement in the makeup of presenters and methodologies. The planning required for a special topic-driven symposium is more involved; thus, If you are interested in submitting a proposal for one of these symposia, please submit electronically by April 1, 2014, to ucea@virginia.edu and put the words “Special Topic-Driven Symposium” in the Subject box. Please note these special session proposals are due earlier than the regular UCEA Convention proposals. The special symposia topics are:

- Racial & Human Rights and Education
- Gender, Sexuality, and Education
- Education as a Civil Right (Civil Rights Act)
- Educational Opportunity (ESEA)
- Desegregation (Brown Decision)
- Educator Effectiveness and Evaluation
- Educational Leadership Development (UCEA’s 60th Anniversary)

C. International Community-Building Sessions. These sessions, regardless of format (i.e., paper, symposia, conversation, etc.), require participants to be from two or more different countries. These sessions must focus on critical issues of leadership, practice, development, or research from multiple international perspectives. The proposal summary should describe the purpose of the session, the format participants will employ, and a list of the national contexts that will be represented.

D. Critical Conversation Roundtables. These sessions are intended to stimulate informal, lively discussions around a series of provocative questions or research in process. Session organizers may organize a panel of participants who facilitate and guide the conversation. Alternatively, these sessions may be organized as a dialogue where the organizers and attendees discuss an issue or series of questions. The proposal summary should describe the purpose of the session, the ways in which participants will engage in conversation/dialogue, and examples of questions or areas to be addressed. Proposals that address cross-cutting issues are particularly welcome.

E. Innovative Sessions and Mini-Workshops. Proposals utilizing innovative presentation/interaction strategies are encouraged, such as web-based projects, films, and the use of technology to increase interaction and participation. The proposal summary should describe the focus and purpose of the session or mini-workshop (to be held during the convention), the innovative format, and how the format will enhance adult learning and discussion.

F. Ignite Sessions. These sessions are intended to stimulate informal, lively discussions using a cluster of four to five 5-minute presentations with no more than 20 slides per presentation, where each slide is displayed for approximately 15 seconds while the speaker addresses the audience. The intent of an Ignite session
is to spark interest and awareness of multiple yet similar topics while encouraging additional thought and action on the part of presenters and members of the audience. Ignite sessions are an ideal way to present innovations, effective strategies and tools, problems of practice, collaborations, etc. The proposal summary should be for an individual (5-minute) Ignite presentation that describes the purpose and topic of the 5-minute presentation, relevant literature, findings (if relevant), and examples of questions or areas to be addressed.

Examples of "Ignite" Sessions:
http://www.youtube.com/user/iGniTe?blend=1&ob=4#p/u/3/rqSkUlkwQ98
http://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PL9790118FDAAA1D9A

G. Pre- and Postconvention Work Sessions and Workshops.
These sessions, which provide both 2- and 4-hour sessions for scholars of similar interest, are encouraged for (a) groups of scholars who are working on projects directly related to the core mission of UCEA and (b) scholars who wish to present a workshop for faculty members attending the convention. Proposals should describe the purpose of the session, relevant literature, how the time will be used, the role and expertise of facilitators, outcomes for participants, and plans for disseminating information from the session/workshop to UCEA member institutions and the field.

**UCEA is offering two additional ways for engagement in the 2014 Convention.

Graduate Student Symposium is for doctoral students as a pre-conference session. Successfully launched at the 2012 Convention in Denver, the Symposium will be returning at the 2014 Convention in Washington, DC. Doctoral students from UCEA member institutions will be invited to submit proposals similar to UCEA’s format and present them during this preconference session. Further details regarding the call for proposals for this graduate student pre-session will follow later this month and can be found on the Graduate Student portion of the UCEA website: http://www.ucea.org/graduatemember-development/

UCEA Film Festival. For those who are handy with audio-visual technology, the 2014 UCEA Convention will again play host to a Film Festival! UCEA has opened an opportunity for submissions of 5-minute videos that explore broadly the landscape of quality leadership preparation, including our research and engaged scholarship, our preparation program designs and improvement efforts, our policy work, and the practice of educational leaders. Video submissions may relate to the conference theme or share educational leadership program features, innovations, and impacts. Additional details can be found on the UCEA website: http://www.ucea.org.

IV. Criteria for Review of UCEA Convention Proposals
All proposals will be subject to blind, peer review by two reviewers, which will occur electronically. The proposal must not include names of session organizers or presenters. Primary authors of submitted proposals agree to serve as proposal reviewers. Proposals for papers, symposia, and international community building sessions will be evaluated for

• Thoroughness and clarity of the proposal;
• Theoretical framework, methods, analysis, and presentation of findings (for empirical research); and
• Significance.

All other proposals will be evaluated for

• Relevance of research problem/topic to the convention theme and/or broader discourse in the field,
• Thoroughness and clarity of the proposal, and
• Alignment between proposed format and purpose of the session.

V. Participation Guidelines and Proposal Deadlines
Those engaged in research, policy, or practice in educational or youth-serving agencies may submit proposals for consideration.

Proposals must be received by Monday, May 5, 2014. All proposals must be submitted electronically at the link to be provided at the UCEA home page (http://www.ucea.org). This site will officially open April 7, 2014.

Submission length must not exceed 3 single-spaced pages (approximately 1,500 words or 6,000 characters) using 12-point font (Times New Roman). References are required and must not exceed 1 single-spaced page (approximately 400 words or 2,200 characters). The lead author of papers is required to upload an advance copy of the paper into the All Academic System through the UCEA Convention site 3 weeks prior to the convention (October 23, 2014). By submitting a proposal, the lead author of each proposal also agrees to serve as a reviewer. An author’s failure to live up to either of these commitments may lead to the paper being removed from the convention program.

Please carefully review your proposal before submitting it. All Academic directly copies the information provided in the proposal for the program. If you listed yourself as a session organizer in the proposal, also keep in mind that session organizers do not show in the print program. If you have an additional role (presenter, discussant, author) please list it as well.

VI. Participation Limits
To promote broad participation in the annual convention, an individual may appear as first author on no more than two proposals. In addition, an individual may appear on the program no more than four times in the role of presenter. The participation limit does not include service as chair or discussant or participation in invited sessions or any session connected with UCEA headquarters, committees, or publications.

Deadline: May 5, 2014
The Year 2014 marks the 50th anniversary of the beginning of the War on Poverty, the historic legislation that transformed American education by providing a federal role in addressing racial and economic disparities. With the 2014 conference in Washington, DC, coming on this anniversary, UCEA and one of its long-standing partners, the Politics of Education Association, are making plans to highlight the historical and contemporary importance of this legislation for issues of leadership, equity, and politics. Information on the specific events and how to get involved will be available on the UCEA website in early March! Stay tuned and get involved!

Annual Brock Prize Symposium
University of Oklahoma, Norman
March 11, 2014

Each spring, the Brock Laureate receives the prize at a public ceremony, the Brock Symposium on Excellence in Education, at which he or she delivers a keynote address. The Brock Symposium seeks to shine a light on notable accomplishments in the field of education and then to use those accomplishments as a springboard for communicating educational excellence to practitioners, parents, researchers, administrators, and political leaders. Held at one of the three partnering universities, the Symposium is a signature event to which teachers, principals, university faculty and administrators, education executives, students, and the general public are invited to attend.

Featured speakers will be 2014 Brock Prize Laureate, Ellen Moir - founder and Chief Executive Officer of the New Teacher Center (NTC), a national organization dedicated to improving student learning by accelerating the effectiveness of new teachers and school leaders.

Round table discussions, open dialogue, and personal conversations with Brock Laureate, Ellen Moir, will explore the practical application of improving beginning educators’ success to policy and practice.

http://brockinternationalprize.org

University Council for Educational Administration
The University of Virginia
Curry School of Education
405 Emmer St.
Charlottesville, VA 22904
(434) 243-1041

www.ucea.org
https://twitter.com/UCEA
https://www.facebook.com/pages/University-Council-for-Educational-Administration-UCEA/109442432407507

Conference: July 11-13, 2014 at Stratford-upon-Avon

“Educational Policy & Practice: Can Leaders Shape the Landscape?”

http://www.belmas.org.uk/Annual-Conference-2014
The 2014 UCEA Graduate Student Summit will be held at the Washington Hilton hotel in Washington, DC. The summit will commence Wednesday, November 19, 2014, at noon and will conclude Thursday, November 20, 2014, at noon. The purpose of the 2014 UCEA Graduate Student Summit is to provide graduate students a space to engage in authentic dialogue about their scholarly work. This summit will offer opportunities to meet and network with graduate students and faculty, to present your work, and to receive feedback on your research. It will include:

- **Paper sessions**, in which you will share your research and receive constructive feedback;
- **Workshop sessions**, in which you will get direct feedback on a paper that you would like to publish, a proposal, or your dissertation research plan; and
- **Networking sessions**, where you will have the chance to network with students from other UCEA institutions interested in similar research topics and talk with UCEA Executive Committee members and Plenum representatives.

To access the full Call for Proposals, please visit [http://ucea.org/ucea-gssummit/](http://ucea.org/ucea-gssummit/). We will begin accepting proposals April 7, 2014. All proposals must be submitted electronically per the directions located at the UCEA Graduate Student Summit site. Proposals must be received by **Monday, May 5, 2014**.

[http://ucea.org/ucea-gssummit](http://ucea.org/ucea-gssummit)

---

**Jackson Scholars at UCEA 2013**

The Jackson Scholars Summit featured a special program to celebrate the legacy of Barbara Loomis Jackson (1928-2012). UCEA faculty paid tribute to Jackson’s 50-year career in multiple roles as a scholar, trailblazer, and mentor and recognized former Scholars and her family in attendance. Following the public welcome of the 40 new Jackson Scholars, mentors presented certificates to first-year Scholars and special designed lapel pins to second-year Scholars. These pins, featuring Jackson’s profile and the Jackson Scholars logo, will be presented to second-year Scholars to recognize their entry into the Jackson Scholars Network.

To commemorate the 10th anniversary of the Jackson Scholars Network, UCEA has launched the Barbara L. Jackson Legacy Fund to honor its namesake. Jackson Scholar Alumni and Jackson Mentors, past and present, will receive a complimentary Jackson Scholar pin for contributions of $25 or more to the Jackson Legacy Fund.

During the Graduate Student Summit at the 2013 UCEA Convention, over 20 second-year Jackson Scholars presented their research to date. Anthony Normore and Jeffrey Brooks facilitated an engaging hour-long writing workshop crafted for Jackson Scholars. Gerardo R. Lopez, UCEA Associate Director for Jackson Scholars, welcomed 40 first-year Jackson Scholars and Jackson Mentors to the Julie Laible Memorial Session, an orientation session designed to support their scholarship and maximize their participation. The next development opportunity for Jackson Scholars occurs in April at the annual spring Jackson Scholars Workshop (Thursday, April 3, 2014, from 8:00 a.m. to noon) during the AERA Conference in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
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)
mdy8n@virginia.edu

Feature Editors:
April Peters (University of Georgia) 
apeters@uga.edu
Mariela Rodríguez (University of Texas at San Antonio) 
mariela.rodriguez@utsa.edu

Interview Editor:
Lisa Bass (North Carolina State University) 
lrbass@ncsu.edu

Point-Counterpoint Editor:
W. Kyle Ingle (Bowling Green State University) 
wingle@bgsu.edu

Innovative Programs Editor:
Hans Klar (Clemson University) 
hklar@clemson.edu
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2014 Calendar

February 2014  ISLLC Standards refresh process launches

March 2014  Excellence in Educational Leadership nominations due Mar. 30
INSPIRE Program information surveys due

April 2014  Deadline for special topic-driven symposia, UCEA Convention, April 1
Deadline for Summer UCEA Review, April 1
David Clark National Graduate Student Research Seminar, April 2-3, Philadelphia
Barbara Jackson Scholars Spring Summit, April 3, Philadelphia
AERA convention, Philadelphia

May 2014  UCEA 2014 Convention proposals due May 5
UCEA Award nominations due

July 2014  PSR forms due July 1
BELMAS Conference, July 11-13
UCEA Film Festival submissions due
UCEA launches new website
UNCEA Convention registration begins

September 2014  Deadline for Fall UCEA Review, Sept. 1
Values & Leadership Conference, Sept. 18-20, ONT, Canada