ROCKING THE BOAT WITHOUT FALLING OUT: SPIRITED TEMPERED RADICALS AS AGENTS OF COMMUNITY TRANSFORMATION

Faith Wambura Ngunjiri, Yale University

Introduction

African women have been left out of the theorizing and writing about leadership for long enough – literature focusing on African leadership is limited. Although they are missing in the literature, African women do assume positions of leadership and authority at community, national and international arenas (Mabokela, 2003; Ngunjiri, 2006). Ellen Sirleaf Johnson, president of Liberia, and Professor Wangari Maathai, Nobel Laureate, are just two well known examples.

The available studies about African women have concentrated on explicating their marginalized status and the subsequent deficiencies in access to resources, education, employment, land, property and human rights, often describing women as 'beasts of burden,' 'donkeys of the university,' victims of HIV/AIDS, war, as well as cultural, social, religious, political and legal oppressions (Cutrufelli, 1983; Kamau, 1996; Kanogo, 2005; Karuru, 1997; Mabokela, 2003; Muteshi, 1998). This article is a counter-narrative aimed at demonstrating the strategies that women leaders employ as tempered radicals in confronting these struggles and challenges. Tempered radicals are people who, upon finding themselves at odds with the dominant culture in their organizations or communities, decide to alter that culture in some way, yet remain inside the institutions and communities that they are intent on changing (Alston, 2005; Meyerson & Scully, 1995).

The article is intentionally celebratory, concentrating on resiliency and resistance to the myriad of oppressions that women encounter inside their institutions and/or communities (Baker, 1998; Ngunjiri, 2006).

The wider study from which this article is derived explored how select women leaders in an African context transverse gender, traditional culture, organizational culture, social norm stereotypes, and other constraints to their authority and leadership (Ngunjiri, 2006). Leadership is defined as making meaning amongst people to engender commitment (Drath & Palus, 1994), and as a specialized role, as well as social influence (Yuki, 2001) within a community of practice. The participants were 16 women leaders from educational, governmental, business and non-governmental organizations. Whereas the arenas of leadership varied, each woman considered herself an educational leader broadly defined; that is, a leader who is committed to educating men, women, children, communities, and the nation through the institutions and organizations that they lead. All the names used in this article are the actual names of the participants: they refused to use pseudonyms saying they wanted to own their stories.

I utilized a feminist qualitative method, one that I found to be culturally relevant as well as contextually appropriate (Ngunjiri, 2007; Ngunjiri & Lengel, In Press). Portraiture is a biographical approach blended from ethnography and phenomenology, where the researcher as primary instrument develops genuine relationships with the participants, with the aim of co-creating portraits that authentically convey the essence of the participants and the phenomenon under study (Lawrence-Lightfoot, 2005; Lawrence-Lightfoot & Davis, 1997). Portraiture concentrates on a search for goodness; that is, what works in the context, rather than the traditional social science emphasis with pathology (Lawrence-Lightfoot, 2005). Portraiture also blends scientific rigor with aesthetic sensibilities, with the aim of producing portraits that speak to wider audiences within and beyond the academy. I conducted all the interviews and focus group with the sixteen participants, and tape recorded and transcribed these conversations. I triangulated data sources by using the transcripts, along with any available archival data and my written observation notes.

The data analysis was iterative, beginning with the initial entry into the research site, continuing throughout the research process, and was aimed at finding common themes as well as discovering elements of dissonance in the women's narratives, to support and or expand the a priori conceptual framework. I utilized open coding or categorizing, as well as axial coding where I condensed categories into fewer and fewer themes (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Readers helped in confirming the coding system, and member checking assisted in maintaining the authenticity and credibility (see Ngunjiri, 2006, 2007). Tempered radicalism and spirituality were two of the major themes emerging from, and illustrated through extant quotes.
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Leave a Leadership Legacy Through UCEA’s Partners for the Future

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

Writing a will and including a bequest to UCEA allows you to choose where your estate will go and, in most cases, helps you to reduce taxes on your estate. Your bequest or planned gift-regardless of size-is a meaningful way to honor UCEA’s work and assure its future.

If you are interested in receiving information about wills, charitable gift annuities or other planned giving opportunities available at UCEA-with no obligation-please contact UCEA’s director of finance at 512-475-8592.

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

Spirited Tempered Radicals

According to Meyerson (2001), tempered radicals are people who exist as outsiders/within in organizations because of their values and social identities that differ from the majority; they want to fit in yet they want to retain what makes them different. Both Alston (2005) and Jones (2003) found that African American educational administrators tended to be tempered radicals, in response to the intersections of race and gender. Additionally, they found that African American educational administrators utilized their spirituality as a guide for their lives and leadership. Critical spirituality (Dantley, 2003) pervaded their activism, as they deconstructed existing unjust educational structures. As Dantley argued,

The element of critique and deconstruction of undemocratic power relations is blended with spiritual reflection grounded in an African American sense of moralism, prophetic resistance, and hope in order to form the viscera of this hybrid theoretical construct called critical spirituality. (p. 5)

African American and their African counterparts engaged in social justice leadership utilize a critical spirituality within the framework of being tempered radicals, as they deconstruct injustice in the institutions and communities they are attempting to change (Alston, 2005; Dantley, 2003; Jones, 2003; McClellan, 2006; Murtadha-Watts, 1999). The women in this study demonstrate how they are spirited tempered radicals in their pursuits of social justice as active agents in their own emancipation. Meyerson (2001) provided five strategies on a continuum that tempered radicals employ in their leadership: quiet resistance, turning personal threats into opportunities, broadening impact through negotiation, leveraging small wins, and collective action. Additionally, the African women leaders employed other strategies that expanded the notion of tempered radicalism. What follows are succinct illustrations of the strategies in practice among the African women leaders.

Resisting Quietly and Staying True to Oneself

Dr. Faith Nguru, an associate professor at Daystar University, director of research and consultancy at this Christian institution, aptly demonstrated quiet resistance. As she described her experience, “I found that it was a good thing to be female because there weren’t that many [of us], I would be sitting at a table as the only woman, and I would be handed all sorts of responsibilities...it was also taken for granted that I would serve the tea, which I didn’t mind except for the fact that it was expected of me... I delegated many responsibilities that were thrown at me, so that I was always at the top of my game.”

Mrs. Shiphrah Gichaga, the National Coordinator for Forum for African Women Educationalists Kenya Chapter falls under the category of the quiet resister. She rose in the ranks from a teacher, to an inspector of schools, to her position in the non-governmental sector through sheer hard work and quiet resistance. She described her own leadership experiences in terms of humility, service, and ‘leading like Jesus’—that is, modeling her behavior on what she interpreted to be humble service. She never ruffled any feathers overtly, and even though her mission has always been radical: increasing girls’ access to quality education, her methods have always been tempered. Her quiet personality seemed to fit well with that strategy, but other contexts and personalities demanded more radical engagement.

Turning Personal Threats into Opportunities

Mrs. Wainaina, former Executive Director of Pan African Gen-

ucea
Leveraging Small Wins

Small wins are what appear to be minute tasks that result in concrete, measurable, and visible progress towards transformational goals (Meyerson, 2001). Such small wins provide fuel for broader action later, as some of the women demonstrated. Mrs. Nangurai discussed her experiences when she first began to rescue girls thus; “I was younger then, and really feared our people's culture, so at first I did nothing. Then, one day, a girl ran away from home because she was about to be married off...she ended up with me...even during school vacations as she was afraid to return in case they married her off forcefully...when I was successful with her, I thought to myself, I can do this on a larger scale”. Mrs. Nangurai's success at rescuing just one girl resulted in the rescue mission that began in her own house, and later grew to become part of the school agenda. Similarly, Mrs. Eunice Ole Marima, another educated Maasai woman, formerly a development officer with World Vision began with small wins at the grassroots; by educating Maasai women in basic literacy and helping them learn how to grow food in kitchen gardens. Eventually, a few women growing vegetables for subsistence became a large community development project involving cattle trade, wheat farming, and adult education programs.

Organizing Collective Action

It is imperative for tempered radicals involved in social justice work to expand their sphere of influence. According to Meyerson, if three pre-conditions necessary for social movements exist: a. the presence of immediate political opportunities or threats; b. available structures for members to organize themselves into collectives; and, c. the framing of a collective identity, opportunity and threats; then it is possible for tempered radicals to successfully engage in collective action. All these preconditions exist in the Kenyan and African contexts. As Mrs. Likimani recollected, during the time when all the men were busy fighting in the forests for Kenya's independence, women quickly collectivized to help each other in their daily responsibilities. “the women had to participate in collective forced labor…then in the evening, with just an hour before curfew…one would collect the firewood, another would cook the dinner for several families, a third would go and plant or weed in the garden and bring some back.” This skill of organizing themselves into collectives to solve their common problems continued after independence. For example, Mrs. Ole Marima described her involvement in a Women’s Shadow Parliament, a collective of women engaged in policy making, giving themselves a voice in national issues such as constitutional review processes. As Dr. Mombo, academic dean at a Christian university asserted, “I need the support of the women because it is an isolated environment…we discuss gender socialization, among other issues”. In each instance of collective engagement, the women discussed the need for the skill of deconstructing the existing social structures in order to fully comprehend why things are the way they are, and how to create alternatives.

Practical Wisdom and the Ability to Deconstruct Social Structures

The ability to deconstruct social structures, while not overtly discussed in Meyerson's (2001) text about radical engagement, is a necessary skill for people of color and women serving in environments that are sexist, racist and otherwise unjust. An understanding of intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1991), the interpretive paradigm that seeks to apprehend multiple, connected lines of inequality along race, class, gender, sexuality, and even national context (Alston, 2005; Collins, 1999) is also imperative to being effective in both deconstructing unjust systems, and creating viable, equitable alternatives. Each of these women's ability to deconstruct culture, religion, politics, economics and institutional norms that served as...
structures of injustice, and consequently to find ways to remedy the situation through various strategies. Mrs. Wahu Kaara, a global social justice described it thus: “we are deconstructing society because something is wrong, our relationships with each other, the models that we live in, they are warped... we are doing an operation on society, cutting item by item which is a malignancy and looking for a cure”.

Rev Judy Mbugua, the first woman to be ordained in a mainline denomination in Kenya deconstructed religion thus: “It is God’s desire for women to rise up. I would get very impatient with men and feel like they are being inconsiderate of women, but now I realize they are too ignorant. They too were socialized to believe women are inferior and men are superior. So this has enabled me to be patient and to work behind the scenes to ensure that men too are trained... ”. Mrs. Muthoni Wanyeki, the current Executive Director of FEMNET felt the same: “The first question you have to ask about FGM (Female Genital Mutilation) is what exactly about it is supposed to be cultural, then you come to the fact that may be not necessarily the physical pain, but the teaching... which is so sexist. Can we have a different rite of passage that flips this script around? Some of the most interesting work in Africa is being done by people who do that kind of exploration and reinterpretation of culture and religion”. This skill of deconstructing social structures was dependent upon practical wisdom, born of experience and acuity of observation. As Paris (1995) described it, it is “excellence of thought...cognitive discernment for determining what hinders good action and what enables it...the fully developed capacity of a free moral agent” (p. 144). Practical wisdom is akin to Dantley’s (2003) conception of critical spirituality, which involves the ability to deconstruct unjust social arrangements as a prerequisite to rebuilding socially just institutions.

Resourceful Problem Solvers

The women leaders utilized limited resources to solve their personal, professional and community problems. They described it as an African woman trait: born out of their poverty and the challenges inherent in their common experiences as women in Africa. Mrs. Kaara described it thus: “we are the engines of our own societies...[for example] micro-credit strategies emerged out of women's groups... it is the creativity necessary to meet budget lines without a budget, mobilizing resources out of goodwill...”. Or as Rev. Mbugua commented, based on her own experience of rising from a high school drop out with five kids to her current position as the Executive Director of Pan-African Christian Women’s Association and observing the women she serves, “necessity is the best teacher, and knowing that this drunkard will never build me a house, he will never educate my children...I have to rise up. The African women are very resilient; I guess because of their poverty and need... problems have their own blessings in disguise.” These women were not glorifying poverty but rather recognizing that out of the women’s struggles have arisen creative means to solve their problems. However, the women were quick to note that their leadership had matured through trial and error, success and struggle.

Leverage Outsider/Within Positionality

Tempered radicals are outsiders/within, in their institutions or the communities they serve and attempt to transform (Alston, 2005; Meyerson, 2001). To be effective, tempered radicals have to learn how to leverage their outsider/within positionality to their advantage; how to best stand out while also fitting in. Dr. Mombo, the only woman in the administration at St. Paul’s University said, “The ladies had been told am a feminist so they shied off me because they were afraid to be branded feminists too...If am assertive am not motherly, if am motherly am not assertive. So I learnt what it means to be a feminist and I appropriated the term for myself, saying a feminist means refusing to be a doormat. So I speak up, I challenge the status quo.”

Mrs. Kaara asserted, “In this boardroom, you need not be saying ‘you all have forgotten me’. Speak up for yourself, so they dare not forget that you are there by merit not as a privilege. When you win one of those battles, you win for every other woman.” Each time the tempered radical becomes a visible and accepted member of the organization, even as she continues to ruffle feathers, she opens doors to other women (Meyerson, 2001). As Mrs. Wainaina commented, one need not be afraid of being different because it is in that difference that she can institute and drive change.

Conclusion

The African women leaders have demonstrated that African women are actively engaged in their own emancipation, in breaking down the barriers that exist against various marginalized communities in their contexts. They demonstrate resiliency and resistance against the intersecting oppressions deriving from gender, traditional customs, economic status, and other contextual realities. They help to expand our understanding of tempered radicals by demonstrating the pragmatic strategies at their repertoire, strategies that others can emulate when faced with unjust social structures.

These women leaders not only critiqued social constructions of gender, culture, leadership, religion, and the dominant discourse on history, but also reconstructed these to make them more just, more inclusive of different, or gendered and ethnic points of view. This ability is connected to their acuity in historicizing the status of women from colonial period to the current era, showing how the intersections of culture, traditional religion, Christianity, colonialism, westernization and market economy combine to create hegemonic powers that oppress women. But, it is noteworthy that these women do not consider themselves as victims, rather, they are victors who have managed to thrive and succeed as leaders in spite of the many challenges that they have had to surmount. Their stories illustrate the strength that comes from a profound grounding in spirituality, the conviction that comes from finding fulfillment in serving others, and the courage that emanates from being connected to others in community. They also illustrate maturing into pragmatic leadership through becoming tempered radicals – women who are willing to challenge the status quo but recognize the need for wisdom in choosing their battles, as well as the necessity for temperance in choosing their modus operandi. They recognized that sometimes they had to employ quiet resistance and covert negotiation, rather than direct confrontation, because they needed to rock the boat without falling out. When the situation demanded it they put their necks on the line through direct, confrontational, collective action towards social justice. Educational leaders would be well served to learn and be inspired by the resiliency and resistance that these African women leaders demonstrate.

Further studies need to be carried out utilizing qualitative, quantitative, mixed and emancipatory methodologies, looking at leadership from non-western and marginalized perspectives to continue to enrich our overall understanding of the phenomenon. Practicing educational leaders would gain a greater appreciation and a richer repertoire of strategies they can utilize in their own lives by learning from others experiences and expressions of leadership.
From the Director: What is UCEA Membership and Why Is It Significant? By Michelle D. Young

University-based, graduate level, leadership preparation programs provide the primary means for pre-service preparation for principals and superintendents in the United States. An estimated 450-500 programs in schools and colleges of education offer leadership preparation through masters (472 institutions), specialist (162 institutions) and doctoral (199 institutions) degrees (Baker, Orr, & Young, 2005). Seventy-eight of those are members of the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA), a consortium of research institutions with doctoral programs in educational leadership.

UCEA membership signifies program quality. The UCEA Plenum, its governing body, has established a single standard of excellence for membership: “Superior institutional commitment and capacity to provide leadership for advancement of educational administration preparation, scholarship, and practice consistent with UCEA’s established mission and purpose.” In order for UCEA membership to maintain its meaningfulness, its member universities must be marked by a distinctive commitment and capacity to lead our field. Thus, UCEA leadership encourages membership among those universities willing and able to commit time and resources to research, development, and dissemination activities toward the ends of improving preparatory programs and solving substantial problems in educational administration.

Prior to admission, each program is thoroughly reviewed by and voted on by the UCEA Executive Committee and Plenum, and it is UCEA policy that each University member undergo a re-evaluation every seven years. It is essential that member universities be able to commit personnel, time, and resources to research, development, and dissemination activities toward the ends of (1) improving preparatory programs and (2) solving substantial problems in educational leadership. To ensure a high degree of commitment to improve educational leadership among its members, the UCEA consortium asserts the following standards:

a. Faculty within preparation programs should make significant efforts to identify, develop, and promote relevant knowledge focused on the essential problems of schooling, leadership and administrative practice.

b. The preparation program should involve a critical mass of full-time tenure-track faculty members (typically five or more) whose appointments are in the department in which educational leaders are educated and who exhibit excellence in scholarship, teaching and service in educational leadership. A majority of educational leadership coursework must be taught by these full-time faculty.

c. The preparation program should make use of an advisory board of educational leadership stakeholders and involve leadership practitioners in program planning, teaching, and field internships.

d. Preparation programs should engage in collaborative relationships with other universities, school districts, professional associations, and other appropriate agencies to inform program content, promote diversity within the preparation program and the field, and generate sites for clinical study, field residency, and applied research.

e. The preparation program should be conceptually coherent and clearly aligned with some quality leadership standards, informed by current scholarship on the essential problems of schooling, leadership and administrative practice, and should make use of research-based, best practices in leadership preparation. In particular, the content of the preparation program should address problems of practice including leadership for student learning and diversity. Also, the processes of the preparation program should be based on adult learning principles.

f. The preparation program should engage in on-going programmatic evaluation and enhancement.

g. The preparation program should include concentrated periods of study and supervised clinical practice in settings that enable leadership candidates an opportunity to work with diverse groups of students and teachers.

h. The preparation program should be characterized by systematic, written recruitment and admission plans that rely on multiple sources of evidence and show deliberate efforts to attract applicants who demonstrate leadership potential with particular attention given to increasing diversity within the program.

i. The preparation program should develop and maintain systematic efforts to assist all students in professional placement and career advancement.

j. The preparation program faculty should participate in the development, delivery, and evaluation of systematic professional development programs for educational leaders, in cooperation with appropriate professional associations and other educational and social agencies.

k. The preparation program should offer regular professional development for program faculty to enhance their skills in leadership preparation, research methods, and other content areas.

Each of the above program standards were developed by the UCEA membership committee based on a review of research on quality preparation and then rigorously debated by members of the UCEA Plenum. These standards reflect the fields best understanding of the characteristics of quality leadership preparation.

In addition to being a marker of quality, membership in UCEA symbolizes an important aspiration; namely, advancing significantly the field of educational leadership through inter-institutional cooperation, communication, and contribution. The rationale underlying this aspiration is as follows:

a. Far greater human, financial, and technical resources exist in the total group of institutions belonging to UCEA than in any one of the member institutions;

b. Strategies for combining these resources for effective improvements can be better realized through a cooperative framework than through isolated efforts of individual institutions;

c. Cooperative patterns can be created for effectively implementing significant strategies;

d. Motivations of UCEA institution faculty to improve educational leadership will be enhanced through cooperative ventures; and

e. Results of program innovation and research endeavors can be disseminated efficiently through established channels that formally link the professors in member universities.

UCEA programs are distinguishable by their quality program features. Their faculty members are engaged scholars and their programs are working to produce excellent leaders for our nation’s schools. Moreover, as the UCEA/TEA-SIG Taskforce on Evaluat-
Ms. Gina K. Stanley
2007 UCEA Educational Leadership Award

Ms. Gina Stanley became Superintendent of the Sequoyah High School in March 2004. Sequoyah is a grade 7–12 residential/day school for American Indian students now sponsored by the Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma with financial support from the U. S. Bureau of Indian Schools among other sources. She succeeded to this position after previously serving Sequoyah as Principal (2002-2004) Coordinator of Curriculum, Instruction and Counseling (2001-2002), Assistant Principal (1997 – 2001) and teacher. Ms. Stanley began her career as head of a Sequoyah affiliated alternative school that served pregnant teens in an attempt to help change the statistic that showed 80 percent of these girls never received a high school diploma. She has, therefore, been associated with Sequoyah since 1986. She received a Bachelor of Education in Business Administration in 1985, and Master of Education in School Administration in 1986 from Northeastern State University in Tahlequah, OK.

Her professional memberships include: Cooperative Council for Oklahoma School Administration, American Association of School Administrators, Phi Delta Kappa, National Association of Secondary School Principals, Oklahoma Association of School Administrators, National Indian Education Association, and the National Indian School Boards Association. Ms. Stanley also is involved in several service organizations including the American Cancer Society, Relay for Life, and the Tahlequah Chamber of Commerce.

As Superintendent, Principal and Curriculum Coordinator, Ms. Stanley presided over significant changes in school offerings and requirements raising the quality, rigor and success of the educational program at Sequoyah to extraordinary heights. A significant aspect of the mission of Sequoyah High School is to serve the special needs of American Indian students that may not be met at area public institutions. This mission has many pitfalls, yet graduates of Sequoyah have come to expect that they will continue their education at universities both in and out of state. In fact, nearly 70 percent of Sequoyah’s graduating seniors annually go on to higher education, a far cry from the rates at which this occurred prior to Ms. Stanley’s influence. In addition, with the mean number of graduates in recent years being 55, a graduation rate of more than 96 percent and an average of 6-8 Gates Millennium Scholars annually, Sequoyah is a shining example of high quality school reform. Ms. Stanley added programs like college prep, which assists students with test-taking and applications; concurrent enrollment, which promotes early entry into college; and a leadership curriculum that enhances courses by including attributes of leaders as determined by a year-long project intended to identify such. Finally, although Oklahoma public schools normally require 23 units for high school graduation, Sequoyah now requires 28 units including classes that provide cultural validation and increased attention to traditional subjects such as English.

Through Ms. Stanley’s imaginative leadership and guidance, Sequoyah has changed from a school of last resort to a school of choice.

An E.C. Minute –
Stephen Jacobson

This new feature is a response to concerns expressed by some members of the Plenum that there needs to be greater transparency in terms of discussions taking place at Executive Committee meetings. At the August 2007 leadership meeting in Chapel Hill, which involved UCEA President Fenwick English, President-elect Stephen Jacobson, Executive Director Michelle Young and Associate Directors Linda Tillman and Catherine Lugg, the President-elect was charged with providing the membership an overview of one or two key topics considered at E.C. meetings. The material presented in this first edition comes from the minutes of the E.C.’s February, 2007 meeting in Alexandria, Virginia, attended by Fenwick English, Stephen Jacobson, James Koschoreck, Khaura Murtadha, James Scheurich, Alan Shoho and Michelle Young (recorder).

This first E.C. Minute reports the E.C.’s desire to increase diversity on the Plenum and UCEA’s plans to expand internationally.

1) Increasing the diversity of the plenum:

Towards the end of the last plenum session in San Antonio in November 2006, the E.C. introduced a motion to increase the diversity of the plenum by adding at-large PSRs who would be drawn exclusively from amongst scholars of color. This proposal was met with considerable debate and the motion was tabled. Upon reflection at the February meeting the E.C. realized that the plan, while well intended and still high on the E.C.’s list of priorities (i.e., modeling our commitment to equity and social justice), had been presented without sufficient deliberation on our part, nor sufficient notification to prepare the plenum for the discussion to come. Among other things raised by the plenum was that the E.C. consider gender and sexual orientation, in addition to race and ethnicity, in its attempts to increase diversity. We realized that to move forward, we needed more information about the demographic composition of our member institutions.

We had faculty data collected from UCEA institutional websites (which may not have been as up to date or accurate as we would like) and found that diversity in the composition of the PSR may be worse than that of UCEA faculty in aggregate because some institutions are quite diverse while others are hardly diverse at all. We feel that some, but not enough, headway has been made in increasing diversity on the plenum as UCEA has made a concerted effort to attract and admit institutions that have considerable diversity. We have also implemented the Barbara Jackson scholars program, which we feel will begin to pay tremendous dividends to the field and to the Council within a few years.

We discussed that more consideration needs to be given to the guidelines for PSR appointments and length of service. Currently, PSR selections are supposed to be made by deans, although it is more likely that department chairs or program coordinators make the appointment and the Dean simply signs off. Moreover, there are no term limits and some PSRs have served for very long periods of time. Two possible actions were discussed:

1) Sending notes to deans stating clearly that we want a more diverse plenum and that we need their help when making PSR selections at their institutions;
2) Consider policies for PSR qualifications and term limits.

We decided first to establish a Diversity Committee that will continue to gather data and then recommend a mechanism to increase the diversity of the plenum in place of the tabled motion. Drawing on the model of term limits for membership on the E.C., we will also present a seconded motion to the plenum to limit the term of PSRs to no more than 10 years at a time. We believe this policy will help to advance diversity, develop more opportunities for leadership experience, infuse new ideas, while at the same time maintaining a measure of organizational stability.

2) UCEA’s International Expansion:

With the admission of the Chinese University of Hong Kong in 2006 as the second non-North American institutional member of UCEA (University of Lincoln was the first, and several others have expressed interest), the E.C. feels that it is time for the Council to begin working on a mission/vision statement that describes our commitment to international leadership.

We see the 2007 UCEA conference theme, “Fostering Compassion and Understanding Across Borders: An International Dialogue on the Future of Educational Administration,” as the symbolic starting point for this expansion and there are a number of initiatives that will be highlighted at the conference, e.g., a general session and several paper sessions will report from the forthcoming International Handbook on Educational Leadership Preparation, which was an undertaking co-sponsored by CCEAM, BELMAS and UCEA. There will also be a strand of sessions on the program that will examine leadership and social justice from diverse international perspectives.

Finally, the E.C. believes we ought to start planning for an International Program Center and the creation of an International UCEA Associate Director. Both of these initiatives will require the development of appropriate RFPs.

We hope this first E.C. Minute begins to address concerns about greater transparency and we welcome your responses to this feature.

Call for Proposals to be Released in winter of 2008 For EAQ and JCEL

In the spring of 2008, UCEA will issue a “Call for Proposals” to UCEA member institutions concerning editorial hosting functions of the Educational Administration Quarterly (EAQ) and the Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership (JCEL). EAQ has been hosted at the University of Utah under the editorship of Diana Pounder and JCEL has been hosted at Miami University of Ohio under the editorship of Michael Dantley. Both terms will expire in June of 2010. The CFP will be distributed in February 2008 to UCEA plenary session representatives, department chairs and deans. If you have questions before that time, please contact UCEA headquarters.

Interview Series: An interview with Ellen Goldring of Vanderbilt University

By: Laura McNeal, Georgia State University

Dr. Ellen Goldring is currently a Professor of Educational Policy and Leadership at Vanderbilt University. Her research interests focus on examining leadership assessment and evaluation, exemplary models of school leadership, and linking leadership and learning. Dr. Goldring’s interests in the changing roles of school leaders requires an interdisciplinary approach that is refreshingly new, theoretically rich, and methodologically rigorous. Currently, Dr. Goldring is utilizing field-based, experimental research to develop innovative and unique measurement tools that can be used to evaluate educational leadership professional development programs and provide feedback to principals about their leadership effectiveness. The interview provides a unique perspective on the use of experimental design in studying educational leadership.

LM: Hello, Dr. Goldring. Can you please describe your current research inquiry in which you employ scientifically based research methods to evaluate leadership professional development programs?

EG: Yes, in light of the renewed emphasis on scientifically-based evidence from the US Department of Education and the Institute of Education Sciences, I’m conducting randomized field trials as a way to uncover new ways to evaluate the impact of leadership professional development programs and study mechanisms to provide feedback to school principals about their leadership effectiveness. I would like to acknowledge my colleagues who are collaborating with me: James Spillane at Northwestern University, Carol Barnes at Michigan State University, Eric Camburn at the University of Wisconsin-Madison and Henry May and John Supovitz at the University of Pennsylvania and Leonard Bickman at Vanderbilt. In our professional development project we are a collaborative team focusing on both trying to develop new ways to measure the impact of leadership professional development programs, and to explore the implementation of random assignments in studying principal development. Of course, the importance of random assignment is so that one can rule out other explanations or other factors that may explain the relationship between a program and its outcome. We have been fortunate enough to be able to work with a school district to randomly assign principals to the program and a control group.

In my other experimental project with another school district, we are exploring ways to use principal feedback to help improve principal leadership. This project also implements an experimental research design by randomly assigning principals to the feedback intervention and a control group. More specifically, one group of principals will be receiving feedback on their performance and another group will not. We are really encouraged that this project will provide us with invaluable insights into helping principals improve their practice.

I think for a long time people thought “well, when you’re studying school leaders what could one possibly randomly assign?” I think we are learning that there are districts that are very interested in this type of research and are willing to collaborate and cooperate.

LM: What challenges, if any, have you experienced in implementing experimental designs in researching educational leadership?
EG: There are a lot challenges. One of course is something that we call implementation fidelity. In other words, is the program actually implemented as designed? There are several challenges since we are working in the contexts of real districts versus a laboratory. As a result, superintendents change, priorities in a district change, all of which may impact whether a program is actually implemented as designed. Another challenge we have experienced is called non-compliance, which occurs when people don’t attend as they’re supposed to or do not engage in the program, and that’s very similar in the field of medicine. If a patient doesn’t take the medicine as prescribed they’re not complying with the regimen, and therefore one could say there may not be an effect, not because the program was ineffective, but because the participants are not complying with the program. So obviously if they’re not attending regularly, and not engaging, then it’s hard to attribute program outcomes to the program or to the participant’s failure to attend. Another problem we face is what is called crossover. This occurs when someone who is assigned to a control group participates in the program. One could have what is called “contamination” where participants in the program talk to each other and share what they’re learning with participants in the control group or in the comparison group. These are things that one reads about in the research literature and they are the typical challenges researchers face in conducting these types of experiments in the field.

Another common challenge, which isn’t the case only in random experiments but in all types of field research, is the problem of response rates and participation in the measurements and data collection. Since experiments (especially in our case) tend to be longitudinal, we have changes, such as principals who are leaving the district, principals who are moving to different schools, and principals who retire. Also, sometimes people just choose not to respond to data collection.

LM: Have you ever encountered any challenges due to changes in school contexts or shifts in policy while conducting experimental research?

EG: Yes, there have been superintendent changes, changes in policy, or school systems wanting to emphasize something different while the experiment is going on and that’s why it is very important to have a change component in the research. My research always uses mixed methodologies because it’s very important to have a component that can document and follow the context of the experiment as it is unfolding so that we can take those changes and those factors into account when we analyze and interpret the data. So I think it is a misnomer to think that a randomized experiment is simply the black box approach; where the black box is the intervention or program under study. No, we want to constantly study what’s transpiring with the principals, with the program, with the district and with the context during the time of the experiment so it is really opening the black box for a very deep understanding of the program and the intervention. This requires a detailed study using mix methods, such as interviews, case studies, and observations as well as valid measure of the leadership outcomes.

LM: Please describe one of the most interesting aspects of utilizing experimental research as a tool to examine educational leadership.

EG: One of the most interesting aspects to me as I mentioned before is actually trying to develop innovative and unique measurement tools to try to capture changes in leadership. Having the control group and the experimental group allows one to better rule out alternative explanations for what may be contributing to these changes. However, unless one has valid and reliable measurement tools that can help capture changes in leadership, then the fact that you randomly assign doesn’t necessarily mean much of anything. So our work, and again across a number of projects that I have been involved with both in the randomized trials of professional development and principal feedback but in some of my other projects as well, has really begun to explore how can we measure leadership in different ways. A typical way is with annual surveys. The problem with annual surveys is that often, it’s hard to capture and to measure changes based on perceptions whether they are teacher perceptions or principal perceptions and self-reports. So in our studies we’re really trying to develop other methods. We have an end-of-day log that we’re using, where principals log across a week, three times a year specifically about how they spend their time during each day they log. We validate the logs through shadowing and, conducting cognitive interviews on days when the principals log. We are developing a methodology to measure changes in knowledge with vignettes and scenarios. All of this measurement is happening at multiple time points across the school year and then across four of five years. In our work on leadership assessment and feedback, after an extensive review of leadership assessment instruments used by large districts across the US, we know that assessment instruments in the field have not undergone much, if any psychometric development. We (with colleagues Joseph Murphy, Andy Porter and Stephen Elliot) are developing measures of leadership effectiveness that are undergoing extensive reliability and validity testing. The challenge is to develop sound measurement tools that are not overly burdensome to the respondents and have strong face validity for the field. The measurement development work has been really very exciting and I think we will make a very big contribution to the field because other researchers can begin to use these tools once we finish our validation and reliability studies and we can develop a knowledge base.

LM: Based on your past research experiences, are there any changes that you will make in your use of randomized field trials for future research projects?

EG: Yes, I think there are two. First, I think it depends if the researchers are involved in the implementation or intervention or are evaluating an intervention being implemented by someone else, such as a district or third party. And the reason I say that is I think this question of implementation fidelity, and how it is both measured and understood is going to become very, very important. Because without a much deeper understanding, conceptualization and actual measurement of implementation fidelity it will be hard to know whether a program does in fact work, or if, as I said before, it is that there is something in the nature and implementation of the program that best explains the results. So I think as a field how we measure implementation fidelity and how we measure program components are essential. We are beginning to come to some consensus about what is a high quality professional development program in our field. Although we can talk about cohorts, learning in action, and situated learning and application, we still must address how would we measure those things to know if the program, although they may say it on paper, is really being implemented. So I think that is one big challenge in our field.

And then, as I mentioned before there’s still a lot of work that needs to be done in how one measures leadership. And as much as
we want to attribute a change in leadership to student achievement, I still think we have to better understand what are some of the measures of leadership that we know are experimentally associated with student achievement. All the research we have now is of course correlational. There have been almost no random experiments on leadership. So, I think it is important to continue this line of work. And to continue it in large enough samples so we can begin to see a body of evidence. And that’s why this brings us back to the measurement question. We need sufficient power in our experiments. As noted in my experiments we are randomly assigning all school principals in a district and these districts are urban and quite large so obviously one needs measurement and data collection techniques that can be implemented across large numbers of schools and large numbers of principals so we can begin to generalize knowledge.

LM: In exploring alternative ways of understanding different measurement tools and different treatment effects what are your feelings regarding the use of quasi-experimental designs?

EG: Well, they certainly do not have the same level of rigor as experimental designs. We know from the classical research literature that if you have a quasi-design you cannot rule out as many of the external and internal validity factors as you can with a true experimental design. However, we also know that in many cases, for many reasons, a true experimental design cannot be implemented. And there are many other advanced methodologies now that are being explored and implemented that I think can really contribute to our field using quasi-experimental designs. The field of educational leadership is quite behind, or rather in its infancy in many of these areas compared to other areas; some of them in educational policy in general. So, I think it is great that the field is beginning to see how these new methods and complex designs can be applied. I think these developments in research methodology require us to address measurement and capacity issues. We need to be training a new generation or a generation of researchers that understand the contexts of schools and educational leadership. And at the same time these researchers should have the methodological skills to be able to do this kind of work. And that’s certainly why IES is funding doctoral training grants to begin to help develop this new generation of researchers. But we have to make sure that enough people are interested in this work and knowledgeable about the field of educational leadership. One of my favorite quotes is from Lee Shulman, a quote I use often in my courses, he said, “The choice (of research methodology) requires an act of judgment grounded in the knowledge both of methodology and of the substantive area of investigation.”

LM: How do you suggest we train emerging scholars to utilize experimental research designs to study educational leadership?

EG: I have graduate students currently working with me on these research projects as part of our IES training grant. The purpose of this grant is to support students to train a new generation of educational researchers in experimental design. Through these training grants we are all involving doctoral students in experimental research and many of them will be doing their dissertations on these types of projects. And then they can graduate and hopefully continue their own lines of work with these types of designs.

LM: Thank you for the opportunity to discuss your innovative research in educational leadership. It has been a pleasure speaking with you.

Some Observations on Useful Approaches to Research on Education Leadership

Carolyn Riehl
Teachers College, Columbia University

With expanding accountability demands, an influx of new kinds of students in urban, rural, and suburban communities, and other changes facing schools and school systems, it is hard to know exactly what knowledge about education leadership will be useful or how that knowledge can be developed. The federal government has clearly weighed in on the side of scientific research, through initiatives like the National Reading Panel and the What Works Clearinghouse. Many critics have taken issue with the government’s approach to science, complaining about narrow specifications of appropriate research questions and methodologies, and the inattention to values or the subjectivity of the researcher. A somewhat more moderated view was promoted by the National Research Council’s report in 2002, Scientific Research in Education. The report acknowledged that many kinds of research can be useful but stressed the role of science and articulated six general principles to help create a “culture of scientific inquiry.” Researchers are to:

• Pose significant questions that can be investigated empirically;
• Link research to relevant theory;
• Use methods that permit direct investigation of the question;
• Provide a coherent and explicit chain of reasoning;
• Replicate and generalize across studies; and
• Disclose research to encourage professional scrutiny and critique.

Several years earlier, a task force of AERA’s Division A concluded much the same thing, advancing the view that research in educational administration ought to be relevant to identifying, analyzing, and solving significant education problems; ought to provide appropriate warrants for its assertions and conclusions; and ought to be communicated effectively and be subject to public evaluation (Riehl, Larson, Short, & Reitzug, 2000).

The government’s approach to research is evident in the request for applications for research funding in education leadership recently issued by the Institute of Education Sciences (IES, 2007). The Institute’s stated research agenda is to focus on factors within the control of the system that influence academic outcomes for students, including “systemic changes in the ways in which schools and districts are led, organized, managed, and operated that may be directly or indirectly linked to student outcomes.” Five goals for research in educational leadership are articulated, ranging from identifying the characteristics and practices of leaders who produce better student outcomes, to developing and measuring the efficacy of new programs for leader professional development, recruitment, and retention, to developing new assessments of the quality of education leaders. This program of research is intended to produce “an array of tools and strategies (e.g., in-service programs, policies, assessments) that have been demonstrated to be effective for improving and assessing the performance of education leaders in ways that are linked to increases in student achievement.”

The Institute’s request for applications outlines in considerable detail the preferred research methods for fundable studies. They range from multivariate analyses of large data sets (for identifying leadership characteristics and practices) to field research using carefully designed and replicable data collection strategies, to experiments that
either establish the possible efficacy of an intervention condition or evaluate the effectiveness of a fully implemented program. For studies of efficacy or effectiveness, studies that use randomized assignment to treatment and comparison conditions are given preference.

This request for applications is noteworthy both in its assumption that research can identify particular “tools and strategies” that help to produce leadership that generates better student outcomes, and in its expectations for sophisticated and carefully constructed research methodologies. Clearly, the field of education leadership research is being called to account. Is this a valid approach to education research? Will it generate knowledge that is truly useful? Is the field really ready for randomized trials?

**Perspectives on research from medicine**

Medicine is the field best known for its use of randomized experiments. Clinical trials with elaborate specifications for randomization and double blind protections to eliminate any bias from confounding factors are the “gold standard” of medical research. When the findings of random trials conflict with findings from other kinds of research, the random trials generally are seen as more authoritative and persuasive. Thus, education researchers who are encouraged to use randomized experimentation, as suggested in the IES request for applications, might benefit from looking more closely into how medicine uses random trials.

Medicine takes great care in the design and oversight of randomized clinical trials. For example, the National Institutes of Health (NIH) develops requests for research proposals with input from the research community and often specifies the precise trial designs it wants to fund. NIH works with the investigators it funds to further refine and then monitor studies.

A key aspect of the medical research review process is to determine whether “equipoise” exists. Ideally, equipoise is the condition of having a genuine null hypothesis, that is, one in which no treatment is considered superior to any alternative. This protects human subjects from harm and exploitation. But true equipoise is hard to achieve in clinical practice, because patients and their doctors have at least some idea of what they think should and will happen. Under such conditions, researchers strive for what is known as “clinical equipoise,” a stance which recognizes that while individual physicians and patients may have treatment expectations and preferences, the medical community overall is not of one mind about the best course of care and thus random assignment can be justified.

Experimentation in medicine is not conducted frivolously. The randomized trial is usually the culmination of a laborious and expensive progression of research through basic laboratory discovery and initial tests of efficacy, to a more extensive validation of the presence of intended effects and a search for rare, unacceptable side effects. Finally, when a treatment has been developed and refined, and its impact studied through other kinds of research, a random trial is conducted to ensure that unforeseen influences are eliminated. The cumulative knowledge gained from this extensive research, not just the results of the last, large randomized trial, lends its weight to a finding that a particular treatment is effective.

If such a model were adopted in education, researchers would have similar opportunities to conduct extensive conceptual and exploratory research, in addition to small scale treatment studies and contextual analyses, before even beginning to think about randomized trials. No one would proceed directly from the genesis of an idea to a random experiment, but studies would build upon one another. The condition of equipoise would have to be considered, so that research would not be designed to simply confirm that which is already held to be true. Consistent with the medical model, the push for more experimental research in education would be best answered, not just by more experiments, but by experiments surrounded and buttressed by an array of preliminary studies of many types.

The recent request for applications from the Institute for Education Sciences does seem to acknowledge that many different kinds of studies are needed. Random trials of large scale effectiveness are the last rung on a ladder that also includes exploratory studies of causal processes and efficacy studies that determine whether particular interventions can potentially work. This is encouraging news, especially if research proposals all along the spectrum of studies are actually funded. But will this research be useful?

The conclusions drawn from medical research must, of course, be made available to practitioners in useful formats. Some of this knowledge is transmitted by agents who sell products such as drugs and medical equipment; there are obvious parallels to textbook publishers and other vendors in education. Medical practitioners learn by attending continuing education seminars. And they read. Physicians read practitioner-oriented journals; unlike educators, they also read many of the same journals read by medical researchers. Given the scope and complexity of medical knowledge, mechanisms for synthesizing information, such as research meta-analyses (using techniques first developed in education), or a newer approach known as “evidence-based medicine” are important. Health care organizations and other entities also produce clinical guidelines for practitioners, but increasingly there are concerns that such guidelines might not be independent of political or economic interests.

Even with all of these mechanisms for getting research knowledge into the hands of practitioners, the application of knowledge is not guaranteed. The clinical practice of medicine varies more than people seem to realize, partly dependent upon physicians’ preferences and the availability of resources. Moreover, as in education, medical practitioners sometimes question whether research-based conclusions are applicable to the individual cases they encounter. Even the strongest experimentally-derived conclusions in medicine are just probabilities and do not guarantee that results will be identical in all cases. This leads us back to a consideration of what forms of research are really most helpful to practitioners.

Maxwell’s (2004) discussion of the difference between variance and process research is useful here. Variance research seeks to identify associations between fairly discrete constructs or variables. Process research is the investigation of actual, observable processes and mechanisms, in all of their complexity. Often, quantitative research reflects a variance orientation, while qualitative research is more process-oriented. In medicine, the processes and mechanisms of disease and healing are discovered in basic laboratory science and in clinical case studies. In randomized clinical trials, researchers seek variance-based evidence that the mechanisms they have identified in other studies do in fact work as hypothesized in the preponderance of cases. The growth of knowledge in medical care thus depends on both variance and process research. In the end, however, for the individual patient, it is not probabilities that matter most, but instead the particularities of their own case. No matter how well developed the knowledge based on random trials, the clinical physician must be a knowledge worker and use her or his best judgment in individual cases. Good medical care is based
upon expert clinical reasoning; good clinical reasoning is informed, but not determined, by authoritative knowledge derived from both process studies and variance studies.

Educational leaders (along with those who make policies and provide services to support them) can also benefit from both process-oriented and variance-oriented research, and they would be in the best position to do so if they were understood to be knowledge workers much like physicians, with the same expectations to apply knowledge derived from both kinds of studies, according to their best judgment and with explicit consideration of the case at hand. It is good to search for durable evidence of the effectiveness of different leadership approaches. But in the end, as Yvonna Lincoln and Egon Guba argued long ago, no generalization is entirely determinate, and practitioners can ask whether their own “working hypotheses” match those developed through other close studies of actual processes.

Some lessons for research from leadership practice

Several more observations about educational leaders are also relevant to this discussion of useful research. First, education leadership usually occurs within a complex social system, whether an individual school or a large district organization. Systems theory has taught us that multiple causal pathways through a system can produce the same outcome, a phenomenon that von Bertalanffy (1968) called “equifinality.” Given this, we should not expect to find one single form of leadership that will be effective in all places at all times. Experiments might determine that a leadership intervention is successful, but they likely will not rule out other possible interventions.

Equifinality complicates random experiments. Comparison groups not implementing the treatment being studied may find other routes to the desired endpoint (in the IES case, leadership that produces better student outcomes). In such a case, it would be very difficult to demonstrate that one particular approach is superior to another.

Moreover, as teacher researcher Hilda Borko (2004) has articulated in her “situative perspective,” individual actions are choices situated within nested layers of social organization—from the local classroom or school, to the wider district or state policy context, to an even wider community of professionals. To understand the practice of leadership, one must also understand the layered contexts within which leaders act. This is almost impossible to study through research that extracts and isolates variables. It requires a careful look at the enactment of leadership within particular circumstances. While the IES request for applications does make note of particular contextual factors that might interact with leadership practices, it may not be sufficient to model those factors as discrete variables in quantitative analyses.

The contexts of leadership are socially constructed. What people experience as “reality” includes material conditions that can be considered more or less objective, but also subjective conditions that are based on one’s own thoughts and consciousness. Researchers need to develop appropriate ways to apprehend the subjective and objective features of human life, along with their subjective and objective consequences.

This has at least two implications. First, we have to recognize that human beings engage in iterative cycles of interpretation, what Anthony Giddens (1984) calls the “double hermeneutic.” Research begins as an interpretation of what’s going on in the world, but those interpretations get noticed and they influence what goes on subsequently, necessitating more interpretation. So, for example, as soon as researchers coined the phrase “professional learning community” to describe what they saw occurring in some schools, the nature of professional interactions in schools began to shift, in ways as subtle as a new self-consciousness, and all further research has had to take this into account in some way or another. Social science research truly does shoot at a moving target.

Second, the persons who conduct research live in worlds that they help to socially construct through their own subjective meaning-making, and this influences their perceptions of and conclusions about the phenomena that they study. To account for this, research designs of all sorts – quantitative as well as qualitative – must attend to the disclosure of researcher subjectivities and the explicit demonstration of the trustworthiness of findings.

Neither of these implications are addressed in the IES request for applications for research. Researcher objectivity is implied and the emphasis is on objectively observable causal connections. Surely this will meet objections among education researchers.

The employment of research

Persons who read and use research on education leadership need to have access to research reports that are easily accessible and persuasive. In medicine, prestigious research journals like the New England Journal of Medicine have figured out how to present scientific knowledge through empirical research articles, editorials, commentaries, and case accounts in ways that engage and inform practitioners. Educational researchers (and the journals in which they publish) could do likewise, especially if they paid attention to human beings’ preferences for a good story.

Jerome Bruner (1990) has argued that human beings come to know the world and express what they know in two very broad ways. In the first mode, knowledge is conveyed through logical propositions that declare relationships among processes, things, and events. Most of us have been taught this mode of knowing and can follow its logic reasonably well.

The second method is the narrative mode of knowing, which Bruner claims to be more basic to humanity and ultimately more persuasive. Narratives present interpretations of the world that are holistic, fluid, and imprecise enough to invite the reader or hearer into further interpretive activity. They eschew the “sudden death,” right-or-wrong quality of propositional assertions and focus more on the varieties of human action.

It may seem that science employs only propositional forms of knowledge, making clear assertions of cause and effect. But looking more deeply, it appears that scientific propositions and narratives share one particularly important feature: the plot—the twists and turns of action and reaction that provide the forward thrust of the story. Narrative interpretations of the social world are built around plots as their key organizing feature; events find their meaning in how they are knit together within the overall direction of the plot. How can the same be true for science?

Scientific models based on quantitative analyses reflect probabilistic and conditional chains of events. Simple statistical tests show the likely probabilities that if one thing happens, another thing will follow; more complex analyses estimate the conditional effects of additional factors. But even in the most precise statistical analysis, causal relationships do not line up like dominos. Scope conditions, variance explained, error terms, confidence intervals, probability lev-
els—all of these regular components of statistical analyses serve the practical function of carrying the contextualization and indeterminacy of observed events and relationships. If we take these elements seriously and add to them the theories that are used to explain them, it becomes clear that a quantitative analysis has its own sort of plot, its own distinctive story line of meaningful human action.

The problem with most quantitative research is not that it does not have a good plot with which to knit its propositions together, but that its rhetorical structure makes the plot less visible. When researchers speak in the omniscient third person instead of the first person voice, use the continuing present tense instead of the past tense to describe relationships that were observed at a particular place and time, and describe variables that were constructed precisely but measured less precisely, they hide beneath a cloak of objectivity and certainty that may be illusory. The meaningful, conditional plot behind their propositions fades away, replaced by seemingly formulaic propositions.

This rhetoric of certainty around which scientific knowledge is constructed may provide comfort to leaders who feel they need clear guidance for the decisions they make. But if it doesn’t convey an accurate sense of what human action or leadership practice is all about, in the end what good is it? Research on education leadership will generate useful knowledge to the degree that it captures and interprets the full complexity of education leadership as a meaning-driven, socially situated, interpretive practice. While researchers may search for regularities in the antecedents and consequences of leadership practice, they could profitably also seek to understand the conditional nuances that characterize leadership at different times and places. This is possible through quantitative as well as qualitative research, as long as researchers reveal the plot behind their findings, the variable story line that holds action together.

One way to do this is for researchers to describe the interpretive challenges that they have faced. Quantitative research relies upon the interpretive perspective of the researcher as much as qualitative research does, but in different ways. Interpretive moments occur at different times in the process, starting when an initial hypothesis is constructed, and ending as the researcher makes sense of findings. Post hoc theorizing sometimes is thought to have no value because the propositions are not subjected to an empirical test, but clearly it is useful since the conjectures posed at the end of one study can become the hypotheses that frame another study.

Although qualitative researchers often describe their interpretive tasks, they too could be more explicit about how they face these challenges. Anfara, Brown, and Mangione (2002) illustrate several ways in which researchers can report more fully their analytic process. They argue against what they call the “privatization of analysis,” in which phrases such as “themes emerged from the data” or “member checks were done” are included almost as “magical incantations.” Instead, they show how researchers can present evidence in “documentary tables” and explain procedures used to ensure that the findings are credible.

Conclusion

The stakes are rising for research on education leadership. Policy makers and others want evidence linking leadership to student achievement. Our capacity to deliver the research that makes convincing linkages will depend upon our willingness to frame research approaches that capture the full complexity of leadership practice and that present the plot line of leadership effectiveness as a tale with many routes to one destination. As research on education leadership becomes more important, we can only expect that debates over methodology will become more strenuous. Perhaps one positive outcome of this will be that all types of research on leadership will improve.
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McLeod selected as one of ’20 to Watch’

Scott McLeod, Director of the UCEA Center for the Advanced Study of Technology Leadership in Education (CASTLE) and coordinator of the Educational Administration program at Iowa State University, was recently selected by the National School Boards Association (NSBA) as one of its ‘20 to Watch’ educators for 2007. The award goes to emerging leaders who NSBA believes will help shape the world of educational technology for the next 20 years. This is the third national award Dr. McLeod has won this year for his work with CASTLE. Earlier this year he was recognized as an ‘Emerging Leader’ by Phi Delta Kappa and as a ‘Leader in Learning’ by the cable industry.
NPBEA Seeks Input on Standards

The National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA), a ten member constituency group representing organizations with an interest in the improvement of educational leadership policy and practice, requests your participation in a review of the revised draft of the Educational Leadership Policy Standards: ISLLC 2008. These draft national policy standards will form the foundation for further work in the creation of more specific programmatic standards for the accreditation of educational leadership programs at colleges and universities (i.e., ELCC) and will provide the architecture for the more in-depth work of crafting practice standards at the state and district level. Policy Standards are empirically and value based statements that provide a broad vision that is designed to influence and shape the profession. Practice Standards are designed to bring to life the policy standards around key dimensions of the profession (e.g., preparation programs, professional development, and evaluation of school leaders).

The attached set of draft standards are only intended to identify broad policy functions of the educational leadership position. As you will see, there are similarities with and differences between the current version of the ISLLC standards and those proposed (2008) herein. First, we have kept the framework of the six “broad standards” but have made slight modifications to the language. Second, we have added “functions” that define each standard. Third, we have added research citation sources, and finally, we elected not to include “indicators” in the revised Educational Leadership Policy Standards: ISLLC 2008 policy standards.

The ISLLC Standard’s Revision Steering Committee requests your participation in the completion of the attached ISLLC Standards Revision Survey. On the coverpage of the survey we would ask you to indicate your position and the NPBEA organization you represent.

Please access the survey by clicking this link:

Deadline for submission of your survey response:
Friday, October 26, 2007

If you would like to view a copy of the draft Educational Leadership Policy Standards: ISLLC 2008 please visit:

The New DEEL (Democratic Ethical Educational Leadership) is Makes Strong Progress

Steve Gross- Temple University

Since first launching the New DEEL at the 2005 UCEA Annual Conference, university faculty and practitioner colleagues have made great progress:
• We are making progress on all six of our projects: Curriculum, Research, Publications, Technology, Funding, and Code of Ethics

• There were two New DEEL sessions at last year’s UCEA Annual Conference, including a lively flash point meeting and a curriculum focused session

• We held our first annual New DEEL conference. It was well attended and featured presentations, panels, and discussion forums from US and Canadian scholars and practitioners.

• The first New DEEL graduate course is now being offered. It is called Profiles in Democratic Ethical Leadership and has been well received by students at Temple University.

• We are even on Facebook!

Please join the conversation by attending one of the three New DEEL sessions at the upcoming UCEA Annual Conference.
Please also come to our second annual New DEEL conference:
• Place: Temple University, Philadelphia, PA.
• Date: February 21-23, 2008
• Keynote speakers will include:
Carl Glickman and Paul Begley
From the President: Toward Re-founding the Field of Educational Administration
Fenwick W. English, President UCEA and R. Wendell Eaves
Senior Distinguished Professor of Educational Leadership, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

It is time to seriously consider re-founding educational administration. My Canadian colleague Eugenie Samier at Simon Fraser University has begun a conversation involving Canadian, European and American scholars about such an idea (Samier, 2005). A “re-founding” may not be as radical sounding as may first appear. A similar “re-founding” of public administration occurred in the early 1980s, and came to be known as the Blacksburg Manifesto because it was crafted by scholars at VPI in Blacksburg, Virginia (Evans & Wamsley, 2007, p. 200).

We need to understand the context and conditions which produced the Blacksburg Manifesto. Leading scholars in public administration had grown weary of the partisan “bureaucrat bashing” of the Carter and Reagan administrations, as well as the stranglehold of behaviorism and positivism of the social sciences in which public administration had been historically grounded.

The premise of the Blacksburg Manifesto scholars was that the founding of public administration was actually a “mis-founding,” or as described by Evans and Wamsley (2007) “a misapplication of the tenets of managerial or administrative science onto government” (p. 200). This “mis-founding” left public administration vulnerable to “bureaucrat bashing” and unanswered questions regarding the epistemological legitimacy of the field. I believe we have a similar problem in educational administration (English, 2002; 2006) which has left us open to a range of criticism from the neoconservatives in the Broad Foundation and Fordham Institute (2003), the American Enterprise Institute (Hess, 2003), and even to Arthur Levine’s (2005) “research,” if it can be called that.

The Blacksburg Manifesto called for a “re-founding” of public administration’s normativity within a democratic state grounded in effective public participation. The participation concept was re-conceptualized as a policy process located in the public interest, as opposed to the idea of privatization and marketization advanced these days in business administration. These latter concepts are coming to dominate educational administration in the continuing pejorative legacy outlined over forty years ago in Callahan’s (1962) Education and the Cult of Efficiency.

The writers of the “Blacksburg Manifesto” viewed public administration “…as a calling to service of one’s fellow citizens—a moral enterprise, as contrasted with the mere management of public agencies.” Such a vision embraced an “empowered citizenry as partners in the governance process” (Evans & Wamsley, 2007, p. 200). The Manifesto positions public administrators as “agential leaders whose authority is derived from their civic virtue, their sense of vocation, and their experience in administration” (Evans & Wamsley, 2007, p. 200).

Re-Founding Not Re-Culturing

I endorse the move to engage in a “re-founding” because it is becoming clearer that the forces which continue to dominate our discourse have perhaps irreversibly corrupted it beyond salvage. It is difficult to express an oppositional voice when the grounds of the conversation have already been captured by the ideology one opposes. But first let me differentiate between the notion of “re-founding” versus “re-culturing.” The latter term assumes that the initial point of a field is correct, only that somehow it either went astray or turned sour.

I think one could build a fairly substantial case based on the research and scholarship of many of our UCEA colleagues, past and present, that educational administration was mis-founded, first on scientific management (Callahan, 1962) and then on managerial science (Culbertson, 1988). Both of these traditions remain strongly entrenched in our field into present times, though scientific management has morphed into TQM, various sundry accountability schemes, and the managerial skill sets represented in the approach taken in the creation of the ISLLC standards. Furthermore, the legacy of these traditions continues implicitly in the form of institutionalized racism (Tillman, 2003); sexism (Blount, 1998); and homophobia (Lugg, 2003). And it seems doubly ironic that calls for “re-culturing” often take on the metaphors and rhetoric of marketization and job standardization which continue and extend such past practices (Saltman, 2000; Emery & Ohanian, 2004).

Pierre Bourdieu (2003) has commented on the strategy of the neoliberal forces at work in our larger society in which conservatism “presents itself as progressive” (p.34). Bourdieu (1998) identifies the metaphors of neoliberalism as “lexical tricks” in which “the idea of freedom, liberation, deregulation…reform, for example [are] designed to present a restoration as a revolution, in a logic which is that of all conservative revolutions” (p.50). Catherine Lugg (2000) has similarly labeled neoliberal supply-side economics as “essentially nineteenth century classical economics reclothed in an Armani suit” (p.25).

We would be naïve to believe that educational administration as an applied field, wholly situated in the larger political context, could somehow avoid the pervasive lexicon and neoliberal discourse of our times. Bourdieu (1998) has called the neoliberal world view centered on such phrases as the “global village” and “globalization” as one which engenders “fatalism and submission” (p. 57). He quotes Max Weber as saying that dominant groups “always need a theology of their own privilege,’ or more precisely, a sociodicy” which is “a theoretical justification of the fact that they are privileged” (p. 43). For these reasons it is my contention that “re-culturing” is simply not adequate as an antidote for the malignity of our times and of the current contestation for what Ted Kowalski (2004) has called “the soul of school administration.”

Two Key Issues in the Focus on The Re-Founding of Educational Administration

I want to focus on two key aspects of the discussion around “re-founding” the field of educational administration. They are: (1) the possibility of supporting a boundary between a “field” and a “non-field,” or especially if claims are made about the field being “scientifically grounded,” between a “science” and a “non-science”; and, (2) the pervasive and perverse impact and influence of economics, rational choice theory, and privatization from business administration as models and metaphors for educational administration. This latter emphasis works to deregulate governmental influence towards the law of the marketplace.

Bourdieu (1998) has called this trend “the involution of the state,” in which the “social functions of education, health, welfare, and so on,” are repressed and abandoned (p. 34). The Germans have created a word for this backward movement as it pertains to social gains, i.e., regressionsverbot (Bourdieu, 1998, p. 41). We see this battle occurring in our midst over the idea of social...
just as one of the major focal points for university preparation programs. While NCATE has already abandoned social justice in a craven surrender to the neoliberal agenda, nowhere is that struggle clearer than the current debate over the revision of the ISLLC standards.

Science, Certainty, and Conceit

The first problem with the continuing notions of a “field” concerns the triumph of rationalism and/or logic in promoting “administrative science.” This trajectory in educational administration has long been documented (Griffiths, 1988; Crow & Grogan, 2005) and despite much criticism continues to endure (see Young & Lopez, 2005). The critical assumption of the existence of a “field” defined by science is that it is possible to empirically or logically support what Lakatos (1999) has called a “line of demarcation,” that is, a place where a juncture between science and non-science, or in our case, a field from a non-field can clearly be demarcated. Lakatos (1999) has called this dilemma, “the central problem in [the] philosophy of science (p. 168) and goes on to elaborate why empirical or logical support for any “line of demarcation” is futile.

However, on just such an assumption we have constructed a “knowledge base” (see Scheurich, 1995; Donmoyer, 1999). The knowledge base, the presumption of a line of demarcation, and the existence of a “field” are synonymous. Upon this conceit our current delineation of “professional standards” is anchored. I use the word “conceit” to indicate that it is a “fanciful idea” or “an elaborate or strained metaphor” (Merriam-Webster, 1972, p. 171).

When examined closely and critically, there is very little certainty for a singular knowledge base which is congruent with an empirical or logical confluence comprising a “field” in educational administration. When that dissolves, so does the notion of a universal set of professional standards. But we continue to perpetuate that conceit because so much has been erected upon it (licensure, accreditation). It is time to seek a different “founding” for our endeavors which is much humbler and more humane, less certain, and more open to a fuller examination of the many facets of leadership which comprise both art and science (see Heilbrunn, 1996).

Ed-Bizspeak: Privatization, Profits, and the Law of the Market Place

The other contaminating influence on the practice of educational administration has been the expansion of neoliberalism in the economic and business spheres of the nation which has immersed administrative practice and studies of administration in the “law of the market place” (see Anderson & Pini, 2005).

Bourdieu (1998) indicates that this concept consists of setting up as an ideal “the real regularities of the economic world abandoned to its own logic” (p.35). Then he explains what this means:

It [the law of the market place] ratifies and glorifies the reign of what are called the financial markets, in other words the return to a kind of radical capitalism, with no other law than that of maximum profit, an unfettered capitalism without any disguise, but rationalized, pushed to the limit of its economic efficacy by the introduction of modern forms of domination, such as ‘business administration’, and techniques of manipulation, such as market research and advertising (p.35).

Various scholars have revealed the agenda of neoliberal policies being promulgated and pushed on the schools from the business community. Emery and Ohanian (2004) call the language of the Business Round Table, Business Coalition for Education, Business Education Task Force, the Broad Foundation, and others “ed-bizspeak” because it involves the use of numbers “without social conscience” (Emery & Ohanian, 2004, p.13).

At work in the neoliberal/business agenda is “the transfer of public institutions into private hands” which “eclipse democratic concerns with the development of a critical citizenry and institutions that foster social justice and equality” (Saltman, 2000, p. ix). House (1998) had earlier observed that four types of economic errors were commonly made by policymakers and the public alike, “…misunderstanding the economic system; misunderstanding the educational system; misunderstanding the fit between the two; and misapplying economic concepts. All four errors are abundant in education” (p.11).

Cuban (2004) has pointed out the irony of the current business led education reform:

What business-inspired reformers wanted for state and local curricula, tests, and ‘bottom line’ accountability has largely been achieved at the cost of preserving orthodox school organization and conventional teaching practices that an earlier generation of business-led reformers severely criticized as both traditional and regimented. (p.111)

The creation and implementation of the ISLLC standards as the presumed zenith of school leadership ironically exemplify Cuban’s critique. The ISLLC standards have become a barrier to radical school reform, because when existing practice becomes best practice then that is all practice will ever become. Standardization amounts to the freezing of change. When social justice is excluded from such standards than current social practices and relationships are similarly ossified. Social inequities are thus perpetuated and legitimized, and in this maneuver we have passed off a regressive social policy as “progressive”.

We need to unmask these practices and the discourse in which they are embedded and in which are own practice has been reduced to enabling a minority to control the majority by creating its own sociodicy.

The evidence about the downside of an unfettered “law of the market place” is clear in the corporate world. Since July of 2002 there have been more than 1,000 convictions against corporate leaders engaged in fraudulent practices. They have been saddled with billions of dollars in penalties (Davies & Scannell, 2006). A study of the practice of backdating stock options by professors at Harvard and Cornell found that about 850 corporate chief executives padded their pay by an average of 10% (Hechinger, 2006). The Security and Exchange Commission has been investigating Dell Inc. for fraudulent financial practices. Dell publicly disclosed it would have to restate four years of its financial statements because of “improper account adjustments ranging from several hundred thousand to several million dollars to reach quarterly financial targets” (Lawton & Clark, 2007). Is this the paragon of effective practices recommended for educational administration by the Business Round Table and neoconservative think tanks and foundations?
It is amazing that business leaders continue to believe they have something to offer to the improvement of public education (see Bersin, 2005), when the actual public has greater confidence in educational leaders than business leaders (see Brush, 2006). In a recent Wall Street Journal/NBC News Poll of Americans only 16% proffered “substantial confidence in the financial industry” but expressed confidence in the public schools by 32% (Harwood, 2007). While 32% is hardly a ringing endorsement, the even lower rating for the corporate sector should give pause to using the for profit/privatization model as one for improving the quality of public service.

The corporate sector has no other aim but to make money. Clive Crook in The Economist (2005) stated it rather baldly when he said, “When commercial interests and broader social welfare collide, profit comes first” (p.4). It is time to liberate educational administration from the tenets of the profit making mindset with all of its attendant efficiency metaphors as the exemplar for its practices. Children and parents are not customers.

**A Re-Dedication to the Idea of Public Service as the Basis of Moral Authority in Educational Administration**

A re-founding of educational administration around the concept of public service instead of privatization is long overdue. In a passionate plea for attention to the re-commitment of Americans to the mission of the common schools, Paul Houston, Executive Director of the AASA, recently argued in the 2006 NSSE Yearbook for school administrators “to lead the renewal of the spirit of commonweal that has always been the central expectation of public education” (p.5) Houston has indicated that “we must recognize that the first and foremost mission of the public schools is their civic mission” He asks pointedly, “What would it take to recapture the deepest reasons we have public schools?” (p.1)

For UCEA professors the challenge is how to shape our intellectual and research agendas to re-establish the civic mission of public education and to re-energize our purpose to force our constituencies to confront the profound social and economic inequities that schools often reproduce and perpetuate. Bourdieu (2003) also challenges us:

To give symbolic force, by way of artistic form, to critical ideas and analyses...to give a visible and sensible form to the invisible but scientifically predictable consequences of political measures inspired by neoliberal ideology (p.25)

The moment is at hand to re-found educational administration to resist and overcome neoliberal ideology by employing what Bourdieu (2003) has termed “scholarship with commitment” defined as “collective politics of intervention in the political field” (p.25). Such a commitment means that professors abandon the idea that they must not take part in the debates that are going on about the future of education in our society. To adopt a position of advocacy and intervention does not mean that we cannot also engage in competent research. As long as the proponents of privatization can count on our remaining neutral in this struggle, the force of our public intellectualism will be kept from the fray. We will never be “players” in any game as long as we sit on the sidelines, no matter the reason. And ultimately, we become irrelevant.

**Rejecting the Neoliberal Vulgate: Getting Active in the Struggle**

As we consider re-founding educational administration, we ought to recognize that the American perspective is not the only one in the world, and currently not even the major voice in the English-speaking world. If scholars in other nations take up the challenge of re-founding our field, and indeed move its raison d’etre away from marketization, privatization and the landscape of for profit business administration to one of public service, we would have to take notice.

Secondly, this activity is first and foremost an intellectual and epistemological one (Bourdieu, 2003, p. 11). Re-founding the field is not about practice. Rather it is about how we think about practice and to what ends practice is directed. It is first and foremost a theoretical matter, anathema to most practitioners and many of their associations who are content to cull and codify existing practices as though collectively they could produce the nadir of professionalism and the schools in which they were to be applied the epitome of development. The problem is that the currents in which the culling and codifying occur contain the mindscapes and metaphors of consumerism (see Murphy, 1999) or the “neoliberal vulgate” identified by Bourdieu (2003) as far from “a product of spontaneous generation” (p.12). Rather “it is the result of a prolonged and continual work by an immense intellectual workforce, concentrated and organized in what are effectively enterprises of production, dissemination, and intervention” (Bourdieu, 2003, p. 12).

Mike Bottery (2004), a thoughtful colleague in the UK, has indicated that the landscape of consumerism is “built upon the profit motive [and] is likely to subordinate and transform values like trust, goodwill, sincerity, fairness, as they are primarily used as instrumental values to service a commercial relationship.” (p.70) Bottery (2004) talks about hollowing out state functions where the state “ceases to have a role in the creation of societal projects...[and] is reduced from being a player in the game of life to being an umpire in the game of the market” (p.72)

We have been operating on a dangerous and disillusioned conset about practice and professional standards, and a serious discussion about re-founding the field should provide the leverage for the full exposure of it. Bourdieu (2003) wrote that those of us who “have the good fortune to be able to devote their lives to the study of the social world cannot stand aside, neutral and indifferent, from the struggles in which the future of that world is at stake” (p. 11). This is a call to take part in such a struggle on grounds we know well. If we are witnessing what has been called, “the gutting of the compassionate functions of the state” (Saltman, 2000, p. xvii) and within that struggle the erasure of the civic function of schooling, then a re-founding of our work around civic virtue within a democracy could become the means of organized collective resistance to the loss of those compassionate functions of government and the state currently under siege.

If you are concerned about the erasure of the compassionate functions of the state in education, health, housing, medicare, welfare, social security, and alarmed by the continuing silence in our standards and accreditation content regarding social justice, and if the idea of re-founding the field is appealing to you, email me at [fenglish@email.unc.edu]. I intend to speak to these and related issues in my Presidential address at the 2007 UCEA Convention in Alexandria, Virginia in November in greater detail.
UCEA Announces New Members to the UCEA Review Editorial Team

Dr. Laura McNeal will replace Dr. Mark Gooden on the team and will be working with Dr. Gerardo Lopez on the Interview section. Dr. Laura McNeal holds a Juris Doctorate (J.D.) degree and a Ph.D. in Education Administration. Following her graduate studies Dr. McNeal served as a Research Associate in the College of Education at Michigan State University. While at Michigan State University, Dr. McNeal worked with urban high school students in Detroit to increase their academic readiness for college and encourage them to pursue teaching careers in urban schools. Currently, she is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Educational Policy Studies at Georgia State University where she teaches education law, policy, and leadership courses. Her research interests include examining the intersection of law and policy and how it shapes and influences educational leadership and urban student achievement. Dr. McNeal’s interests in urban youth and education policy requires an interdisciplinary approach that is refreshingly new, theoretically rich, and methodologically rigorous. She is a published author and has presented her research at several national conferences.

Dr. Liz Hollingworth has joined the UCEA Review team as the editor of the Innovative Programs section. After earning a bachelor's from the University of California Los Angeles and a master's degree in elementary education from Northwestern University, Liz Hollingworth taught elementary and middle school for eight years. She went on to earn her Ph.D. at The University of Iowa, while working as a graduate assistant with the Iowa Testing Programs. In 2006, Dr. Hollingworth joined the faculty in the College of Education at the University of Iowa where she holds a joint appointment between the Educational Policy and Leadership Studies Department and Iowa Testing Programs. Professor Hollingworth’s research and teaching focuses on school curriculum, assessment, and policy— in particular, how the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) policies affect school administration.
Journal of Research on Leadership Education

Volume Two, Issue Two Released on UCEA Website

WHAT THE RESEARCH AND LITERATURE SAY ABOUT THE DELIVERY OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP PREPARATION PROGRAMS IN THE UNITED STATES

Stacey Preis, University of Missouri-Columbia, preiss@missouri.edu
Margaret Grogan, University of Missouri-Columbia, groganm@missouri.edu
Whitney H. Sherman, Old Dominion University, whserma@odu.edu
Danna M. Beaty, Tarleton State University, dbeaty@tarleton.edu

Abstract: This article reports the work of Domain 7 of a University Council of Educational Administration (UCEA) taskforce. The purpose of the taskforce was to examine the literature on current delivery models of educational leadership preparation programs and determine which aspects of delivery have been studied. All available articles and chapters that dealt with the aspect of program delivery were reviewed – both in educational administration at the PK-12 level, and in other selected fields to provide instructive comparison. The taskforce found that apart from some empirical research on the cohort model, very little empirical work has been done on delivery. There is some scholarly literature about delivery issues, but clearly, this is a seriously understudied aspect of leadership preparation.

THE REALITY OF LEADERSHIP PREPARATION IN A RAPIDLY CHANGING CONTEXT: BEST PRACTICE VS. REALITY

Darlene Y. Bruner, University of South Florida, dbruner@tempest.coedu.usf.edu
Bobbie J. Greenlee, University of South Florida, greenlee@tempest.coedu.usf.edu
Marie Somers Hill, University of South Florida, mhill@tempest.coedu.usf.edu

Abstract: Leadership preparation programs find themselves in a state of flux, experiencing changing demands, and increasing scrutiny and accountability. New challenges and definitions of leadership preparation coupled with expanding demands for increased abilities of school leaders in ever larger numbers create the necessity to examine, question, revise, partner, and expand current program offerings. This paper discusses the changing context of a leadership preparation program striving toward a more ideal model while considering the realities of students’ employment obligations, experience, and career aspirations.

AN INTERNATIONAL EFFORT TO BUILD LEADERSHIP CAPACITY: INSIGHTS FROM THE FIRST COHORT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION AT THE COLLEGE OF THE BAHAMAS

Autumn Tooms, Kent State University, atooms@kent.edu

Abstract: The purpose of this qualitative study was to learn what motivated students to enroll in the first formal training program in educational administration in the history of The Bahamas. This research considers the intersections of motivation, career paths, and educational histories of those who live and work in schools in The Bahamas. Open-ended, audiotape recorded, interviews were conducted with each of the 18 members of a cohort of Master’s degree candidates at The College of The Bahamas. Data revealed that motivations for program enrollment ranged from an intrinsic desire to obtain a graduate degree, to the belief that the degree would support entrepreneurial efforts within the Bahamian education system. Interviews also revealed a double standard for women who work in Bahamian schools, in terms of advancement to administrative positions. Implications center on the need to address the gender oriented double standard, as well as the need to increase the cultural value of education in The Bahamas.

LESSONS FROM AN INTERNATIONAL COLLABORATION: A FACULTY MEMBER’S REFLECTIONS MOVING BEYOND BEING NICE: TEACHING AND LEARNING ABOUT SOCIAL JUSTICE IN A PREDOMINATELY WHITE EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP PROGRAM

Joanne M. Marshall, Iowa State University, jmars@iastate.edu
George Theoharis, Syracuse University, gtheohar@syr.edu

Abstract: This article describes activities, discussion questions, and readings from a required educational foundations course in an educational leadership preparation program at a predominantly White Midwestern university. The course is designed to move future educational leaders beyond their inherent “niceness” to a sense of social justice in their schools. Strategies and implications are discussed.

“JUST THE WAY THINGS WERE” OR MALICIOUS INTENT?: ONE PROFESSOR’S EFFORT TO FACILITATE TRUTH

Katherine C. Mansfield, University of Texas at Austin, kcmansfield@mail.utexas.edu

A JRLE Student Voices Essay.
New Service for Non-English Speaking Authors

This note is to let you know about a new service that SAGE will be referring to assist non-native English speakers with language fluidity in their manuscripts.

In recent years, we have noticed that many journals have been receiving an increasing number of submissions from international authors writing in English as a second language. In an effort to address concerns some editors have raised about preparing these manuscripts for publication, we have identified a company, SPi, which offers “language polishing” services to authors in the areas of science, technology, medicine, and the social sciences. SAGE has completed an examination of their services and we have found that their work meets our standards. For more information about SPi and their Professional Editing Services, visit http://www.prof-editing.com

In order to make authors aware of this company and their services, we will be adding the text below to the end of the Manuscript Submission Guidelines. Please note that although we recommend SPi, SAGE is not affiliated with them and authors who choose to utilize the services of SPi will be solely responsible for the costs incurred.

How to get help with the quality of English in your submission:

Authors who want to refine the use of English in their manuscripts might consider utilizing the services of SPi, a non-affiliated company that offers Professional Editing Services to authors of journal articles in the areas of science, technology, medicine or the social sciences. SPi specializes in editing and correcting English-language manuscripts written by authors with a primary language other than English. Visit http://www.prof-editing.com for more information about SPi’s Professional Editing Services, pricing, and turn-around times, or to obtain a free quote or to submit a manuscript for language polishing.

Please be aware that SAGE has no affiliation with SPi and makes no endorsement of the company. Your use of their services in no way guarantees that your submission will ultimately be accepted. Any arrangement you enter into will be exclusively between yourself and SPi, and any costs incurred are the sole responsibility of the author.

Thank you,
Burke Nagy
Publishing Editor, Journals Division
Sage Publications


UCEA Employment Resource Center

UCEA Job Posting Service

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

UCEA Job Search Handbook

The UCEA job search handbook, located on the UCEA website (www.ucea.org), is an online resource for aspiring educational leadership faculty members and the institutions that prepare them. The handbook was created by Scott McLeod (University of Minnesota), Ken Brinson (North Carolina State University), Don Hackmann (Iowa State University), Bonnie Johnson (University of Kentucky), and Lisa Collins (Lehigh University) based upon a set of materials they have developed about the job search process for Educational Administration academic positions.

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

University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan

The University of Michigan Educational Studies Program prepares individuals for careers as researchers, policy leaders, or university professors in the field of education. Roger D. Goddard, Associate Professor of Education and Kristi Khorsheed, Senior Research Associate, are members of a taskforce that was created five years ago at the University of Michigan to design a new, innovative doctoral program for preparing future scholars in educational studies in collaboration with the Carnegie Foundation’s Initiative on the Doctorate. Almost three-fourths of the School of Education is comprised of the Educational Studies Program, which includes a specialization in educational administration and policy.

The taskforce itself has met monthly for several years. Kristi Khorsheed says members of the School of Education faculty and doctoral students come together regularly to think about innovative ways to improve the program. To inform their thinking, the committee conducts internal research by interviewing and surveying their doctoral students. They also engage in conversations with colleagues to seek input, to construct syllabi and to determine what constitutes core knowledge in the field of education. Khorsheed says, “These interdisciplinary conversations about content and pedagogy give us the opportunity to grapple with the fundamental questions about what students need to know and how we would measure it, particularly in their first year of the program.”

Full-Time Program

One of the unique features of the Ph.D. program at the University of Michigan is that it is intensive and designed only for full-time resident students. The guaranteed funding for the students comes primarily in the form of assistantships: students might work with program faculty on research projects that are independently funded, or they may serve as teaching assistants, or field instructors for student teaching. Part of the reason for creating a full-time graduate program that provides full funding to all students, according to Roger Goddard, is that “we know we are competing with other top education schools for outstanding students and many of the best students receive multiple offers.” Faculty and students are involved in almost two dozen educational research projects which provide students with rich opportunities for practicing field-based research alongside faculty. (For a full list with links to details about the projects, visit: http://www.soe.umich.edu/es/research/index.html.)

Another organizational feature of this program that makes it unusual is the first year cohort system. The program admits up to 20 new students each year. Students who are admitted together take four common core courses in their first year in educational research methods, foundational perspectives, and foundations of teaching and learning. They also participate in a year-long pro-seminar with opportunities designed to orient them to scholarly activities, such as reading, writing, publishing, and engaging in discussion and debate. The decision to create this community of learners came about from Task Force surveys of current and former students. According to Goddard, “A key benefit of the full-time Ph.D. program is that students and faculty work closely together and the vast majority of students receive opportunities to present research at leading conferences and to publish original research with faculty. This helps sustain a vibrant intellectual community that is particularly supportive of both junior faculty and doctoral students.”

Coursework

One of the hallmarks of Educational Administration and Policy at the University of Michigan is the programmatic flexibility offered to students. Students may take courses across the School of Education and across the University to build a coherent and substantive program of study that meets their needs and interests. Students regularly benefit from the ability to take graduate courses from the Schools of Business (Ross School), Law, Public Policy (Ford School), Social Work and the departments of history, political science, psychology, and sociology. Students also benefit from the presence of the University of Michigan’s Institute for Social Research (ISR), which offers summer courses on survey research and statistics.

Although there is a great deal of flexibility within the program, the requirements beyond the first year core courses include a structured sequence of research courses required by the Educational Studies program, and a set of cognate courses in a discipline outside the School of Education, typically in one of the social science departments or professional schools on campus.

After the first year, students select a specialization, and then course work is tailored to student needs and interests. There are four tracks: Foundations, Administration, Research & Policy; Literacy, Language & Learning Disabilities; Education in Mathematics, Science & Technology; and Teacher Education & Curriculum. Students enrolled in the Ph.D. program in Educational Administration and Policy take advanced courses relevant to this specialization. In general, the focus of this innovative program is on developing a critical perspective on important educational issues, understanding how schools can be organized and managed for instructional improvement, education policy and governance, and preparation for research on pressing problems of educational improvement. For example, a student preparing for the professorate would take advanced research methods and design courses in social research. Other students might take courses that would prepare them for positions in school administration or in research organizations. Graduates of the Educational Administration and Policy program can be found at all levels of the public and private education sector. Current graduates are school principals and superintendents, university professors of educational administration, and researchers and policy analysts at educational research organizations, foundations, and government agencies.

For more information about the Educational Studies program at the University of Michigan, check out their website: http://www.soe.umich.edu/es/index.html.
Women’s SIG Hosts First International Conference in Rome

At the 2006 UCEA Convention in San Antonio, members of the Women’s Special Interest Group (SIG) decided upon goals for the next few years. The group decided to develop and disseminate the first scholarly understanding of women in educational leadership across the globe, and to formulate a common international research agenda. To accomplish the first goal, UCEA partnered with the American Association of School Administrators (AASA), and UCEA member institution Duquesne University where UCEA Women’s SIG Chair, Dr. Helen Sobehart, is Associate Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs. The group convened an invitational conference July 24-27, 2007, on Duquesne University’s campus in Rome, Italy. The co-sponsoring organizations provided a small amount of funding to assure representation from every continent, including scholars from developing nations. Indeed, every continent was represented, even Antarctica. Though no universities exist in Antarctica, the keynote speaker was Liv Arnesen from Norway who, along with Ann Bancroft from Minneapolis in the United States, comprised the first all women team to traverse Antarctica. They have an ongoing commitment to the success of women and girls in education. Both were and continue to be teachers, developing a worldwide network online and partnerships through such cross continent organizations as the Girl Scouts/Girl Guides. The other keynote speaker was Dr. Charles Dougherty, President of Duquesne University, who clearly stated, “Even if we were to find that gender dispositions regarding leadership play little or no role in accounting for the under representation of women in educational leadership, we are still left with the fact that women are under represented. This fact, whatever its cause, is unjust on its face.”

A list of participants, titles of their papers, and quotes from their presentations are included at the end of this article. While refinements are still being made, several goals were agreed upon by conference participants. Members recognized the need to create an international gender audit of persons in leadership positions in basic and higher education, as well as contributors and barriers to leadership access, especially for women. They also agreed on the need to collect and disseminate stories of women from various cultures who have successfully attained leadership positions despite major challenges. The group wants to situate the final agenda within the overall context of human rights and social justice. There is a desire to expand the group to scholars from other nations, to meet again periodically, and to speak with one voice as may be needed for research or impact on social justice issues. The papers from this initial conference will be edited into a book which will be of interest to both preparation programs and practitioners.

Highlights of the conference will be presented at the fall 2007 UCEA Convention in Washington, DC. Duquesne University President Charles Dougherty will sponsor an International Symposium on Women in Education Leadership for the next three years. The panel this year will include: Sister (Dr.) Hellen Bandiho, St. Augustine University of Tanzania; Dr. Maria Luisa Gonzalez, New Mexico State University; Dr. Jacky Lumby, University of Southampton; Dr. Thidziambi Phendlu, University of Venda; Dr. Saeeda Shah, University of Leicester; Dr. Helen Sobehart, Duquesne University; and Dr. Jill Sperrandio, Lehigh University.

The conference fostered a new level of enthusiasm and commitment among participants who already came with a legacy of scholarly and practical commitment to impacting preparation and practice for women in educational leadership. The list of conference participants and their topics below highlight only the tip of an Antarctic iceberg of knowledge which awaits further exploration.

Journal of Research on Leadership Education

Journal of Research on Leadership Education (JRLE) is a new electronic peer-reviewed journal which focuses on articles from multiple epistemological perspectives. JRLE will serve as an international venue for discourse on the teaching and learning of leadership across the many disciplines informing educational leadership.

Edited by Edith A. Rusch, University of Nevada, Las Vegas and is sponsored by the University Council for Educational Administration.

Journal of Research on Leadership Education
c/o Edith A. Rusch, Ph.D. Editor
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
jrle@unlv.edu
http://www.ucea.org/JRLE/about.html
UCEA Seeks Associate Directors

As UCEA has increased its membership and has begun to expand the range of services to membership institutions, opportunities have developed for increased involvement of faculty at UCEA institutions. In 2004, the UCEA Executive Committee voted to create six Associate Director positions around the following functions:

- Communications And Marketing
- Development
- International Relations
- Membership
- Graduate Student Development
- Program Centers
- Publications

At this time, Catherine Lugg of Rutgers University serves UCEA Associate Director for Publications, Linda Tillman of the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill serves UCEA Associate Director for Graduate Student Development, and Julian Vasquez Heilig of the University of Texas-Austin serves as Associate Director for Program Centers.

UCEA is now seeking applications for Associate Directors in the following three areas: communication and marketing, international relations, and development. Individuals interested in applying for these UCEA Associate Directors positions must be faculty at UCEA member institutions with the experience and support that will enable them to fulfill their responsibilities. Associate Directors serve for renewable terms of 3 years and should be provided support by their institutions (e.g., release time and travel funds) to fulfill their leadership role with UCEA. The advantages for the member institutions and faculty serving as Associate Directors include, among other things, becoming more closely connected to the work of UCEA and UCEA governance, increased national visibility, and leadership development.

All UCEA Associate Directors 1) work with the Executive Director to build a vision, goals, and activities for UCEA consistent with its mission; 2) lead, support, plan, manage and execute (with UCEA headquarters) the functions, recurring activities, and new initiatives of the focal area responsibilities (e.g., Program Centers, Publications, etc.); 3) manage, plan, and (with UCEA Headquarters) execute any awards and recognition programs associate with focal area responsibility; 4) and provide national visibility, liaison, and outreach to relevant organizations, the public, and potential partners with regard to the focal area responsibility.

If you are interested in applying or nominating someone for one of these positions, please send a letter of interest or nomination to the Attention of Michelle D. Young, UCEA Executive Director by the 5th of November. For more information on these positions, specific duties and application procedures, please contact UCEA Headquarters at 512/475-8592 or michelleyoung@austin.utexas.edu.

www.ucea.org

Latest in UCEA’s Book Series


Edited by Lenoar Foster (Washington State University) and Linda C. Tillman (University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill), this book fills a void in the educational leadership literature relating to theoretical and cultural understandings that are critical for those who prepare leaders for schools with predominantly African American student populations.

Authors include Lenoar Foster, Linda C. Tillman, Adah Ward Randolph, Vernon C. Polite and Kristy Lisle, Paula Groves Price, Bruce Anthony Jones, Michael E. Dantley, Paul Pitre and Willie J. Heggins, III, Jonathan D. Lightfoot, James Earl Davis and Jean Madsen, and Nick and Brett Comier.

*African American Perspectives on Leadership in Schools* will be a critical resource for professors of educational administration and contemporary school leaders who practice in diverse school settings.

Publish your book with UCEA! An Informational Workshop at the UCEA Convention.

Are you thinking about publishing a scholarly book? UCEA sponsors a peer-reviewed book series published through Rowman & Littlefield. We are looking for “cutting edge,” groundbreaking scholarly books that push the boundaries of what we know regarding educational leadership, leadership preparation, and educational politics and policy as they relate to educational leadership. Current books in this book series address: (1) leadership preparation, (2) the New National Research Council guidelines, (3) African American perspectives on school leadership, (4) female professors of educational administration/leadership, and (5) the history of the principalship (US).

In this convention workshop, which will take place on November 18, 2007, Gary Crow (chair of the UCEA publications committee), Linda Tillman (a book editor and author in the series) and Catherine Lugg (associate director of UCEA publications) will discuss the process from initial queries, to the review process, final manuscript submission and production, and what is expected for book editors/authors. Participants in this session can bring along their working manuscripts and proposals for discussion. Registration is limited, so please register early.
UCEA PSR 2006-2007

Nicola Alexander-Knight, University of Minnesota
Thomas Alsbury, North Carolina State University
Pamela Ann Angelle, University of Tennessee-Knoxville
Floyd Beachum, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Allison Borden, University of New Mexico
Jeffrey S. Brooks, Florida State University
Kathleen M. Brown, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill
Ellen V. Bueschel, Miami University
Carolyn S. Carr, Portland State University
Shuangye Chen, The Chinese University of Hong Kong
Dana Christman, New Mexico State University
Jane Clark Lindle, Clemson University
Bruce S. Cooper, Fordham University
Arnold Danzig, Arizona State University
Michael E. DiPaola, College of William and Mary
Daniel Duke, University of Virginia
Julie Edmister, Bowling Green State University
Susan C. Faircloth, Pennsylvania State University
RobertFelner, University of Louisville
Janet Finch, Tennessee State University
Jayne Fleener, Louisiana State University
William Frick, University of Oklahoma
Gordon S. Gates, Washington State University - Spokane
Gene Geisert, St. John's University
Corrie Giles, University at Buffalo, SUNY
Naftaly S. Glasman, University of California, Santa Barbara
Roger D. Goddard, University of Michigan
Mark A. Gooden, University of Cincinnati
Sheryl Gowen, Georgia State University
Steven Jay Gross, Temple University
Marcus Haack, University of Iowa
Richard Halverson, University of Wisconsin-Madison
James E. Henderson, Duquesne University
Patricia E. Holland, University of Houston
Sean Hughes, University of Pittsburgh
Beverly Irby, Sam Houston State University
Robert Knoeppl, University of Kentucky
Bernita Krumm, Oklahoma State University
Barbara Y. LaCost, University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Frances LaPlante-Sosnowsky, Wayne State University
Colleen L. Larson, New York University
Richard Lemons, University of Connecticut
Edward Liu, Rutgers University
Gerardo R. López, Indiana University at Bloomington
Jerry Lowe, University of Texas-Pan American
Linda L. Lyman, Illinois State University
Melinda Mangin, Michigan State University
Hanne B. Mawhinney, University of Maryland
Brendan Maxey, University of Missouri-Columbia
Philip McCullum, University of Oregon
Marla W. McGhee, Texas State University-San Marcos
Sandra McKinley, University of Toledo
Scott McLeod, Iowa State University
Teresa Miller, Kansas State University
Roxanne Mitchell, University of Alabama
Carol Mullen, University of North Carolina at Greensboro
Martha N. Ovando, University of Texas-Austin
April Peters, University of Georgia
Bradley S. Portin, University of Washington
David Quinn, University of Florida
William T. Rebore, Saint Louis University
Cynthia J. Reed, Auburn University
A. LeGrand Richards, Brigham Young University
Mariela Rodriguez, University of Texas-San Antonio
Andrea K. Rorrer, University of Utah
Edith Rusch, University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Charles J. Russo, University of Dayton
Argun Saatcioglu, University of Kansas
Carolyn M. Shields, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Claire Smrekar, Vanderbilt University
Jill Sperandio, Lehigh University
Scott R. Sweetland, Ohio State University
John Taylor, University of Arizona
Angela Thody, University of Lincoln
Eustace Thompson, Hofstra University
Autumn K. Tooms, Kent State University
Mario Torres, Texas A&M University
Linda Vogel, University of Northern Colorado
Teresa Wasonga, Northern Illinois University

REMINDER!!!!
Don’t forget to check out UCEA website for the most current convention schedule and other important information at:

www.ucea.org
UCEA CONVENTION 2007
Fostering Compassion and Understanding Across Borders:
An International Dialogue About the Future of
Educational Leadership

As countries across the globe become increasingly interdependent, it is surprising how little we know about the educational systems of other nations. For example, how do educational leadership and policy address issues of equity and excellence? How are educational leaders prepared to support teacher quality and student learning?

This UCEA Convention theme serves as an invitation to participants from diverse geographic, cultural and political contexts to share their perspectives on theory, research, policy and practice in educational leadership and administration.

Moreover, this convention is intended to be an opportunity for members of an expanding UCEA community to engage in dialogue that promotes compassion and understanding of schooling among educators across international borders.

Speakers Include:
- Dr. Jonathan Jansen, University of Pretoria, November 15, 5:15-7:00 pm
- UCEA President, Dr. Fenwick English, November 16, 9:30-10:50 am
- Texas A&M University Social Justice Lecture, Dr. Gloria Ladsen Billings, November 16, 2:00-3:20 pm
- Penn State Mitsitifer Lecture, Dr. Jane Hannaway, November 17, 11:00-12:20 pm
- International Panel and Sunday Breakfast, November 18, 9:30-10:50 am

Events include:
- “Day on the Hill” visit with legislators: November 14, 9:00 am -8:00 pm [Cost is $30.00 and includes transportation and lunch]
- Annual Plenum Session, UCEA PSRs only, November 15, 7:30 am-4:30 pm
- Opening Convention Reception in Honor of UCEA Past Presidents, November 15, 7:15-9:00 pm
- Jackson Scholar Reception by invitation only, November 16, 6:30-9:00 pm
- UCEA Annual Banquet at the George Washington Memorial Masonic Temple in Old Town Alexandria with jazz multi-media performance, American Musical Landscapes, November 17, 6:00-10:30 pm. Cost is all-inclusive at $75.00.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UCEA University Faculty</th>
<th>Regular (thru 10/26)</th>
<th>Late (thru 11/17)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$115</td>
<td>$130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-UCEA Faculty</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicing Administrator</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
<td>$55</td>
<td>$65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UCEA would like to express its sincere appreciation to the following sponsors of the 2007 Convention:

The University of Virginia
Texas A&M University
Pennsylvania State University
Duquesne University
Old Dominion University
The University of Utah
University of Missouri-Columbia
SAGE Publishing

The University of Kentucky
North Carolina State University
University of Buffalo, SUNY
University of Maryland
Information Age Publishing
University of Illinois-Urbana Champaign
Eye on Education

Thank You!
What is UCEA's “Day on the Hill?”
UCEA's Day on the Hill, Wednesday, November 14, 2007, brings together educational leadership faculty and students from across the United States. You will meet your legislators (or members of their staff) face-to-face at the Capitol, and share UCEA's and the field's legislative priorities concerning quality leadership preparation, as well as positive stories about your programs' impact on the quality of leadership preparation.

What if I have never participated in a “Day on the Hill?”
No background or experience is necessary. The only requirements are that you (1) attend the training workshop, (2) inform legislators about issues important to the leadership preparation field, and (3) participate in a debriefing session.

Tentative Schedule
(Final schedule TBD by September 14, 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday,</td>
<td>• Convene for Training Session at Hilton Alexandria Mark Center Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 14</td>
<td>• to include guest speakers and interactive learning exercises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00-11:30 am</td>
<td>• Depart for the Capitol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Boxed Lunch and transportation provided as part of registration fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00-3:00 pm</td>
<td>• Hill visits in pairs/small groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00-5:00 pm</td>
<td>• Visit with members of Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
<td>• Option 1: Join your colleagues for a debriefing and reception near</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• the capitol before making your way back to the Hilton Alexandria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Option 2: Make your way back to Hilton Alexandria Mark Center Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday,</td>
<td>• “Day on the Hill” Report to UCEA Plenary Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 15</td>
<td>• Discussion and sample activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 am</td>
<td>• Debriefing Presentation and Conversation on UCEA “Day on the Hill”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Open to all convention participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday,</td>
<td>• Day on the Hill workshops and special sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 16</td>
<td>• Day on the Hill workshops and special sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00-9:20 am</td>
<td>• Debriefing Presentation and Conversation on UCEA “Day on the Hill”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Open to all convention participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday,</td>
<td>• Day on the Hill workshops and special sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 17</td>
<td>• Day on the Hill workshops and special sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30-1:50 pm</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00-3:20 pm</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How we will help:
Members of the “Day on the Hill” committee will make appointments for you and provide the preparatory training. You may or may not be assigned to visit the elected officials who represent your state. The required training will focus on the legislature, an overview of the issues that we will be sharing, as well as tips on how to field tough questions, and hands-on practice drills. We will mail you preliminary briefing materials prior to arriving in D.C. to help set the foundation for the workshop.

What you can do:
Want to make a bigger impact? Bring a team with you to D.C.! This could include your dean, members of your faculty, candidates enrolled in your programs, program graduates, and principals in your local school districts.
In 2007 we meet within 10 minutes of the US Capital. Our convention hotel is located in the West End of Historic Alexandria at the Hilton Alexandria Mark Center Hotel. This elegant and modern facility with a unique lakeside setting is within view of the nation’s capital and just ten minutes from the Smithsonian, the historic monuments of Washington D.C. and the quaint waterfront galleries, restaurants and shops in Old Town Alexandria, VA.

The Hilton Alexandria Mark Center offers the best of both worlds – minutes from the Capital, while adjacent to the Winkler Botanical Preserve; a 44-acre collection of plants and trees indigenous to the Potomac River Valley offering access to winding trails. The hotel also offers free local shuttle service to guests, making the use of the Metro system simple and affordable. Nearby places of interest include:

- Reagan National Airport 4 MI
- Washington, DC 6 MI
- Smithsonian Museums 7 MI
- Washington Monument 7 MI
- Arlington Cemetery 5 MI
- White House 7 MI
- US Capitol 8 MI
- Pentagon City Mall 4 MI
- Old Town Alexandria 3 MI
- Pentagon 4 MI
- Mt. Vernon Estate 12 MI

The Alexandria Mark Center Hotel has a towering glass atrium and Italian marble clad lobby. The guest rooms are lovely and offer all of the quality that one expects from a Hilton property.

Best of all, this is a hotel geared towards conference attendees, with over 46,224 square feet of meeting rooms off of the open and bright lower lobby area of the hotel, as well as a separate Executive Meeting Center. The EMC features non-glare tables, ergonomic chairs and individual climate control! There is also a state-of-the-art business center available for those last minute changes or copy needs. WiFi is available onsite, as well.

For meals and entertainment, Finn & Porter Restaurant is available for breakfast, lunch, and dinner, as well as other nearby restaurants. Lunch and dinner feature sushi, steak, and seafood; special happy hour prices are available. The lobby bar is an ideal place to meet and catch up with friends and colleagues alike.

To make hotel reservations at the UCEA Convention rate of $129, go to the convention home page on the UCEA website (www.ucea.org) and look under “Hotel and Travel”. You will also find information here on the official over-flow hotel. For more hotel information, please visit http://www.alexandria.hilton.com on the web.

Please note that the Hilton Alexandria Mark Center Hotel is now sold out on Tuesday and Wednesday, November 13 and 14. There are plenty of rooms available the dates of the convention, which will officially begin at 5:00 p.m., Thursday, November 15 and last through 1:00 p.m., Sunday, November 18. Information regarding the Hilton Alexandria Mark Center and our overflow hotel can be found on our website at: http://www.ucea.org/convention/convention2007/hotel.html

To take advantage of the UCEA group rate for both hotels, make your reservations on or before Tuesday, October 23, 2007. At the cut-off date, all unreserved rooms go up for general sale and the group rate will no longer be made available.
Dr. Jonathan Jansen is the Dean of the Faculty Education at the University of Pretoria, South Africa, and is closely involved in forging a new order in South Africa, building a multi-cultural education system to underpin a multi-cultural society. A curriculum change evaluator and teacher education specialist, he has undertaken more than twenty international commissioned research and evaluation projects including a review of USAID curriculum support to the Namibian Government after independence and an assessment of curriculum change in Zimbabwe since independence. He obtained his PhD at Stanford University and MS in Science Education from Cornell University. He received a Fulbright Senior Africa Research Scholar Award in 2000-2001.

Dr. Gloria Ladson-Billings is the Kellner Family Professor of Urban Education in the Department of Curriculum & Instruction at the University of Wisconsin-Madison and the 2005-2006 president of the American Educational Research Association. Ladson-Billings' research examines the pedagogical practices of teachers who are successful with African American students. Her work has won numerous scholarly awards including the H.I. Romnes faculty fellowship, the Spencer Post-doctoral Fellowship, and the Palmer O. Johnson Outstanding research award. In 2002, she was awarded an honorary doctorate from Umeå University in Umeå, Sweden and, in 2003-2004, was a fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences at Stanford University. She is the 2004 recipient of the George and Louise Spindler Award for ongoing contributions in educational anthropology, given by the Council on Anthropology & Education of the American Anthropological Association.

Dr. Fenwick English is the UCEA President and serving a second term as a member of the Executive Committee. He also serves UCEA as Chair of the Publications Committee, where he took the lead in the development of a contract between UCEA and Roman and Littlefield for the publication of UCEA monographs and books in the future. Fen is the R. Wendell Eaves Distinguished Professor of Educational Leadership at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Formerly, he served as a program coordinator, department chair, dean, and vice-chancellor of academic affairs, the latter two positions in the Purdue University system at Fort Wayne, Indiana. As a K-12 practitioner, he has been a superintendent of schools in New York, an assistant superintendent of schools in Florida, and a middle school principal in California. He also had a stint as an associate executive director of AASA and served as principal (partner) in Peat, Marwick, Main & Co. (now KPMG Peat Marwick) where he was national practice director for elementary and secondary education, North America. Fen recently served as editor of the SAGE Handbook of Educational Leadership (2005) and as Editor of the SAGE Encyclopedia of Educational Leadership and School Administration (expected publication date is February 2006). He has published in the Educational Researcher, Educational Administration Quarterly, Journal of School Leadership, Leadership and Policy in Schools, Education Leadership Review, and the Division A of AERA Newsletter.

Dr. Jane Hannaway is currently principal research associate and director of the Education Policy Center at the Urban Institute, where she oversees the work of the center and is a member of the Institute's senior management team. In addition, Dr. Hannaway is the overall principal investigator for the National Center for Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Education Research (CALDER - see http://www.caldercenter.org/). Supported by a five-year, $10 million grant from the Institute for Education Sciences at the U.S. Department of Education (http://www.caldercenter.org/about/Funding.cfm), CALDER is one of the new federally funded National Research and Development Centers http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/randcenters/index.asp. She has primary responsibility for the running of the center and determining with colleagues in the management/strategic planning group the focus and design of studies, the quality of the research products, as well as other CALDER activities.

Dr. Hannaway is an organizational sociologist. Her recent research is heavily focused on effects of various accountability policies. This work includes a large-scale, multiyear evaluation of the Florida educational accountability plan, and an NSF-funded longitudinal analysis of shifts in staffing and financial resource allocation at the school and district levels as a consequence of standards-based and performance accountability reforms. As is typical of her work, both studies include large-scale data analysis as well as case studies.

Dr. Hannaway also previously served on the faculty of Columbia, Princeton, and Stanford Universities. She has authored/co-authored six books, numerous papers in education and management journals, and has held a number of national positions. Dr. Hannaway currently serves on the Executive Board of the American Education Finance Association. She received her doctorate from Stanford University.
Contributing to the UCEA Review
If you have ideas concerning substantive feature articles, interviews, point-counterpoints, or innovative programs, UCEA Review section editors would be happy to hear from you.

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

Feature Editor:
Rose Vlimaki (SUNY- Buffalo)
rylimaki@buffalo.edu
Andrea Rorrer (University of Utah)
andrea.rorrer@ed.utah.edu

Interview Editors:
Gerardo Lopez (Indiana University)
lopezg@indiana.edu
Linda McNeil (Georgia State University)
epslrm@langate.gsu.edu

Point-Counterpoint Editor:
Julie Mead (University of Wisconsin-Madison)
jmead@education.wisc.edu

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

Managing Editor:
Chad Sayre (Park Hill School District)
sayrec@parkhill.k12.mo.us

2007-2008 Calendar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 1, 2007</td>
<td>David L. Clark Nominations Due</td>
<td>UCEA HQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 12-13, 2007</td>
<td>UCEA Executive Committee</td>
<td>Hilton Alexandria Mark, VA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 14, 2007</td>
<td>UCEA &quot;Day on the Hill&quot; Visit</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 15, 2007</td>
<td>UCEA Plenum Meeting</td>
<td>Hilton Alexandria Mark, VA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 15-18, 2007</td>
<td>UCEA Convention</td>
<td>Hilton Alexandria Mark, VA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December, 2007</td>
<td>NPBEA Meeting</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February, 2008</td>
<td>UCEA Convention 2008 Planning Plenum Meeting</td>
<td>UCEA HQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February, 2008</td>
<td>UCEA Executive Committee Meeting</td>
<td>UCEA HQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 28-29, 2008</td>
<td>David L. Clark Seminar</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April, 2008</td>
<td>AERA Division A &amp; L and UCEA Joint Reception</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April, 2008</td>
<td>Jackson Scholars Workshop</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2, 2008</td>
<td>UCEA Proposals Due</td>
<td>UCEA HQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May, 2008</td>
<td>Duquesne University Leadership Institute</td>
<td>Pittsburgh, PA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>