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A study of a representative sample of school district superintendents nationwide was reported in 2010 by the American Association of School Administrators. This extensive report demonstrated that the work portfolio of America’s superintendents is increasingly diverse, encompassing not only student achievement, but the diversification of student and staff populations, the explosion of technology, expanded expectations from the government, the school board and the community, and the globalization of society. (Kowalski, Mc Cordis, Petersen, Young, & Ellerson, 2010)

In 2001, in a report by the Education Commission of the States (Glass, 2001), a survey of 175 superintendents judged nationally by their peers to be outstanding indicated that 71% agreed that the superintendency is in a “state of crisis.” The demands impacting superintendents today are voluminous, including federal mandates to align local, state, and federal standards for teaching and learning; a constant public cry for transparency in all areas of decision making; policies dictating rigorous accountability at all levels of educational programming; business expectations for rapidly updated technological innovations; and advocacy cries for “evidence-based” instructional approaches with highly diverse student populations. These combined pressures result in rapid turnover in district leadership—even though research has indicated that superintendent longevity is linked to improvement in student achievement (Waters & Marzano, 2007).

A report by the Education Writers Association (Pardini & Lewis, 2003) asserted that superintendents’ responses to this state of crisis must be multidimensional. Although the popular and simple prescription is typically to institute strong instructional leadership, district leaders also must effectively manage change in highly complex, politically charged, and often contentious systems. If they are to survive and thrive in their role as superintendents, they need to understand and be adept at the politics of these jobs. (Pardini & Lewis, 2003, p. 6)

Complex Problems Require Integrated Solutions

The literature is clear in its conclusion that superintendent leadership responsibilities have grown in both scope and complexity. This complexity is borne out of new leadership and management demands brought on by a
Equipment Emerging Executive Leaders With Skills to Meet the Crisis

The Cooperative Superintendency Program (CSP) has been structured to pair a dynamic course of study with a highly focused practicum, or internship, to guide doctoral level students who are preparing to become tomorrow's most capable school district leaders. The CSP is an integrated program in which future leaders are inspired under the joint mentorship and supervision of a respected, capable, practicing superintendent and a knowledgeable and experienced clinical professor. This dual-structured leadership-instruction approach provides a depth of knowledge on current, research-based, professional leadership literature and individually planned skills and expertise in the clinical practice of educational leadership within today's complex and fast-paced school district.

The mission of the CSP is to provide an intensive postgraduate-level preparation program for experienced and capable educators who aspire to become world-class educational executive leaders of urban, suburban, or rural public or charter school systems serving students from the levels of prekindergarten through 12th grade. The program provides participants with the opportunity to obtain a doctoral or master's degree qualifying them as educational leaders from a nationally recognized program of excellence. In addition, candidates entering the program who have not yet earned their state certificate as superintendents of education will complete all statutory requirements qualifying them to take the state exam and obtain such a certificate.

Overview of the Executive Educator Leadership Development Approach

The CSP includes a dynamic 3-year process of integrated academic coursework with a coordinated, sequenced series of field experiences, or practicum, designed to provide expertise, knowledge, and skills needed to competently guide the complex school districts of today. Throughout the program, CSP students (or “fel-
The CSP system for preparing educational executive leaders has been developed, refined, and revised based on input from an external advisory group of active, respected superintendents who maintain state and national visibility in their careers of excellence. In addition, several internal studies have been conducted by the CSP program director, including a study of CSP student completion and progression rates over a 10-year period. This study resulted in several revisions, including realignment of research courses, front-loading them in the program so CSP fellows attain early research skill development. This revision of course sequence allows for continuous student progress monitoring focused on specialization paper and dissertation proposal development.

The CSP is designed as a challenging, collaborative, and invigorating experience for the candidates who are selected to participate. Immediately following a highly competitive assessment screening and admissions process, CSP fellows are involved in a very demanding and yet mutually supportive learning community, and they engage in investigations of research-based practices that involve extensive synthesis, analysis, and application activities.

Scholarly Review of Contemporary Literature and Research

The course of study for CSP fellows is organized around a set of leadership responsibilities that public school superintendents must demonstrate with respect to 10 critical functions that collectively make up a school district’s functions: (a) governance operations; (b) curriculum and instruction; (c) elementary and secondary campus operations; (d) instructional support services; (e) human resources; (f) administrative, finance, and business operations; (g) facilities planning and plant services; (h) accountability, information management, and technology services; (i) external and internal communications; and (j) operational support systems, such as safety and security, food services, and transportation. This comprehensive framework provides the basis for each student to individually self-assess specific growth areas and to develop a personalized plan of field activities to develop and strengthen targeted skills in educational leadership (see Figure).

One of the most prominent features in the program’s course sequence taken during the 1st year of the CSP program is a series of courses focusing on executive school district leadership knowledge and skills, including Advanced Administrative Theory and Practice, Instructional Leadership, and School Restructuring and Renewal. This intensive core of courses focuses on the most recent literature in the field of educational leadership dealing with issues pertinent to developing an integrated vision and acquiring the practical capacity necessary to coordinate and manage a very complex set of district functions, as represented in the Figure.

Supporting this specially designed core of courses, CSP fellows complete a professionally solid complement of related coursework within a university department noted nationally for its excellence. Additional courses include the study of Educational Politics and Policy, Organizational Design and Behavior, Educational Economics and Financial Policy, and Social and Cultural Contexts of Education. Beyond these topics, CSP fellows delve into studies on professional ethics and values, theoretical foundations for formal inquiry, and methods for conducting research that prepare them for a thorough understanding of educational research and program evaluation findings guiding the most contemporary models for school and instructional design, renewal, and innovation.

Mentor-Guided Practicum Informed by Current Research

At the outset of the program, each CSP fellow is assigned an active superintendent who serves as both a mentor and a field supervisor throughout the duration of the program. In addition, the internship is jointly supervised by an assigned university clinical professor and given oversight by the CSP program director. The field supervisor-mentor (i.e., acting superintendent) coordinates practical activities within school district events to provide the CSP fellow

---

**Figure.** Framework of 10 operational functions of school districts. From *Cooperative Superintendency Program Field Experience Guide*, by R. Olivarez, 2010, Austin: The University of Texas.
opportunities to practice and develop leadership activities in actual field settings. The carefully structured internship experience enables the participating field supervisor-mentor and CSP fellow to individually establish a professional bond that becomes the foundation for a successful clinical experience. The field supervisor-mentor provides guidance to the CSP fellow on site at an assigned school district.

A university clinical professor is also assigned to each CSP fellow. The clinical professor observes the CSP fellow both in the university classroom setting and within the school district setting and provides consultation and written feedback for improvement of leadership skills. In addition, the clinical professor offers theoretical guidance based on contemporary professional literature and shares insights derived from relevant scholarly articles and pertinent, current research regarding issues encountered during field experiences.

Critical Networking for Constant Renewal

In addition to engaging in rigorous and scholarly coursework and experiencing a personalized, dual-mentored internship, emerging educational leaders must develop multiple professional networks. Linkages with state and federal educational leadership groups connect forming leaders with critical political information and avail them of collective power to shape shifting local, state, and federal policies impacting conditions under which educational programs must function. In addition, such professional bridges will establish future opportunities for professional renewal.

To these ends, CSP fellows are immersed in a series of professional networking experiences. They attend three major professional events, including a summer conference jointly sponsored by the Texas Association of School Administrators (TASA) and The University of Texas and a fall convention sponsored by TASA jointly with the Texas Association of School Boards. CSP fellows participate in two additional conferences: the TASA Midwinter Conference and the American Association of School Administrators’ National Conference on Education. Another dimension of this networking experience is that CSP fellows participate in key meetings of the Texas Alliance of School Districts in preparation for and during the time that the Texas legislature is in session, observing sessions of legislative educational committee meetings when available, and attending deliberations of the State Board of Education.

Formulating a Personal Vision

In order to complete this highly integrated program and gain the credentials required to provide the demanding leadership needed in our public schools today, CSP participants complete a formal research study (i.e., treatise or dissertation). From this concentrated immersion in theory, practice, and networking with the most effective educational leaders available, each CSP fellow is expected to develop a personal vision to improve educational systems at the local, state, and national levels. Each new educational leader will create a personal mission that respects the diversity of the population served in today’s classrooms and will form a clear sense of ethical values concerning the balance among the needs of students, parents, and community members as equal stakeholders with respect to the costs and benefits of educational decisions. While the CSP program is intensive and demanding, it is designed to prepare tomorrow’s school district leaders to attain the goal of stellar educational achievement using in-depth knowledge of current research on effective educational practices and well-honed professional leadership skills to meet today’s complex educational challenges.

Ruben D. Olivarez, PhD, is the L. D. Haskew Centennial Professor of Public School Administration and director of the Cooperative Superintendency Program, Department of Educational Administration, at The University of Texas at Austin.
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What spurs a state into taking action around leadership program improvement? The most likely responses would include a reference to either (a) the importance of educators to student and school success (Council for Chief State School Officers, 2012; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2008; Murphy, 2002; New Leaders, 2012; Orr, King, & LaPointe, 2010; Young, Petersen, & Short, 2002) or (b) the critiques of leadership development dating back to the beginning of formalized training for educational leaders (Bottoms & O’Neill, 2001; Hale & Moorman, 2003; Young, Crow, Murphy, & Ogawa, 2009; Young, Petersen, & Short, 2002). Regardless of the reason for taking action, over the last two decades, we have seen an increasing number of state-led initiatives to improve leadership preparation leading to changes in state policy as well as the review, revision, sun setting, and/or closure of educational leadership programs (Sanders & Simpson, 2005; Young, 2013b). Initiatives have included:

- State leadership standards setting,
- State preparation program standards setting,
- State funding for program redesign,
- State program approval/accreditation requirements with performance expectations,
- State-required licensure exams, and
- State policy enabling alternative pathways to licensure.

Policy: A Blunt Instrument

Educational policy is frequently heralded as an important lever for educational change (New Leaders, 2013), and one cannot deny the powerful influence of educational policy on the education field over the last decade (Young et al., 2009). However, if not well conceived, policy can be a blunt instrument resulting in change but not necessarily the desired change. For example, in a special issue of the Journal of Research on Leadership Education (JRLE) edited by Joy Phillips (2013), faculty from New Jersey, Kentucky, Florida, North Carolina, and Alabama captured the strategies and impacts of state program redesign efforts. The cases demonstrated that the state initiatives did indeed have a significant impact; however, the impact was not always what was intended (Young, 2013b).

A variety of factors impacted the state redesign efforts. For example, each of the states used a one-size-fits-all approach to the their design efforts, yet the programs were housed in very different institutions with different missions, resources, and quality (Young, 2013b). Additionally, personnel changes within the district, state, and college made it difficult to sustain institutional memory, buy-in, and capacity. Similarly, decreased resources at the state level undermined communication and implementation, and shrinking staff numbers in the state department and within universities and some districts reduced expertise and capacity significantly.

Efforts were also weakened by a lack of alignment of policies (Young, 2013b). To illustrate, in Alabama where state certification requirements were shifted to align with and support program changes (i.e., all new principals must attend a redesigned program in order to be eligible for certification), other aspects of the policy are not aligned. Specifically, the state principal-evaluation system conflicted with the redesign emphasis on instructional leadership and team building. A lack of policy alignment creates a less coherent environment for aspiring leaders and those who prepare them.

Granted, the examples of state redesign captured in the special issue may not reflect efforts made in other states, and the descriptions of state efforts captured in the cases may not fully render the intentions and impacts of the case states. However, the obstacles encountered across the case states are strikingly similar. Furthermore, a 2006 report from the Southern Regional Education Board concluded that state strategies intended to promote redesign of principal preparation programs produced sporadic change in a few institutions rather than the deep change needed to ensure candidates master the knowledge and skills needed to be effective school leaders (Spence, 2006). Murphy, Moorman, and McCarthy (2008) similarly found the results of state-led reform initiatives to be “uneven and fall short of the mark” (p. 2186).

What Might Work?

Many agree that the growth of preparation programs since the late 1990s has flooded the leadership preparation field with increasing numbers of poor-quality programs and an overabundance of certified but ill-prepared leadership candidates (Baker, Orr, & Young, 2007), and that something must be done to prevent poor programs from continuing to certify individuals who do not have the preparation or expertise to lead schools. The good news is that we have the research to know which features mark effective leadership preparation, and we know how to differentiate between high- and low-quality programs. As noted above, however, it is questionable whether states should do this work alone.

Ensuring leadership preparation program effectiveness is an important state responsibility, and it is a responsibility best fulfilled in partnership with higher education and national organizations like UCEA. Researchers and developers from UCEA institutions have worked with a variety of stakeholders to build a research-based understanding of program quality and change as well as critical resources to facilitate change. This work has shed light on the collection and examination of program, candidate, and graduate data in sophisticated and rigorous ways. As a consortium, UCEA consists of significant expertise around leadership preparation and program evaluation and improvement. Together, teams of UCEA leadership scholars with expertise in preparation redesign and improvement could work across states to provide critical friend reviews, guidance on program improvement, and valuable insight for those in charge of program approval.
The first step toward achieving widespread leadership program quality is statewide adoption and implementation of research-based content and program standards. While most states currently have program content standards that align to practicing leadership standards (e.g., ELCC and ISLLC), few have adopted program feature standards like those outlined in UCEA’s Institutional and Program Quality Criteria (Young, Orr, & Tucker, 2012) clarify expectations by which programs can be evaluated. A combination of these standards would be a significant step forward in promoting quality leadership preparation programs.

The second step to ensuring program quality is for states to adopt a program evaluation and improvement process. Importantly, there are evidence-based processes to which states can turn for guidance. For example, the UCEA Program Review process for new and continuing members is a critical friends review process, focused on program assessment, improvement, and sustained quality. UCEA has developed a set of tools that facilitate and enhance the gathering of evidence for program review and accreditation, such as the Initiative for Systemic Program Improvement through Research in Educational Leadership (INSPIRE) surveys (UCEA, 2013), the Developing Evaluation Evidence planner (Orr, Young, & Rorrer, 2010), and the Curriculum Mapping guide (Orr, O’Doherty, & Barber, 2012). In particular, the INSPIRE survey suite, which is aligned with the ELCC and UCEA standards, facilitates planning and data collection around preparation program evaluation and improvement. As such the INSPIRE suite provides an excellent source of data on program quality that can be used for commendation and improvement.

Third, ensure that educational policies impacting the educational leadership pipeline are aligned. As the cases captured in Phillips’s (2013) special issue of JRLE demonstrate, lack of policy alignment can undermine both implementation and sustainability. It is important that policies be reviewed and if necessary adjusted to ensure the continuity of structures that guide, promote, and evaluate an individual’s progress through the educational leadership pipeline. The ideal of a strong leadership pipeline can be achieved if all aspects of the pipeline, from preparation through licensure, placement, evaluation, and development, are aligned (Hitt, Tucker, & Young, 2013).

Over the last few years, a growing number of organizations have released reports focused on improving educator preparation. The majority of these reports have relied foremost on state licensure and program approval processes as key levers for fostering program improvement. Although reformers have asserted that such regulatory policies and requirements either can or do exert significant influence on educational leadership preparation programs (Briggs, Cheney, Davis, & Moll, 2013; Council for Chief State School Officers, 2012; Kelley & Peterson, 2002; Murphy, 2002, 2005; New Leaders, 2012, 2013; Orr, King, et al., 2010), this claim is not well supported by empirical research (Hackmann, 2013; Pavlakis & Kelley, 2013). Furthermore, what research there is does not make a strong case for doing more of the same (Hackmann, 2013; Phillips, 2013; Young, 2013a, 2013b; Young & Brewer, 2008).

Every school deserves a well-prepared, thoughtful and intelligent leader, and ensuring that schools have such leaders is possible. Ensuring preparation program effectiveness is a responsibility that must reflect the complexity of leadership, must be informed by research, must be supported by adequate resources, and should not and does not have to be shouldered alone. As states work together with stakeholders to build a robust and relevant educational leadership pipeline, partnerships should be developed with higher education around program evaluation and improvement. Working in collaboration with higher education professional organizations like UCEA, states are much more likely to be successful.
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Sustainability and the School Leadership Program Grant
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The U.S. Department of Education School Leadership Program (SLP) grant focuses on the preparation and development of aspiring and current assistant principals and principals. Partnerships between school districts and leadership preparation providers (e.g., universities, for profits, and nonprofits) collaboratively develop and implement innovative school leadership training. Since the SLP grant’s inception in 2002, the program has prepared thousands of school leaders throughout the nation through 90 funded projects. Early grants lasted 3 years, but in 2008 the grant cycle increased to 5 years of funding. Currently there are 43 active grants funded in the 2008, 2009, and 2010 award cycles and located throughout the United States, including Florida, Texas, Virginia, New York, Michigan, and Alaska. This brief provides an overview of some of the lessons learned around the issue of sustainability of SLP program features through the work of the U.S. Department of Education SLP Communication Hub.

SLP projects often utilize nontraditional approaches to preparing school leaders that might not have been possible without the $1–5 million in funding each grantee receives. Examples from selected SLP grants include yearlong internships, one-to-one coaching and mentoring, fully funded leadership degrees, online resources, and stipends for professional development. A continual conversation among grantees as the projects come to an end is “how to sustain effective program features with funding reductions (and possible elimination).” Further funding of innovative programs is not guaranteed, and the potential reality is that only certain aspects of the projects may continue with limited resources available. With that in mind, it is critical that SLP grantees and other educational leadership preparation program directors think carefully about organizational factors that can ensure sustainability. This piece focuses on some key lessons learned through the Communication Hub to help support effective leadership program practices.

Funding for the Communication Hub, beginning in 2009, was provided through a subaward of the SLP grant to coordinate the communication and research dissemination efforts of the SLP grantees. During the 2012-2013 academic year, the Communication Hub focused on the sustainability efforts of grantees, including conversations at the SLP Working Conference in Denver, at the UCEA and AERA conferences, as well as through nationally sponsored monthly webinars. The September 2013 SLP Working Conference will also focus on sustainability as one of the conference’s primary themes. The following lessons, while not exhaustive, have emerged as critical to sustaining effective programs beyond the life of their funding cycles: (a) plan with the end in mind, (b) treat programs as cohesive systems, and (c) document practices and procedures.

Plan With the End in Mind

Funded programs should begin with the end in mind and have realistic goals, objectives, and outcomes. These guide the project and should be attainable with the funding model the grant design team has developed. The grant design team should craft a budget that is in alignment with supporting the articulated program goals, including anticipating potential increases in costs (i.e., university credit hour) over the life of the project.

While planning for the project begins at the proposal stage, it does not stop with the awarding of the grant. It is expected there will be some modifications to the project based upon the ongoing program evaluation efforts. Well-thought-out project measures help guide a formative evaluation process that can inform “in-time” changes to program features. These program changes, based upon formative feedback through the evaluation, can positively impact the program outcomes, including the ultimate success of the school leaders and their impact on student achievement. Ultimately these impacts will also contribute to the sustainability of effective project practices.

It is also important to recognize the design is probably not sustainable in the way the project is implemented at the conclusion of the grant because of the funding model. For example, a project may place a significant monetary investment into the development of leadership coaches. When contracting with an external coaching expert, programs should carefully consider how to institute a train-the-trainer model, so the program is not only supporting the current grant participants but also making a significant long-term investment in the capacity of the school district (or university) staff. During the grant, the program can capitalize on external expertise and develop an internal pool of experts within the organization that can sustain the coaching program once the funding ceases.

Treat Programs as Cohesive Systems

SLP grants are facilitated by a project director and involve other personnel such as a program manager, program evaluator, and other key project members to effectively implement the project. The grant team is crucial to sustaining the project. Personnel changes are almost inevitable in grants, and measures need to be taken to ensure the project continues without a negative impact because of the loss of one person. Relying too heavily on one person (and often the “institutional” or “grant memory” of that one person) can impact the efficacy of practices and long-term sustainability of the project and specific program features.

One of the ways to do this is to formalize the roles and responsibilities for each position. While these positions may have been outlined in the grant proposal, often there is a page limit for the submission, and the descriptions lack the richness necessary to fully understand the duties of the position. It is important from a human capital standpoint to specifically articulate the function for each position. This also will assist to eliminate duplication of work by multiple people, a potential pitfall when job descriptions are not fully articulated; overlooking key tasks to accomplish; as well as miscommunication about expectations.

Document Practice and Procedures

As referenced in the previous section, there is a potential to rely on the institutional memory of one project member in the running of the project, and this is usually the project director or program
manager. Often this results in a failure to keep written (including electronic) documentation of the project and the various program features. Important documentation on the management of the grant and efficacy of specific program features can be lost.

Program manuals in the SLP projects have been instrumental in effectively facilitating grants, as well as transitioning effective program features into other programs. Well-documented processes and protocols keep the projects running smoothly and ensure an easy transition if there is a new member to the team. The manual (or other documentation systems) allows replication of effective practices without having to recreate material.

Many university-based SLP grants have implemented key features of the SLP projects into their core university educational leadership programs. Reports from grant members have shown that effective communication practices, including clear documentation of the project practices, have been important for implementing university school-leadership program changes. In part, the documentation is necessary for nongrant faculty to learn about the grant practices and to review the program evaluation reports on the impact of the program features.

Sustainability

Sustainability of effective SLP grant practices can and should extend beyond the original project. Part of the goal of the Communication Hub is to disseminate lessons learned from the grants to the broader leadership preparation and development community. There are many sustainable, replicable school leadership preparation and development practices that can be transferred into practice from the SLP grants. UCEA institutions and leadership faculty are encouraged to learn more about the SLP grants and their successes in providing professional development to current assistant principals and principals, as well as preparing the next generation of school leaders. Avenues include learning more through the Communication Hub, interacting with colleagues affiliated with SLP projects, and reviewing publications about grant efforts and attending conference presentations with SLP grantees.

The contents of this article were developed under a grant from the U.S. Department of Education. However, those contents do not necessarily represent the policy of the Department of Education, and you should not assume endorsement by the Federal Government. (Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1221e-3 and 3474)
In Response to J. A. Perry: Professional Thoughts on What Is the Meaning and Unintended Consequence of the Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate?
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The Basic Problem

The September 2012 issue of the *Kappan Magazine* carried a well-written article entitled “To Ed.D. or not to Ed.D.?” Penned by Jill Perry, codirector of the Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate (CPED), the article reviewed the history of the EdD degree and made the claim through a CPED lens that the EdD degree should no longer be allowed to coexist with the PhD on any equal plane relating to research generation and even employment outcomes. Indeed, the article argued strongly for a distinction so vast that the ultimate outcome, as stated by Perry (2012), distinguishes the EdD from the PhD by relegating approved uses of the two degrees as “those who choose to become professional practitioners (EdD) and can apply theoretical and practical knowledge to solving problems of practice, and those who want to do research and teach in academic institutions (Ph.D.)” (p. 44).

While Perry (2012) rightly pointed to decades of confusion involving the EdD and suggests that EdD programs are at the very least of varying quality and usefulness, there are questions that remain unanswered by either the *Kappan* article or by CPED’s honorable intentions. We do not attempt to dispute the valid points of either Perry or CPED, but do intend to lay waste to the case that the EdD degree should only be awarded to those who have no interest in research; have no use for extended research skills; are only interested (at worst) in credentialing in order to keep a job or to advance in a more lucrative or higher titled career trajectory; have no interest in one day becoming a fully engaged faculty member in higher education; and are so disserved by a higher education system that result in students “sacrific[ing] time away from work and family and spend[ing] hard-earned money…to obtain a degree that won’t enhance their skills or abilities” (Perry, 2012, p. 41). To those appellations, we strongly object.

The discussion on how to differentiate the EdD from the PhD is neither new nor any closer to being solved, if indeed it needs to be solved. Brown (1990) argued over two decades ago that there are three factors preventing the field from moving toward one common degree, the most interesting factor being market forces. Perry (2011) in a *UCEA Review* article provided a thorough historical overview of how the EdD evolved, beginning at Harvard in 1921 as an effort to separate it from Arts and Sciences and train a new class of practitioners and that the PhD is for a different class of researchers. Inherent in our objection is the wholesale manipulation as a response to intervention (RTI) is for everyone else with a lesser set of inquiry skills. The opening pitch to Perry’s (2012) article derived from an anonymous *Edweek* post in which one blogger lamented the costly and useless doctoral education opportunities presented, wherein the predominant cry is outrage against Yet, though thorough in design, they tended to oversimplify the relationship between a practitioner and researcher degree. These two *UCEA Review* articles as well as the *Kappan* article leave us asking whether we are tracking potential doctoral students into one career path versus another. We conclude that the question about the purpose of an EdD or a PhD is much more complex than what type of student or curriculum is more appropriate for one degree over the other.

Where We Agree

As stated in our opening comments above, we have no quarrel with Perry and CPED on the need to improve doctoral education—either in general or specifically regarding the EdD’s purpose and/or rigor. As Perry (2012) accurately noted, both the EdD and the PhD have suffered identity crises over many years, and the goal should be to strengthen both degrees through heightened rigor and the advancement of knowledge. We agree that CPED has provided a marvelous service by bringing together more than 50 important universities offering the EdD degree for the purpose of discussing and refining the elements of good doctoral education. And we heartily endorse the CPED principles of framing doctoral study around equity, ethics, and social justice in a way that has influence and transferability to the world of practice. Indeed, we argue that all doctoral education (EdD and PhD alike) should hold these principles paramount, whether creating new knowledge or applying extant knowledge to resolving problems of practice, and do not see any of these aspects of advanced learning as mutually exclusive based on a degree’s name.

Where We Disagree

We state specific exception, however, to numerous instances in which CPED may have overstated certain “chasms” and may have overstepped constraints to EdD reform. In these instances, we believe neither the perceived disarray of the EdD nor the proposed 180° contrast between the EdD and the PhD make conceptual or practical sense, and furthering these contrivances is unwise and unworkable in the context of P-20 and graduate life.

To be clear, we object to the characterization that the EdD is for a distinct class of practitioners and that the PhD is for a different class of researchers. Inherent in our objection is the wholesale rejection that deep learning is for scholars and that “black box” manipulation as a response to intervention (RTI) is for everyone else with a lesser set of inquiry skills. The opening pitch to Perry’s (2012) article derived from an anonymous *Edweek* post in which one blogger lamented the costly and useless doctoral education opportunities presented, wherein the predominant cry is outrage against
professors teaching in doctoral programs who would “rather debate Habermas and Dewey” and are unable to “relate it to REAL schools and NCLB [No Child Left Behind],” concluding, “not if their life depended on it!” (Perry, 2012, p. 41). Really? Who can argue for the irrelevance of Dewey’s (1900, 1938) experimental lab school or argue that his thesis on experiential education has not shaped today’s educational environment? Who can argue that Habermas’s communicative action theory has not had an impact on education, critical thinking and critical theory (Habermas, 1984; R. E. Young, 1990)? Is it really fair to deny doctoral students of any stripe the opportunity to struggle with critical theory, transformative learning theory, reproduction theory, and resistance theory? Are these topics really too theoretical for EdD students yet somehow appropriate for PhD students? Perry’s (2012) Kappan article and CPED’s reform suggest so, given how Perry’s thesis is by implication that EdD students can impact the world of practice through analogies like surgeons learning to sew, whereas PhD students are somehow freed from relevance to practice and impacting educational outcomes. If this were true, what would be the point of PhD education if not to have some real-world effect? The point should be clear that we do not support the implied assumption that underlies a two-tiered doctoral identity that delineates who is qualified to be a researcher and who is only qualified to be a practitioner. We believe firmly and have seen our EdD and PhD students alike use these educational theories as school leaders, where they have successfully synthesized research to practice. Indeed, we hold that it is unethical if we do not introduce and deeply analyze educational theory with our supposed “practitioner” students in the same manner as we do with our supposed “researcher” students.

We also object to the characterization expressed in the Perry (2012) article in the single sentence: “In the end, the [EdD] student often has spent time and money for a credential that hasn’t enhanced his or her practice” (p. 41). The reality is—in either the EdD or the PhD case—that with shamefully declining state and federal monies, tuition is the major source of income for graduate programs and often drive admission policies to doctoral programs of any kind, with the implication that crass credential enhancement desires by “unworthy” students has created a glut of marginal students in doctoral programs that pander to low standards and uncertain educational identities. This, of course, equally smears high-quality EdD and high-quality PhD programs, while remaining silent on whether there are any low-quality PhD programs by focusing the blame solely on poor EdD designs. The problem, then, might well be far less associated with whether the EdD or the PhD has lost its way and far more associated with an underlying argument for a practitioner doctorate degree as explained by Slaughter and Rhoades’s (2004) theory of academic capitalism. This framework positions the student as a consumer and the educational institution as a marketer. Students operating as drive-by consumers are typically limited by cost, program status, and whether or not they will get accepted into a specific doctoral program or have to settle for their second or third choice. As the theory goes, in order to fill seats and generate enough income to sustain its faculty and infrastructure, universities are forced to pursue new markets and capture new customers. Tuition as the primary source of income is the driving force behind this change in higher education’s mission from a public good to providing education that strengthens student skills and employability. In this scenario, students seek to maximize their return on investment when they consider the value of the degree and balance its cost with what they will get out of it (i.e., greater prestige and higher earning potential). Students indeed may earn degrees that do not enhance practice, but the reason is not causally imbedded in a weak nature of the EdD or the PhD because both programs suffer the same ignominious state of affairs. Bluntly, earning a terminal degree—however titled—becomes a matter of accessibility and convenience rather than a thoughtful selection based on career goals or degree suitability to those same goals. In sum, it is market forces that are driving down quality in many programs, and this charge can be leveled against EdD and PhD programs alike.

Given these realities as Brown (1990) and Slaughter and Rhoades (2004) suggested, the question for any university to award an EdD or only a PhD is moot under academic capital theory—either will do just fine in the institution’s eyes if student enrollments are high enough to support the program because what is most important is the revenue stream. Based on our many years’ experience and based what we know (at least from our peer universities), student costs to complete an EdD or a PhD for all intents and purposes are identical. Likewise, the number of credit hours required by each program and the cost per credit hour are basically the same. The unknown and variable factor—when selecting a doctorate program—is how do entrance requirements and costs vary among universities? For example, if a university offers both the EdD and PhD degree options and its goal is to maximize enrollments, will it create a two-tiered set of entrance requirements in order to make it easier to be admitted to a practitioner-oriented degree rather than a research-oriented degree? From a marketing point of view, price point may be attractive to students who merely want to increase their employability by adding the title of doctor to their letterhead. So if this is the case, it makes sense to have lower entrance and graduation requirements associated with the practitioner degree. For example, a theory-grounded dissertation required for a high-quality EdD program might be replaced by a capstone project or paper, and the required internship hours increased while research methods and dissertation hours are reduced. In graduate programs offering both degrees, only by lowering an EdD’s entrance and graduation requirements will programs be able to add new students to their existing market share. When differentiated entrance and graduation requirements are created in a two-tiered degree structure, the practitioner-oriented EdD with lower entrance and graduation requirements defaults to the degree of choice for that prospective student who needs the doctorate as an outward credential for his or her job. Indeed, the PhD-lite is born not of inherent flaws in the degree but in how market forces have created a temptation to lower standards in the belief that practitioners have less need for research and theory and more need for RTI training, in other words, finding a solution to a problem instead of understanding the cause.

This latter point is particularly troublesome. It sets up conditions where universities are in the money game rather than the knowledge game, and where the only way to turn dust into gold would be if an EdD were to make a marked difference in some measurable field-based performance aspect. However, we are unable to find any research that suggests having a doctorate of absolutely any kind will make a teacher, a principal, or a superintendent more effec-
tive; conversely and far more truthfully, having a doctorate simply will give prestige to one's employability. Here is where academic capital theory foreshadows a trainwreck as the credentialing game accelerates; if we cannot measure improved performance in field-based settings due to earning any doctorate (either EdD or PhD), then the argument gains traction that the major benefit of having any doctorate while employed in a nonuniversity setting is primarily for the title's prestige. And, if we concede that there are both poor EdD and poor PhD programs in relative abundance, then we deceive ourselves by thinking that the answer is to further reduce the knowledge base by steering the EdD away from any research rigor involving real theory and inquiry. Ipso facto, if we succeed in excising the goal of rigorous scholarship from the EdD, are we not simply pandering to the demand for credential inflation? And if we succeed in opening the door to massive credentialing that is more popular with hurried field professionals, are we not fundamentally altering the meaning of the title of Doctor? Carnoy (1974) wrote that education has its greatest value when only a few are able access it (p. 6), so that when more students attain a degree the less value it has, and likewise when more doctorates are awarded, they, too, lose value. Such is the flaw of the anonymous “consumer” rant that prefaced the Kappan article in which the complainer wanted—if not merely an empty title—a title that would function like a Physician's Desk Reference that can easily be applied without deeply understanding the theory underlying the application and without the requisite skills to contribute to genuine theory building.

And there is one more point where we severely disagree with Perry's (2012) analysis, as we ask the crucial question: What, then, are the implications of distinguishing between the EdD as a practitioner's degree and the PhD as a research degree? Obviously, the Kappan article eloquently made the case that one difference is in the focus of a research-based versus RTI-like curriculum. According to Perry (2012), the underlying question's answer is alarming:

The CPED consortium has brought together more than 50 of these [member] institutions in an effort to differentiate between the outcomes and expectations for doctoral candidates—those who choose to become professional practitioners [EdD] and can apply theoretical and practical knowledge to solving problems of practice and those who want to do research and teach in academic institutions [PhD]. (p. 44)

This suggests that CPED believes EdD holders are not qualified to fully pursue academic life in a university, except perhaps as clinical professors who teach practice courses and supervise field-based experiences. Perry's (2012) critique of past EdD programs seems to question whether EdD degrees have ever met the university faculty standard and certainly lays bare the intent to redesign the EdD where future recipients are relegated solely to the world of practice or to a limited corner in higher education based on their lack of theory and research skills.

So Where Are We, and What Should Be Done?

As we developed this response to Perry's (2012) article, we found that we agree with much of CPED's position. Namely, we perceive and appreciate the confusion arising from two historically entangled degrees. We value CPED's effort to provide distinction and refinement, and we sympathize with and support efforts to invent new ways to serve the education field more substantially and more equitably. We also respect the extensive debate over many decades that sought to bring closure to the unfortunate debacle over the EdD degree's origins and aims (Zirkel, 2012). Moreover, our own college and we personally have supported CPED's efforts by fully participating as a CPED member and by contributing to this national conversation.

We argue, though, that it is disingenuous to create a purely practitioner education doctorate degree, whether it be labeled EdD or PhD, that risks reducing deep learning by removing all but the most practical understanding of theory and all but the most rudimentary research skills while still calling it a doctorate degree. As the ultimate litmus test, we argue that EdD recipients should not be so differently educated that they no longer qualify for full and productive lives in colleges and universities. We argue that in so doing, the careers of countless distinguished EdD degree-holding

---

Save the Date:

Second Annual UCEA International Summit

Sunday, November 10, 2013

During the 2012 UCEA Convention, the inaugural International Summit was held at the University of Denver campus. Based on the success of this initial experience, participants enthusiastically endorsed holding another International Summit, which will be on Sunday, November 10, 2013, from 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. at the Hyatt Regency Hotel in Indianapolis. This year’s planning committee is Tom Alsbury (Seattle Pacific University), Lars Bjork (University of Kentucky), and Thu Suong Nguyen (Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis). Plans are being made to involve scholars from around the world to share trend in policies and research on leadership development and preparation.

If you have questions or suggestions for the summit, please contact Bruce Barnett, UCEA Associate Director of International Affairs (bruce.barnett@utsa.edu), at the University of Texas at San Antonio.
university scholars from the past and present are diminished by calling into question the integrity of their degrees, no matter how much CPED protests that there have been legitimate “research EdD programs” that lived in the midst of otherwise reigning confusion. And we further argue that in seeking to so differentiate the EdD, it is irreversibly harmful to new generations of future scholars who would be precluded from a full life of scholarship by a naive decision they made when youthfully applying to a doctoral program. We therefore argue that the EdD needs strengthening, but argue the PhD is no less in need of reform and that the EdD is no culprit at all. In sum, we argue that all doctoral programs should be rigorous, theory-based, comprised of substantial research productivity, and that no career pathway should closed.

What we therefore most object to is that the EdD, as presented by Perry (2011, 2012) and M. D. Young (2013), appears to be a track for those students who do not see themselves as scholars, who merely want to do what they already do except with a more prestigious title, and who are in absolute peril of slamming a door shut to future career opportunities. The goal should not be to eradicate the EdD among higher education faculty incumbents or to limit EdD degree-holders to a clinical role or solely to practice. We agree that many programs are not strong, but many others are. Ergo, making a distinction between a practitioner and a researcher is nothing more than a false dichotomy.

References
Young, M. D. (2013, Winter). From the director: Is the conversation on the educational doctorate leading to a better program? UCEA Review, 54(1), 15-17.
Innovative Programs:
The University of San Diego’s Educational Leadership Development Academy: A University–District Partnership With International Perspectives

Hans W. Klar
Clemson University

This Innovative Programs column features the Educational Leadership Development Academy (ELDA) at UCEA’s newest member institution, the University of San Diego. ELDA is one of three centers housed within the Department of Leadership Studies in the School of Leadership and Education Sciences at the University of San Diego. ELDA has been nationally recognized for its innovative, collaborative programs and for its guiding principle that the success of all children depends on the identification and development of principals as instructional leaders.

ELDA was started in 2000 by School of Leadership and Education Sciences Dean Paula Cordeiro and then San Diego Unified School District Superintendent Alan Bersin. Originally called the Aspiring Principal Program (ASP), this innovative collaboration involved teachers who were aspiring principals being released from their classroom duties to complete coursework that was integrated with a yearlong apprenticeship with a practicing principal.

In 2005–06, the program was changed to a 2-year, 24-credit initiative and became the Aspiring Leaders Program (ALP). In this newer iteration, students are paired with exemplary principal mentors for a 40-day apprenticeship, which is completed during school holidays over the 2 years. Notably, only a small proportion of the apprenticeship is completed at the student’s own school, as is often the case in educational leadership preparation programs. Instead, the majority of the internship occurs with a trained mentor outside the teacher’s home district. Throughout the ALP, students work closely with their supervising principal and University of San Diego faculty to develop leadership skills, as well as their reflective and creative abilities. As with the ASP, coursework in the ALP is closely integrated with the field-based experience to enhance students’ experiential learning. Coursework is taught by University of San Diego faculty who have backgrounds in public administration, educational sociology, and organizational development. Classroom instruction is focused on developing creativity and problem-solving skills, and faculty often draw upon the case-study method to achieve this.

The ALP is offered through the cohort model with only 15–16 participants in each cohort. Admission to the program is competitive. Each applicant is observed teaching before being carefully selected by a panel of ELDA faculty and district representatives. Once students are selected, a formal orientation is held for all students, superintendents, and mentor principals. Participants successfully completing the program receive the California Preliminary Administrative Services Credential (Level I certification). Students completing the ALP can apply their 24 credits toward the MA or the PhD in Leadership Studies offered through the Department of Leadership Studies.

Recognizing that many of the challenges faced by educational leaders are global in nature, and valuable insight can be gained from multiple perspectives, ELDA has implemented the World Educational Leadership Link (WELL) Project. Through this global learning initiative, in their first semester, ASP students are paired with a practicing principal from another country for at least a year. Using Skype, or another method of online communication, students and their mentors discuss educational issues of mutual interest. During this time, students maintain a journal of their interactions with their international mentor. Both mentor and mentee continually evaluate the quality of their dialogue throughout the process. Electronic translators are used to assist communication where language differences occur.

In 2002, ELDA developed the New Leaders Program to support practicing principals by providing ongoing training and support as they progress toward receiving the California Professional Administrative Services Credential (Level II certification). Through this program, 1st- and 2nd-year principals are assigned a trained mentor with whom they regularly meet to discuss issues and strengthen their instructional practices while simultaneously taking coursework and receiving ongoing support from ELDA faculty.

In addition to the ALP and New Leaders Program, ELDA offers professional learning opportunities to principals and other instructional leaders in public and private schools throughout San Diego County. These programs extend beyond the traditional offerings of a principal preparation program to include ongoing professional learning opportunities. One of these opportunities is an annual 4-day Summer Institute, at which school leaders can meet with researchers and educational leaders from across the United States to develop plans for meeting student needs, improving teaching, and enhancing student learning. Another opportunity is the Spotlight Speaker Series, where educators and researchers share information related to educational leadership and developing professional learning communities. ELDA has also worked to foster professional networks of school-level and district-level leaders through the ELDA Forum. The forum begins with a 5-hour training session at the School of Leadership and Education Sciences. Training retreats are then periodically held to allow forum members to continue discussing their experiences. Some forums are now self-managing and continue to meet on a regular basis. In 2005, ELDA developed the Leaders Exploring Administrative Possibilities (LEAP) program to provide selected teachers in San Diego County the opportunity to develop leadership skills as they consider a career in school leadership.

In addition to ELDA, two other centers are housed in the Department of Leadership Studies: the Center for Education Policy and Law and the Mobile Technology Learning Center. Faculty, researchers, and students who work at the centers collaborate with each other to support a variety of school-based initiatives.

Though EDLA students are primarily aspiring and practicing teachers, approximately half the students in the Department of Leadership Studies come from a variety of other professions, such as pub-
lic service, nonprofit organizations and corporations. Regardless of their backgrounds or career objectives, all students in the Department of Leadership Studies are required to have an international experience. Students can meet this requirement through a variety of multicultural experiences. These experiences may involve taking a course that includes a significant international component, participating in a study-abroad program or international internship, or joining an international research project.

ELDA has received national acclaim for its program. In 2007, ELDA was identified as a model university–district partnership. In 2010, US Secretary of Education Arne Duncan recognized ELDA as an exemplary program in his speech at the Annual Conference of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Importantly, ELDA has exceeded its initial goal of 60% of graduates becoming principals within two years of completing the program. The vast majority of these principals have remained in their positions after five years, and student achievement in schools led by EDLA graduates has increased.


For more information about ELDA or the School of Leadership and Education Sciences at the University of San Diego, please contact the EDLA directors or visit the program website:
Rose Linda Martinez or Richard Thome
Educational Leadership Development Academy Directors
School of Leadership and Education Sciences
University of San Diego
5998 Alcala Park
San Diego, CA 92110
(619) 260-4538

David L. Clark National Graduate Student Research Seminar in Educational Administration & Policy: 
A Call for Nominations

The David L. Clark National Graduate Student Research Seminar in Educational Administration & Policy, sponsored by UCEA, Divisions A & L of the American Educational Research Association (AERA), and Sage Publications, brings emerging educational administration and policy scholars and noted researchers together for 2 days of presentations, generative discussion, and professional growth. The majority of Clark Scholars go on to become professors at major research institutions around the world. This year’s seminar will be held in the spring at the beginning of the AERA meeting in Philadelphia (tentatively scheduled for April 2-3, 2014).

Nominations due November 5, 2013.

Nominees should be outstanding doctoral students in educational leadership, administration, and/or policy, seeking careers in research. Nominees must have substantially completed their courses and must have formulated a dissertation proposal. Students who have already started or completed their dissertations are unlikely to gain as much from the seminar as students who are in the early stages of formulating their research. Nominations of students from underrepresented groups are strongly encouraged.

Student proposals are blind reviewed by three prominent scholars. Invitations will be issued to 40 doctoral students, with competition based on the quality of the student’s proposal and their perceived capacity to gain from and contribute to the seminar.

Each university may nominate up to two students. Nominations must be accompanied by a student research proposal. This year, all materials will be submitted online, see directions for nomination materials and an overview of the Clark Seminar process can be found at the following urls:

http://ucea.org/nomination-process-forms/


To be considered complete, both forms must be filled out completely. The information requested includes: nominator’s information, nomination statement, student information, abstract of student research, title, and statement of proposed research. Nominating institutions must also indicate the level of financial support that will be provided to support their nominee’s travel and participation.

Additional information concerning the seminar is available on the “Clark Seminar” page of UCEA website (http://www.ucea.org). We expect to extend invitations to 40 students in December 2013. If you have any questions, please call (434) 243-1041.
UCEA Welcomes New Member: University of North Texas

We would like to welcome new provisional member, the University of North Texas, to UCEA. The University of North Texas offers master’s programs in Counseling; Curriculum and Instruction; Early Childhood Studies; Educational Leadership; Educational Psychology; Higher Education; Kinesiology; Teaching; Special Education; and Recreation, Event & Sport Management. At the doctoral level, students can earn an EdD in Educational Leadership or Higher Education or a PhD in Counseling, Curriculum and Instruction, Educational Leadership, Educational Research, Higher Education, or Special Education.

The doctoral Educational Leadership program at the Department of Teacher Education and Administration at the University of North Texas trains students in current educational theories and research and helps them develop the decision-making skills required for leadership positions in the field. A superintendent certificate and a certification scholarship program can be combined with the doctoral program.

Conceptual thinking and problem-based learning are emphasized throughout the program. Courses are available at several locations throughout the North Texas region (Denton, Dallas, McKinney, and Fort Worth). Some required courses are available online. The College of Education is accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. The college is also one of the state’s top producers of teachers, administrators, counselors, and other school professionals.

Courses are structured to create a supportive network of colleagues during and after the program. Students and professors collaborate on presenting at conferences and publishing works. Professors conduct research, publish, and present data analysis for improved student performance; education law; leadership and reform initiatives; and online instructional strategies, among others.

The Education Management Research Center assists the university, states, and local school districts with the conception, design, methodologies, and analysis of data related to school performance and improvement. It is also a focal point of research data used by graduate students.

The Center for the Study of Education Reform conducts research related to public policy and education, cultural and language policy in schools, and social justice initiatives in education. It disseminates the findings to policy makers and educators around the state and region.

The Southwest Securities Superintendent Certification Scholarship Program aims to produce school leaders who provide new opportunities for all children while solving critical problems in education.


For more information, contact marilyn.kocurek@unt.edu

University of North Texas
Department of Teacher Education and Administration
940-565-2383
graduateschool@unt.edu

www.coe.unt.edu/tea

Snapshots of School Leadership in the 21st Century: Perils and Promises of Leading for Social Justice, School Improvement, and Democratic Community

Editors:
Michele A. Acker-Hocevar, Washington State University Tri-Cities
Julia Ballenger, Texas Wesleyan University
A. William Place, University of Dayton
Gary Ivory, New Mexico State University

We provide snapshots describing this critically important time in our nation when federal educational policy implementation has been at a level previously unheard of in the United States. You also receive access to the 27 focus-group transcripts on which the chapters are based. Instructors of qualitative research may find these data useful in their classes, e.g., for students to practice different types of data analysis and coding.
Interview With Ivonne Chirino-Klevans of North Carolina State University

Lisa Bass
North Carolina State University

LB: Please describe your background (where you are from, your personal experiences as an English language learner (ELL), your interest in your field, the path you took to get where you are, your current position).

IC: I am originally from Mexico, and the first time I came to live to the U.S.A. was because of an athletic scholarship in gymnastics I received from Georgia College and State University. I must say that, although I spoke English, I was not at all familiar with the U.S. educational system. That created some challenges and missed opportunities. For example, I was invited to join an honors program class, but since it did not seem to be aligned with my major at the time, I did not choose to take it. I was not aware of the importance of taking honors classes. I was also not aware of certain stereotypes about student athletes. That, in perspective, was a good thing, since I was awarded two “Outstanding Student” awards (for my bachelor's and my master's).

After finishing an undergraduate and master's in Psychology, I went back to Mexico. I worked as a sports psychologist with elite athletes, but there was not enough support for that profession in my country. It is then when I found training and development to be a wonderful field to help others reach their potential. I felt that, in order to succeed in training and development, I needed to enrich my background. Therefore, I studied an MBA.

LB: How did you move into working in distance education?

IC: Technology was starting to be noticed as a tool to enhance training, development, and higher education. So then I looked for an opportunity to work at an important university in Mexico, which was the pioneer of distance education. I served in different roles in administration, but realized that I enjoyed teaching. So pursuing a PhD was definitely the next step. I studied my PhD while I was an administrator for the university integrating technology in education. I was later given the opportunity to help implement the technology strategy for the university. That is when I saw the need to study a specialization in instructional design. I was then given an opportunity to direct their international education efforts using technology. That is when I was attracted by Duke University to serve as Assistant Dean of Executive Education, where I worked with global companies designing training and development mediated by technology.

LB: How did working with people from diverse backgrounds influence you and your work?

IC: Working with people from different parts of the world gave me a unique perspective of the differences and similarities in work cultures and values and attitudes towards our jobs. I was then given an opportunity to implement online learning for institutions around the world with Laureate Education. I had not only to develop cross-cultural competency but implement development programs to reinforce this skill for my own team as well as for faculty working with international populations. Now a new exciting chapter in my life has opened, having been given the opportunity to collaborate with the College of Education leading the International and Distance Education Alliances Department.

LB: Describe your current position. How will you serve ELL students?

IC: The possibilities of helping our ELL students will be implementing creative and evidence-based interventions to help them integrate to the U.S. educational culture. Some of those interventions will be designing cross-cultural competency skill development and activities for international as well as U.S. students interested in the topic. Understanding a culture is a two-way street. My plan is to make available resources and activities that could be used by faculty and staff to continue to increase their knowledge about other cultures as well as skill development in cultural competence.

Integration to a new culture is another important aspect that needs to be addressed for international students. Adding to the current orientation for international graduate students considering cultural integration will be one more resource to help them understand the U.S. culture.

Creating more opportunities for students to engage in international student-teaching opportunities will also help our ELL students, as these international experiences increase cross-cultural understanding, impacting others upon their return.

LB: How familiar are you with the English as a second language (ESL) programs in the United States?

IC: I am somewhat familiar.

LB: From your vantage point, how well do we perform in ensuring a quality educational experience for ELL students? Can you provide examples?

IC: I do not think I can make an educated comment in this area as I am just immersing myself into the activities that the university has implemented to address the needs of this population. I believe that metrics need to be implemented assessing the effectiveness of these interventions.

LB: Do you know of any examples of systems where ELL instruction is particularly done well (i.e., states, school districts, universities)?

IC: Yes. The University of Nebraska has a very interesting cultural immersion program for international students. They have an extensive orientation for international students.

LB: Can you tell me more about this program?

IC: Nebraska has a strong mentorship program for international students. They are assigned to a current international student who
acts as a link to the university. He/she is not only a connection but also a cultural translator. They have a formal coaching relationship with specific outcomes.

What I meant earlier is integrating content and experiences that help students understand the impact of knowing and understanding other cultures. Encourage activities where they work in collaboration with students in other countries. Technology has opened the door for these kinds of interactions, which increases the pertinence of better understanding other cultures.

**LB:** Are you familiar with how any other country welcomes newcomers?

**IC:** Yes. I am familiar with how Korea is welcoming new international ventures including international students as well as global companies. Incheon City (outside of Seoul) has a very powerful initiative to provide a fertile ground to attract students, professors, businesses, and educational institutions. They have built a global campus with state-of-the-art technology where they provide very interesting resources for newcomers. Their interest is to create a global village where intellect and businesses merge to create powerful synergies for education, research, and business purposes. Their processes and administrative initiatives facilitate the immersion in the culture. In addition, there are many associations of international schools that share resources to improve international students’ experience while overseas.

**LB:** In your opinion, what are the largest obstacles faced by ELL students? Please discuss obstacles at the K-12 level, throughout college, and postgraduate.

**IC:** There are several major obstacles that immediately come to mind:

- The first obstacle stems from the fact that their parents may not understand the U.S. academic system. Therefore they do not know how to effectively use the resources that the educational system offers.
- Stereotypes associated with their status are an obstacle. Students from specific regions are “imposed” certain stereotypes over them, creating a self-fulfilling prophecy. For example, some students from certain nations are expected to over-perform (and treated as such), while others are expected to underperform (and treated as such). This causes that the students “perform” according to external expectations and not their real potential.
- The fact that students may not know the language from the country where they are integrating serves as a major stumbling block. But children absorb language at a very fast pace. The challenge for teachers is to have an objective perception towards children's capabilities, which may or may not be correlated to their language ability. The fact that a student does not know the language well is not related to his or her intellectual ability.
- Also, there are different expectations towards the role of the teacher as well as towards the role of the student according to each culture. ELL students may have a very different understanding of what their role is in the classroom compared to the expectations there are in the U.S. academic system. The same would be for the expectation of the teacher's role. Some cultures see teachers as facilitators of learning, while others see them as promoters of critical thinking. Some others may see teachers as the ones possessing the knowledge and students as the recipients of such knowledge.

- Religion may influence values and behavior at school, causing culture and value clashes. This may not be very evident at first, but teachers need to understand the role that religion plays in students from different cultures.
- Finally, the way we make friends and develop relationships varies across cultures. Being able to understand this aspect is key for developing effective relationships in a new country. This increases the likelihood that social support systems will be available for students entering a new cultural environment in time of need.

**LB:** Overcoming such obstacles would have to be tough for newcomers. What could be done to ease transitions for these students?

**IC:** There are several:

- Promote strong and intentional cultural competency skill development for families, students, faculty, and staff.
- Revise our current processes and identify how they could be more international student friendly.
- Identify “cultural translators” within each school so that they not only understand a different language but also can address the relationship between culture and the educational system.
- Promote more international education experiences overseas for American students. This will help them understand other cultures, increase sensibility towards other nations and better understand their own cultures.

**LB:** What is your knowledge of experiences of undocumented students? What extra obstacles do they face?

**IC:**

- I have very extensive knowledge when it comes to the challenges of being an undocumented student. The most important obstacle they experience is the stereotype imposed over them. That has been a strong obstacle towards their full growth as students. These stereotyping creates learned helplessness, because it won't matter how much they try, they will most likely be considered as having more challenges at learning (which is not necessarily accurate).
- The second one is the lack of role models to help them transition into this culture.
- Assertiveness so that they can feel proud of their culture of origin and at the same time learn to integrate into a new nation without losing their identify.
- Last but certainly not least, dealing with culture integration without guilt. There is sometimes a duality that some students will have in regards to their national identity. Sometimes their families have not had the chance to effectively integrate into a new culture, and students may feel pressure to self-identify with one or the other without realizing that there could be effective integration.
LB: What do you project as the future of ELL programs in the United States (growth in number of students, services, etc.)?

IC: In a globalized economy, those students who are not culturally savvy will be at a disadvantage. Other nations know it, and that is why they are choosing to go overseas to learn about other cultures. This view needs to be strongly encouraged at universities worldwide, and it is already booming. In order to be competitive, be productive, have adaptive lives, and be able to promote peace, students need to understand other cultures and other ways to do things. We live in a multicultural world, so we must know it. That is why ELL programs should be a strategic intention such as in other parts of the world. That brings peace and better understanding of others.

LB: Are there any points that I missed that you believe should be included for our readers?

IC: The importance of integrating U.S. students into a globalized educational context. Students benefit from learning and visiting other cultures, but in an intentional way, integrating cultural translations that allow for better understanding of another culture within its context.

LB: Can you elaborate on this?

IC: What I mean is integrating content and experiences that help students understand the impact of knowing and understanding other cultures. Encourage activities where they work in collaboration with students in other countries. Technology has opened the door for these kinds of interactions, which increases the pertinence of better understanding other cultures. These are also key features of the Nebraska program that I mentioned above.
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18th Annual Values & Leadership Conference
September 29-October 1, 2013
Skirvin Hotel, Oklahoma City, hosted by the University of Oklahoma

The theme for the 2013 conference is Ethical Leadership across Borders: Multiple Realities and Building Collective Capacity. Research papers and posters will address the ethical dimensions of leadership within the context of multiple stakeholder perspectives and contributions for building collective capacity in and across educational contexts, institutions, and organizations. Building from the core concepts presented at the 2012 conference in Brisbane, Building Capacity for Moments of Challenging Choices, this conference focuses on the ways in which multiple perspectives across geographic, professional, cultural, and philosophical borders contribute to building collective capacity during challenging moments influencing decision making and action planning. Aligned with the theme of multiple realities, ethical leadership is broadly defined as affecting all levels and domains of the educational pipeline to include nontraditional leadership roles. Unique to this conference is a focus strand on athletics and the ways in which organized sports impact education and ethical decision making in both K-12 and postsecondary settings. Four strands for research align with the conference’s theme:

- Building ethical cultures: Risk-taking and enabling distributed ethical leadership across multiple domains to bridge the theory-practice divide.
- Technology and the changing facets of leadership: Exploring ethical leadership within online communities and nontraditional educational experiences.
- Man vs. machine: Understanding people as a part of and apart from the education or organizational system.
- Student voice and the moral purpose of activism: validating marginalized voices across the border of underrepresentation.

The conference organizing committee is arranging additional workshops and activities. Saturday will be an optional tour of the University of Oklahoma campus including the Ssam Noble Museum of Natural History and the Fred Jones Museum of fine art. Also, there is a plan to include the Jacobson House, which highlights the artwork and culture of the Kiowa 5. Sunday will include a workshop for practitioners, workshop for graduate students, and an international perspectives discussion on educational reform. Also, there is to be a graduate student reception before the keynote and a reception for all participants following the keynote. A new feature will be the graduate student poster session, with the posters remaining on display the whole conference. We are featuring topical “fireside chats” at preselected destinations (e.g., wine bar, brewery, fondue restaurant, etc.) that people can sign up for so that everyone has a place and doesn’t feel left out. The conference is to feature a number of entertaining and educational sections in between research, including short re-enactments of westward expansion with the Buffalo Soldiers, Native American storytelling, Hispanic performers, a youth choir, and others. Details will be provided soon at our website (under development): www.ou.edu/values2013

Contact Hollie Mackey at valuesandleadership@ou.edu for further information.

The historic
Skirvin Hilton Hotel
1 Park Ave
Oklahoma City, OK 73102
(405) 272-3040
Point/Counterpoint:
Successful School Leadership for English Language Learners (ELLs)

Mónica Byrne-Jiménez
Hofstra University

There is much attention in news and politics about Latinos as “the sleeping giant” or as the soon-to-be majority or as a growing economic power or as beneficiaries of the DREAM Act or as leading the push for Comprehensive Immigration Reform. Many of these conversations focus on when American-born Latinos will reach voting age or when young Latinos, of any origin, will enter the job market. These conversations often skip—or ignore—the reality experienced in public schools across the country: the urgent need for creating successful schools for ELL students. Leaders in long-established ELL communities or in newly emerging ones are faced with the same dilemma of developing and maintaining schools that are culturally and linguistically competent. (Note: Spanish-speaking students are neither the only ELL community in schools nor the fastest growing, but presently they are the largest group new to English.)

The following essays reflect the two different experiences with the kinds of leadership that are necessary for schools to be responsive and respectful of their local communities. These essays also represent perspectives from a “traditional” ELL community, along the U.S.–México border, and an “emerging” ELL community in the Midwest. Samantha Scribner and Erica Fernandez, from Indiana University, IUPUI and Bloomington, describe one school where the principal and Latino parents were caught in the maelstrom of community needs, state policy, and evolving leadership roles. In addition, they highlight the leadership capacities needed for engaging and leading at the “intersection.” Francisco Guajardo and his colleagues from the University of Texas Pan American, Texas State University, and San Marcos CSID, offer five “lessons” that school and district leaders must learn in order to nurture ELL students and communities. These lessons require individual development of leaders and other educators, as well as a long-term commitment to continuous learning and outreach.

These thoughtful essays will provoke educational leaders and leadership preparation programs to analyze their practice, courses, and syllabi for evidence of how prepared they are—or how well they are preparing leaders—to lead for successful ELL students. These essays should also make us pause to think about the needs and opportunities found in bilingual and multilingual communities.

Leading With Latin@ Immigrant Parents

Samantha M. Paredes Scribner, Indiana University, IUPUI
Erica Fernández, Indiana University, Bloomington

On a regular Wednesday afternoon at a public elementary school in Indianapolis, you will find three or four Latina mothers arranging the school’s Community Room for the weekly meeting of the Latin@ parent organization. They set up refreshments they prepared or purchased and arrange seating so that parents and guests can assemble around a large table at the center of the room. They also confer on the agenda for this and future meetings. As the after-school programs come to an end, the mothers leading the organization carry on their weekly commitment to organizing Latin@ immigrant parents in accordance with the group’s mission: to advocate for Latin@ parents’ rights at the school and for high-quality education, to gain access to community resources, and to work collectively to change and improve their own future and that of their children.

Typically, the meetings involve a guest speaker who will speak on a topic that the parents have requested. They have invited the school principal, the district coordinator of English as a second language (ESL) programs, and a school psychologist to learn about school and district programs and policies, as well as issues related to student learning. These include representatives from health and human service agencies, who assist and inform Spanish-speaking, immigrant parents about their rights related to health care and coverage or make presentations about health concerns such as tobacco use and women’s health issues. They have invited representatives from community organizations advocating for hotel workers, in a space where stories of workplace exploitation are common among the women who attend the meetings. Without question, however, the most well-attended meetings are those at which the immigration lawyer is present to discuss the latest in local or federal immigration policies.

Context

This setting—a room in a public school that serves as a headquarters for Latin@ parent organizing and self-education—is possible, we argue, because of a convergence of interest made possible by a full-service community school model that invites parent groups to use school space to meet family and community needs. The parents fulfill a vision of the full-service model, and the model provides a space, within the institution they want to influence, to meet weekly. However, it is the parents’ actions that are most educative for preservice and in-service educational leaders in Indiana and nationwide. In this case, the Latin@ parents continue the momentum begun through a study group with a parent advocate to identify challenges they faced in supporting their children's education in a context where educators and educational systems are struggling to meet the needs of a growing newcomer Latin@ population. In particular, Indiana, like other Midwestern states, has experienced an influx of immigrants (of various backgrounds) over the last 10 years. Over the last 10 years the Latin@ population has grown by 49%, outpacing the 14% increase of Latin@s in the West (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011). Latin@s, specifically Mexican Americans, have inhabited

---

1 We use the term Latin@ purposefully. A review of popular and academic discourse reveals increasing use of “@” in place of the “-o/a” because it is gender neutral. The “o/a” represents distinctions that are reinforced in a very gendered language. Because the group of parents includes both men and women, we replace the “o” in Latino and the “a” in Latina with the “@.”
the Midwest since the early 20th century; Gonzalez (2011) argued indigenous populations in the Midwest can trace connections to Mayan civilizations. Despite this fact, the increase in newcomers over the last 10 years has introduced new issues for educators and educational systems in Indiana and across many Midwestern states.

A report by Indiana University’s Center for Evaluation and Educational Policy (Levinson et al., 2007) documented the lack of preparedness by districts to cope with increasing numbers of language-minority students—citing underprepared teachers and funding per ELL students that did not adjust despite an almost four-fold increase of students. Without the human and fiscal resources to educate these students, many educators have viewed the students and their educational needs as problems (López & Vázquez, 2006).

A policy context that increasingly criminalizes immigrants (or anyone who “looks” like an immigrant from south of the border) compounds the challenges encountered by theses students in school. The intersection of economic downturns and scapegoating of immigrants has lead to the adoption of state and local measures that target undocumented or unauthorized immigrants, particularly immigrants of color (López, 2011). In Indiana, for example, the state legislature passed two bills that required undocumented college students to pay out-of-state tuition (House Bill 1402) and expanded law enforcement capacity to detain undocumented residents (Senate Bill 590). In the county that encompasses Indianapolis, law enforcement officials have opted into the Secure Communities Program, a federal program that allows local jurisdictions to share fingerprint files on arrested individuals with immigration authorities, via an agreement between the local authorities, the FBI and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Authority (ICE; U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 2011). This means, in a state where undocumented immigrants are prohibited from obtaining a drivers license, a traffic violation can easily result in ICE detention.

Engagement at the Intersections of Immigration and Educational Policies

For Indianapolis Latin@ immigrants, this context is particularly hostile. Families with undocumented members live in fear of being detained or deported. The threat of family separation as a result of such detentions is a constant stress on adults and children. At the school described above, parents and children alike have experienced these traumas all too often, and it affects their engagement in classroom and school activities. And while Indiana is not a state that requires schools to track or report immigration status, it is a context in which immigration policies and educational policies intersect in tangible ways.

In the case of our work, the activities of the parent group have informed our own thinking and teaching about parent engagement in particular and about the knowledge base that is necessary for principals and other school leaders to effectively and compassionately serve their students. At minimum, we find that educators and administrators benefit from alternative views of parent involvement and engagement that privilege asset-based; culturally relevant; and, simply put, broader conceptions of how parents support their children’s education (see for example, De Gaetano, 2007; López, 2001; Valdes, 1996; Yosso, 2005). However, working with these parents, we have learned that there are other considerations to be made by school leaders in contexts such as this one.

For example, in this urban district, as in many districts across the country, it is policy that any volunteer must have a criminal background check in order to assist in classrooms or in other areas of the school. This often involves, as it does in Indianapolis, getting fingerprinted and having those records entered into an electronic database. The mothers leading the parent organization have identified some problems they would like to help address, beginning with the lack of Spanish-speaking bilingual staff at the school. They have offered to come into classrooms to read to children in Spanish during silent reading time so that the Spanish-speaking children can enjoy stories and, in their words, enjoy their own culture. Given the fingerprinting policy, however, many of the mothers refuse to risk having their records entered into the database, due to the Secure Communities Program. In such a situation, principals are faced with a conundrum: willing and available parent volunteers and a district policy in place to protect the school population. As in many urban districts, this school is under duress amid pressures to increase student performance and the ever-present threat of bad press. In such conditions, some principals have dismissed the dilemma as untenable, viewing the immigration policies that prevent the parents from complying with the volunteering requirements as “separate issues.” For the parents, these are matters of family survival. Due largely to the parents’ persistence, they organized a meeting with the new principal to discuss these matters in depth. Having established themselves as a legitimate parent organization at the school, the parents and the principal negotiated ways that the parents could assist in particular ways without skirting either policy and ensuring increased visibility and support for Spanish-speaking parents and children at the school. What becomes instructive here is that this principal was open to the fact that immigration policies and educational policies do intersect in ways that must be dealt with in order to achieve school objectives.

Leading at the Intersections

This one example is by no means a minor lesson. In other settings we have observed leaders and educators using their inability to speak or understand Spanish to evade the painful realities of threatened immigrant populations. While espousing a value for ethnic and cultural diversity, school leaders who do not find ways to engage parents
directly to learn about families’ circumstances miss opportunities to understand threats in the community that may lead to week-long (or longer) absences, despondent students, or fearful and distraught students and parents who avoid interacting with English-speaking authorities. When political consequences of difference are evaded, Abu El-Haj (2006) explained that those in power are led “to scrutinize the bodies that occupy the subordinated positions, without paying attention to the norms and assumptions that privilege the dominant term and simultaneously shield it from our view” (p. 16). If educational leaders are to engage families and communities—if they are to view their role as community leaders (Khalifa, 2012)—they must find the will and the ways to see and act on the impact of policies that shape family life and inevitably intersect with school-life and within the school space. When parents mobilize to support children and schools, leaders do well to lead with them, rather than in spite of them.

References

Toward a Radical Participation Model to Engage ELLs, Families, and Communities
Francisco Guajardo, The University of Texas Pan American
Joy Esquierdo, The University of Texas Pan American
Mónica Valadez, de Zavala Elementary, San Marcos CISD
Miguel Guajardo, Texas State University

District-level personnel in schools have a pivotal role in advancing and nurturing conversations on how to work with ELLs, parents, families, and communities. Typically, superintendents and school board members engage in lofty rhetoric touting the virtues of teachers, principals, staff, and students. Parents, families, and communities gain less attention in the public speak, as do critical instructional programs and approaches such as bilingual education and engagement approaches schools take to build relationships with families and communities. More can, and should, be done by central office staff and even by university educational leadership faculty and departments to bring more formal attention and investment toward the education of ELLs and their families. We (the authors) have spent our lives as immigrants—quintessential ELLs ourselves—teachers, school leaders, and community members. We find that school leaders whose public approach places students, families, and communities as having value, and who translate that value into a working philosophy, tend to nurture teaching and learning environments more conducive to ELLs and their families. Cultivating culturally appropriate and respectful environments in schools encourages a sense of caring that goes beyond aesthetic caring, and toward cultural caring. When district-level leaders articulate a mission and vision of caring in culturally appropriate ways, environments for ELL success are more likely to take shape.

We suggest school leaders pay attention to five broad areas of concern pertinent to school leaders stewarding the education of ELLs. We advance a process that moves from traditional checklists to a guideline that encourages a deliberate approach informed by local community assets, especially of ELL families, looks at transferring policies and practices from front office to the campus level, and is built on mediating factors and/or strategies of radical participation to expand the collaborative engagement process. The interventions must begin from the inside out, and the leadership at the district level must be conversationally competent, diverse, and culturally competent.

1. Know your history—policy, community, and family histories

A common argument suggests that Americans are increasingly plagued by a sense of historical amnesia. School leaders are not immune. School leaders who work with ELLs and communities should know the histories of students, the demographic patterns, the policies and practices that impact them, and instructional approaches that have historically shown both good and bad results. Bilingual education is one such enterprise that is often misunderstood. In a recent conversation with front office personnel in a South Texas school, few understood the history of bilingual education, its critical court cases, the program criteria set out by Castañeda v. Pickard (1981), or the impact of No Child Left Behind on Title VII and other important policy guide posts. Not knowing Castañeda
was particularly disconcerting, because Castañeda transpired in Ray-
mondville, Texas, in our own backyard. The shame is that we are
surrounded by history we don’t know, and when we don’t know it,
we can’t understand it. Not knowing the history of bilingual edu-
cation, or other programs specific to ELLs, handicaps us all. This is
not a monolithic history or culture, as the shifting demographics
make this a dynamic process. Understanding these changes helps
policy makers respond to the local context in culturally relevant
ways. School leaders must be well-versed and ready to engage in
important conversations about policies pertinent to ELLs.

2. Know the research

Knowing the research establishes the framework for effective
educational practices of ELLs. This is particularly acute because
misguided public views directly influence educational practices
of ELLs. There is merit in the statement, “without research, statements
are nothing but opinions.” Basing educational decisions that impact
the structure and instruction used in classrooms on ideas not based
on valid and reliable research can be dangerous for all stakeholders.
The lack of research-based practices leads to ineffective teaching
and learning outcomes. It is essential that educational leaders, teach-
ers, community members, and parents become well informed of
research-based practices that support quality education for ELLs.
One good research report is not sufficient to construct a framework
for educational reform. A systematic review of empirical research
needs to be conducted before changes can be recommended. A
systematic review of research should include methods centered on
evaluating through comparing and contrasting results from various
studies identifying patterns, or lack thereof, from the research.

Once there is a strong level of comprehension of the research
by educational leaders and other stakeholders, how they utilize this
information is key. How is this information used to impact curric-
ulum? How is this knowledge used to design and deliver staff de-
development? Educational leaders need to be cognizant of research-
based practices so they can make informed decision when adopting
curriculum programs. The “what” students learn in school is im-
portant, and the “how” students learn is equally critical to their suc-
cess. There are occasions, unfortunately, when staff development is
delivered based on trendy educational approaches. Educators tend
to get frustrated when training on specific instructional practices
is not based on sound research. When these practices fail to yield
promised results, staff development may be offered on another
trendy approach. Understanding and applying research appropri-
ately deeply impacts the education of ELLs. In short, practices and
policies should be informed by sound learning theory and practice,
not by divisive political strategies.

3. Nurture the public discourse and create a
demand for good practice for ELLs

As educational leaders develop an agenda for the public good, fami-
lies of ELLs must be invited to be part of the conversation; they
are closest to the issues of educating their children and should be
involved in identifying the solutions. A sincere invitation must be
extended, even if the families don’t know the rules of engagement
of public schools and the educational system. Parents, students, and
community members should be at the table to provide input on the
skills, interests, talents, and gifts of the students and their com-

munity. We know from our research and personal lived experiences
as children, students, teachers, and engaged citizens that there are
very literate citizens in our communities. Our families read the
word, though it may often be in a different language, and they
know how to negotiate the struggles of life.

Engaging families in the democratic process is an opportu-
nity to develop a power-building process for the families of ELLs
and for the district leadership. The expansion of this citizen base
into an educational citizenship develops an additional model for
accountability. A politic of citizen engagement gives way to the
emergence of a new accountability for the education of ELLs that
is relational, is pedagogical, and fosters community building. This
engagement is grounded in equity and dignity and informs the
behavior on campus; the hope is that it also engenders a culture of
generosity and hospitality, as we move away from the deficit and
shame of our current policies and practices.

4. Invest in personnel and their development

As with acknowledging and validating the history that frames bi-
ilingual education and the rich social fabric of the Spanish-speaking
communities that tirelessly advocated for access to equitable
learning environments, the development of a district’s personnel is
also critical to the overall success of ELLs. Strict adherence to
the maintenance of the native language or the acquisition of the
second language is too myopic a vision for developmental pro-
cesses to foster critically conscious personnel. Bilingual education
should not be reduced to language, as it is the most viable oppor-
tunity that districts can provide to integrate ELLs, families, and
communities into the district’s social fabric. This quality of inte-
gration demystifies the notion that bilingual education programs
detract from the overall vision to educate all students and fosters
instead an assets-based understanding of the cultural wealth that
ELLs, families, and communities have to offer.

Developing school district personnel cannot focus only on
issues of compliance, identifying and distributing bilingual re-

sources to campuses to help ELL students achieve academically
and ESL resources to help them acquire the second language. The
investment must also focus on understanding the multiple factors
to create and sustain inclusive learning environments. The devel-

opment of district personnel should include the capacity to under-
stand how to invite, welcome, and sustain dialogical relationships
with campus personnel about the shared commitment to ELLs,
families, and communities. Such a discourse must be promoted
from the most micro of settings (i.e., the family home, the school
classroom, the local playground, etc.) to the most macro of set-
ings (i.e., the district office, the school board, the city council,
etc.). District personnel become key role models in this process as
they give legitimacy to a new politic for educational leadership
grounded on invitation, hospitality, and imagination.

5: Make long-term commitment to radical
participation with ELLs, families, and
communities

We propose school districts consider the following framework to
expand and fortify the learning for ELLs and their communities.
The structural elements outlined above can be addressed by school
districts by employing mediating strategies outlined in the Figure.

To hit the structural elements, we propose schools invest in
learning how to build healthy relationships with ELLs, families,
and communities. Relational accountability as a mediating strategy should be guided by a politic of engagement that is respectful and honors the lives of ELLs and their families. This relational process must go beyond the aesthetic of involvement and toward a radical engagement model that challenges schools to build deep relationships, as those relationships are characterized by school efforts to identify individual and community assets in the lives of ELLs, families, and communities. Through intentional invitations to participate, by identifying the assets of ELLs, by practicing a new politic of engagement, and by nurturing strong relationships, a new model of accountability can be forged. It is the strongest method of accountability—where the stakes are highest and where the best results can be achieved.

**Figure.** Framework for learning for English language learners (ELLs) and communities. MS = mediating strategy.
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**At a Crossroads: The Educational Leadership Professoriate in the 21st Century**

by Donald G. Hackmann & Martha M. McCarthy

This volume represents the results of a comprehensive study of educational leadership faculty and the departments and programs in which they work. It reports the characteristics, activities, and attitudes of educational leadership faculty involved in university-based educational leadership preparation programs in 2008 and provides longitudinal comparisons with data from studies conducted since 1972. Findings are compared by type of institution and with respondents grouped by sex, race, administrative experience, type of appointment (tenure-line or clinical), length of time in the professoriate, and affiliation with UCEA and the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration. While the number of university-based leadership preparation programs continues to grow, the average faculty size has declined. Among major trends are an increase in female faculty (from 2% in 1972 to 45% in 2008) and the reduction in gender differences in attitudes and activities since the mid-1980s. Also, over the past few decades, there has been a significant increase in faculty occupying non-tenure-line positions, having administrative experience, and focusing on leadership in general, in contrast to a content specialization. These and other developments have significant implications for leadership preparation programs and for knowledge production in our field.

www.infoagepub.com/products/At-a-Crossroads
Call for Nominees

2014 Excellence in Educational Leadership Award

Deadline: March 15, 2014

The Award

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

The Procedure

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

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

http://www.ucea.org/the-excellence-in-educational/
Nominations due March 15, 2014
Questions? Call UCEA Headquarters at (434) 243-1041

Preparing Leaders to Support Diverse Learners: LSDL Module Development Project

Using Data
Developing Advocacy Leadership
Family & Community Involvement
Leadership for English Language Learners
Organizing Learning & the Learning Environment
Building a Community of Trust through Racial Awareness of Self

Available for use at www.ucea.org/lSDL-preparation-modules-new
Martha N. Ovando (University of Texas at Austin) was the featured speaker for the 2013 AERA Jackson Scholars Workshop, held Saturday, April 27, 2013, at the Grand Hyatt San Francisco. Dr. Ovando’s two-part presentation, “In Search of a Valid Research Topic and its Development,” provided guidance to more than 30 Jackson Scholars on techniques for writing and defending dissertation proposals. More than 30 UCEA faculty, supporting facilitators, and Jackson Scholar alumni provided coaching and insight to Jackson Scholars during roundtable discussions on developing research topics and questions, literature reviews, methodology, data analysis, career direction and publishing. Jackson Scholar alumni Cozette Grant-Overton (University of Cincinnati), Muhammad Khalifa (Michigan State University) and Natalie Tran (University of California–Fullerton) offered advice to current scholars on making the most of the Jackson Scholars Network to move their careers forward in academia. Cristóbal Rodríguez (New Mexico State University), Maria Luisa Gonzalez (University of Texas at El Paso), Melissa Martinez (Texas State University), Timothy Salazar (University of Utah, Jackson Scholar 2010-12) and Carmen Foster (UCEA Headquarters staff) comprised the planning committee for the workshop, which is cosponsored by UCEA and Division A of the AERA.

Sunday, April 28, 2013, UCEA hosted a memorial service at the San Francisco Hilton Union Square during the 2013 AERA annual meeting to pay tribute to the life, legacy, and leadership of Barbara Loomis Jackson (1928–2012), namesake of the UCEA Jackson Scholars Network. Jackson passed away November 15, 2012, in Oberlin, Ohio, after a brief illness. Judy Allston (Ashland University) served as mistress of ceremonies, which featured acknowledgments from UCEA Executive Director Michele Young and AERA Division A Secretary Jeffrey Brooks (Iowa State University). Jackson’s contributions as a scholar, colleague, trailblazer, and mentor provided reflections from Cindy Reed (Auburn University), Maria Luisa Gonzalez (University of Texas at El Paso), Cryss Brunner (University of Minnesota), James Hennessy (Fordham University), Fran Kochan (Auburn University), Linda Tillman (University of North Carolina–Chapel Hill), Cristóbal Rodríguez (New Mexico State University), and Cozette Grant-Overton (University of Cincinnati). John Nash (University of Kentucky) produced a short video of current Jackson Scholars describing their gratitude for her accomplishments and the Jackson Scholars program as well as a video clip, courtesy of Wellesley College, which honored Jackson as a distinguished Wellesley alumnus in 2003. Jackson’s daughter, Caroline Jackson-Smith (Oberlin College), and granddaughters ended the program with personal reflections regarding Jackson as a role model, mother, and inspiration for their family.

Jackson was a leader, builder, scholar, and mentor in the field of educational administration for over 50 years. As a trailblazer, she opened up avenues of study and practice that still add extraordinary impact on people, institutions, scholarly and applied research, diversity, and urban education. As a scholar, her work was seminal and her publications numerous. She pioneered research on women, particularly concentrating on women of color, paving a path for others to broaden this area of research. Her work has helped to transform the field of educational administration. In 2004, UCEA recognized her with the Roald Campbell Lifetime Achievement Award. UCEA also established the Barbara L. Jackson Scholars Network as a legacy in her honor. Since 2004, almost 300 doctoral students have participated in the UCEA Jackson Scholars program.

---

Grad Student Column & Blog: Submissions Welcome

Two elements of the UCEA website are focused on issues and information relevant to the graduate students of UCEA. The [Graduate Student Column](http://www.ucea.org/graduate-student-column/) typically features scholarship written by graduate students at UCEA member institutions. Column entries explore a variety of topics and allow the authors to present developing research and to the UCEA graduate student community. The [Graduate Student Blog](http://www.ucea.org/graduate-student-blog/) is a more discussion-oriented format encouraging conversation between graduate students via posts and comments. Topics addressed in the blog include discussion and links to educational leadership and educational policy news relevant to graduate students, as well as updates and information about ways graduate students can be more involved in UCEA. Graduate students are invited to send in contributions for both the Graduate Student Column and the Graduate Student Blog. To find out more, please e-mail ucea@virginia.edu.
Greetings, UCEA colleagues! We are pleased to announce the latest special issue of JRLE (August 2013), edited by Joy Phillips. This issue focuses on state-mandated redesign of principal preparation programs and includes contributions by Joy, Fran Kochan and Ellen Reames, Tricia Browne-Ferrigno, Meredith Mountford and Michele Acker-Hocevar, Gini Doolittle, and Michelle Young. The contributors highlight five different states—Alabama, Kentucky, North Carolina, Florida, and New Jersey—and the pervasive nature of these state-mandated redesigns across all five of these states. Distinctive outcomes of the redesign process suggest questions as to how the state policy context, timelines to submit materials for state approval, resource support, faculty attrition, and overall faculty relationships with state policy makers prior to the reform might lead to such different programmatic outcomes. As with all UCEA publications, UCEA members have free access to JRLE, including this special issue, through the “Members Only” link on the UCEA website (www.ucea.org).

Please consider submitting your work related to leadership preparation to JRLE. As a peer-reviewed, SAGE e-journal, JRLE offers timely publication through SAGE’s online-first system and a wide audience for your work. We especially encourage submissions related to

- Innovative approaches to leadership preparation pedagogy, programs, and professional development
- Research on leadership preparation, including evaluation of impacts and outcomes
- Analysis of current policy trends influencing leadership preparation and development (e.g., new trends in state-mandated evaluation systems)
- International/comparative studies of leadership preparation pedagogy, programs, and professional development

We are also interested in proposals for JRLE special issues that address timely and substantive topics related to leadership preparation. For questions, please contact our Managing Editor at jrle.editor@wsu.edu. Submission information is accessible online: http://jrl.sagepub.com

Finally, our thanks to outgoing Editorial Board members who completed their terms in December 2012:

- Gary Crow
- Eleanor Drago-Severson
- Susan Faircloth
- Bernita Krumm
- Latish Reed
- Viviane Robinson
- Nancy Staub
- Alison Taysum
- George Theoharis

A big welcome to new Editorial Board members:

- Nicola Alexander
- Curtis Brewer
- Michael Bezzina
- Christa Boske
- Roxanne Mitchell
- Mariela Rodriguez
- Megan Tschanen-Moran
- Teresa Wasonga
- Anjale Welton
- Richard Flanary

Congratulations to our Reviewer of the Year for 2012: Ernestine Enomoto of the University of Hawaii.
The 27th annual UCEA Convention will be held at the Hyatt Regency Hotel in Indianapolis, Indiana. The convention will commence Thursday, November 7, 2013, at noon and will conclude Sunday, November 10, 2013, at 1:00 p.m. The purpose of the 2013 UCEA Convention is to engage participants in discussions about research, policy, and practice in educational leadership and administration. Members of the Convention 2013 Program Committee are Mark A. Gooden (University of Texas–Austin), Terah Venzant Chambers (Texas A&M University), Muhammad Khalifa (Michigan State University), and Samantha Paredes Scribner (Indiana University–IUPUI).

The 27th Annual UCEA Convention theme, “Seeking New Understandings of Persistent Challenges: A Call to Action to (Re)Unite Research, Policy, and Practice with Community,” is meant to capture the importance of the role of community contexts in which we all exist, navigate, and serve. At times, educational reforms are discussed in the absence of a community’s role in education. This year’s theme addresses connections between and among research, policy, and practice, with attention to a broad range of community concerns. To this end, the conference theme acknowledges that many of the challenges facing educational leadership are longstanding and have important historical contexts that must be considered. Given the chronic nature of these issues, we intend for the 2013 Convention to provide a forum for fresh, engaging, and viable ideas that will be useful to researchers, practitioners, and policy makers and, more importantly, to encourage coalitions where these constituent groups can work together to put these ideas into action.

We acknowledge that there are competing notions of what or who counts as “community” and how local, state, and federal politics and current reforms may privilege or disadvantage different “communities.” Educational leaders, increasingly, must skillfully navigate the politics of “community” and its competing conceptions. Thus, we encourage broad, far-reaching interpretations of community and consider the role of educational leadership in international settings; local neighborhood contexts; local, state, and federal environments; and, of course, communities within schools. Further, we realize that community will resonate in diverse ways across the field of educational leadership, ranging from “school community” and “professional learning community” to “the Black community” and “a community of scholars.” Common to all of these notions of community is a sense of coming together for a purpose, such as seeking new understandings of persistent challenges.

Things to do in Indianapolis: http://visitindy.com/ucea2013
INTRODUCING YOUR 2013 KEYNOTE SPEAKERS

Jeff Duncan Andrade  
San Francisco State University

Cynthia Reed  
Auburn University

Vanessa Siddle Walker  
Emory University

Glenn Singleton  
Pacific Educational Group

TO REUNITE PRACTICE AND COMMUNITY AT THE ANNUAL CONVENTION

Special Thanks to our Convention Sponsors:

Penn State University  
Routledge

Texas A&M University  
SAGE Publications

The Wallace Foundation  
Teachers College Press

The Brock Prize Foundation  
Emerald Group Publishing

Loyola Marymount University  
Information Age Publishing

Indiana University (convention host)

Convention details: http://ucea.org/annual-convention-2013/
The 27th Annual UCEA Convention
Hyatt Regency Downtown, Indianapolis, Nov. 7-10, 2013
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http://www.regonline.com/ucea2012convention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registraiton</th>
<th>Early Bird (through Sept. 3)</th>
<th>Regular</th>
<th>Late (beg. Oct. 20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UCEA Faculty</td>
<td>$190</td>
<td>$215</td>
<td>$230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-UCEA Faculty</td>
<td>$220</td>
<td>$245</td>
<td>$270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCEA Graduate Student</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>$95</td>
<td>$115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-UCEA Graduate Student</td>
<td>$95</td>
<td>$115</td>
<td>$135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practitioner</td>
<td>$205</td>
<td>$230</td>
<td>$255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$220</td>
<td>$245</td>
<td>$270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Student Summit*</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td>$35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In addition to applicable Graduate Student registration rate listed above

It is the policy of UCEA that all persons in attendance at the 2013 UCEA Annual Convention and Exhibition, including participants who plan to attend one or more sessions, are required to register. Registration is not transferable.

Rates increase after September 3, the end of early bird registration. Early bird registration provides several advantages: a discount on registration fees, hotel accommodations at special guaranteed group rates, and no delay or inconvenience on site.

International Scholars

In keeping with UCEA’s longstanding tradition of an international focus and collaboration with aligned organizations worldwide, we welcome international attendees to the 2013 Annual Convention. If you require a letter of invitation to travel to the UCEA Convention, please e-mail your request to uceaconvention@gmail.com

UCEA Graduate Student Summit

The 2013 UCEA Graduate Student Summit will be held at the Hyatt Regency in Indianapolis. The summit will commence Wednesday, November 6, 2013, at noon and will conclude Thursday, November 7, 2013, at 2:00 p.m. The purpose of the 2013 UCEA Graduate Student Summit is to provide a space for graduate students to engage in authentic dialogue about their scholarly work. This summit will offer opportunities to meet and network with graduate students and faculty, to participate in presentations, and to receive feedback on your research. Although we are no longer accepting proposals, we welcome all graduate students to participate in the summit by attending the presentations. Registration for the summit is done through RegOnline as you register for the 2013 UCEA Convention. Registration begins July 1, 2013. For more information visit: http://www.ucea.org/graduate-student-home
LODGING DETAILS

Hyatt Regency Downtown Indianapolis
One South Capitol Ave.
Indianapolis, IN 46204
(317) 632-1234

Rates
Individuals registered for the conference may reserve a room at the hotel at the following discounted rate, good until October 21. After October 21, rates increase. Please keep in mind that availability is limited, and rooms should be booked as soon as possible.

- Single/Double: $144.00
- Triple: $169.00
- Quad: $194.00

Check in: 3:00 pm. Check out: 12:00 p.m. noon. Features include indoor heated pool, jacuzzi, revolving rooftop restaurant, gym, nearby tennis and golf facilities. In-room Internet service $9.95 daily.

Reservations
IMPORTANT: To reserve a guest room, please use the dedicated web page provided by the Hyatt Regency: https://resweb.passkey.com/Resweb.do?mode=welcome_ei_new&eventID=10581923

If you wish to have the option of making your reservations via phone, please call Toll Free: 1-888-421-1442

The 27th Annual UCEA Convention
Hyatt Regency in Indianapolis, IN
November 7-10, 2013
Contributing to the UCEA Review

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

General Editor:
Michelle D. Young (UCEA)
mdy8n@virginia.edu

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

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

Point-Counterpoint Editor:
Mónica Byrne-Jíménez (Hofstra University)
Monica.Byrne-Jimenez@hofstra.edu

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

Managing Editor:
Jennifer E. Cook (UCEA)
jenniferellencook@yahoo.com

2013-14 Calendar

September 2013
- Women Leading Education Across the Continents Conference, September 25-28, Ghana
- Values & Leadership Conference, Oklahoma City, Sept. 29-Oct. 1

November 2013
- Clark Seminar Nominations due, Nov. 5
- UCEA Executive Committee Meeting, Nov. 4-6
- UCEA Plenary Session, Nov. 6-7
- UCEA Graduate Student Summit, Nov. 6-7, Indianapolis, IN
- Barbara Jackson Scholars Program 10th Anniversary, Nov. 7
- UCEA Convention Nov. 7-10, Indianapolis
- UCEA International Summit, Nov. 10, Indianapolis
- Deadline for David L Clark National Graduate Student Seminar nominations, Nov. 15

December 2013
- Deadline for Winter issue of UCEA Review, Dec. 1

March 2014
- Excellence in Educational Leadership nominations due Mar. 15

April 2014
- David Clark National Graduate Student Research Seminar, April 2-3, Philadelphia
- Barbara Jackson Scholars Spring Summit, April 3, Philadelphia