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I would like to begin this address by first taking presidential license and asking you to indulge me for just a moment as I early on in this address take the time to offer my personal gratitude to a number of people. I know that when a preacher who is also a professor asks a captive audience to indulge him, normally that means you’d better get ready for a long time of sitting and listening. But I hope that you will agree with me that this time will be time well spent. I would first like to thank the membership of UCEA for having elected me president of this organization and having given me the privilege to serve UCEA in this capacity. This presidential year has certainly been one of the events in my career that I celebrate and will long remember. I have had the honor of working closely with the members of the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee is a group of scholars and leaders who are committed to seeing UCEA live out the principles that have guided this organization for some time. It has been my personal pleasure to have had the opportunity to think, reflect, and provide leadership for UCEA with this phenomenal cadre of individuals. Would you join me in a round of applause for the men and women who serve on the Executive Committee? It has also been my esteemed honor and pleasure to have had the opportunity to work closely for the last two years with our executive director, Michelle Young. Michelle has not only boundless energy and no end to the commitments she makes on behalf of this organization, but she is also a leader of quality, ethics and integrity. Michelle has provided the kind of leadership that affords our organization the privilege to continue to be considered as the leading consortium of scholars of educational leadership not only in our nation but around the globe as well. There is no doubt that UCEA enjoys such a stellar reputation because of the phenomenal efforts of Michelle Young and the staff that so ably supports her in serving our organization. Would you please join me in a round of applause in demonstration of our gratitude to Michelle for her continued leadership of high quality and excellence? We are quite fortunate to have the quality of associate directors that we have in Trudy Salsberry, Catherine Lugg and the newest associate director, Linda Tillman. These three have taken on tremendous responsibilities and have done so with great aplomb and phenomenal skill. I wish to thank them for all of their hard work as well. I would also like to thank the dean of the College of Education, the department of educational leadership, Dr. Mike Thomas and the other faculty members of the department as well as the staff of the University of Texas, Austin for your continued support of UCEA and for the way you have demonstrated hospitality and welcome to our organization. Finally, I would like to thank the PSR’s and the members of UCEA for your support and dedication to the work of the organization. Without you our plans and ideas would simply remain in the realm of rhetoric and we would lack the effectiveness as well as the productivity we have enjoyed for some time. Thank you for all of your hard work and support.

Now, I would like to divide this presidential address into three sections. First, I will talk about the changing contexts of educational leadership and hopefully address the ways in which leadership preparation must also shift in order to meet the challenges with which we are faced. Second, I will address what I believe to be the courageous efforts UCEA is currently engaging that will assist us in responding to the contextual challenges we face and finally, I would like to suggest a particular project for UCEA to explore that could even more powerfully place our organization in the forefront of shepherding the quality of educational leadership programs across this country.

For just a brief moment however, I want to take you on a historical journey with me that will offer some context to my remarks this afternoon. As an undergraduate at the University of Pennsylvania, during the holidays and vacations, I would go to Winton Place Elementary School with my father who proudly served as the night janitor. My father came to this second job after leaving the Post Office which was his primary job. My father took this second job in order to keep me in school. He and my mother both took a second job so I could stay at Penn. Both of my parents believed that my primary responsibility was to study and so they didn’t want me to get distracted and so they worked two jobs so I would only have to study while at Penn. So, on my vacations and holidays, when I came home, I would go with my father to Winton Place Elementary School to put the chairs down after he had cleaned...
the classroom floors. I would lift the shades and follow my father's
strict orders. My father was a perfectionist and wanted each class-
room that he cleaned perfectly prepared for the next day's activities.
My father always told me, if you're going to do anything, son, be the
best at it. Here is the irony of this story. The school where I served
as an assistant principal, years later, was Winton Place Elementary
School, the same school my father cleaned, mopped, and swept with
pride and purpose because his labor was putting his son through
school. To my father, education was the key to success. It was the
agent for making a difference. To my father education was the an-
tidote to racism and the one sure way I could become somebody in
this life. I stand here today as the president of UCEA because my
father pushed and motivated and inspired me to use education as
a weapon against marginalization and disenfranchisement. I stand
here as the president of UCEA partially because last year you voted
for me but more so because my standing here as the president of
UCEA pleases my father and knowing him as I do, this evening he is
in heaven telling God and the angels, "that's my son, Michael giving
that speech, he's the president of UCEA".

I maintain the same perspective today as my father did. Our
work as educational leaders and those who prepare educational lead-
ers must be a weapon used in the struggle to combat racism, sexism,
classism, homophobia, ageism, and other dehumanizing perceptions
and actions that loom predominately in our nation's schools.

My research over the years has been grounded in the scholarship
of Cornel West's notions of prophetic pragmatism. So I am sure it
comes as no surprise to some of you that I would call upon West to
of those forms and rituals that tend to dehumanize and marginalize
equipping our students as well as ourselves to become transgressors
of human experiences, breaking through those contexts so that equity,
democracy and socially just behavior and practices come to pass and
enlighting of children and families who have been left behind, silenced,
and discounted throughout the educational process. Without en-
lightening these kinds of ideas our field is destined to propagate the historic
projection of desires and hopes in the form of regulative emanci-
pointing at the center of prophetic pragmatism, a struggle guided by a democratic and libertarian vision sustained by moral
courage and existential integrity and tempered by the recognition of
human finitude and frailty. It calls for utopian energies and tragic
actions, energies, and actions that yield permanent and perennial
revolutionary, rebellious, and reformist strategies that oppose the
status quo of our day”

These words from West continue to impact my thinking as I con-
sider the work of school leadership preparation programs and the
scholars who serve in this capacity. Words like struggle, democratic and libertarian vision, moral courage and existential integrity are not
usually components of the educational leadership discourse. Words
and ideas like revolutionary, rebellious, and reformist are also some-
what foreign to the traditional vernacular of educational leadership.
However, it seems to me that without such notions, without fo-
cusing on these ideas our field is destined to propagate the historic
plight of children and families who have been left behind, silenced,
and discounted throughout the educational process. Without en-
gaging these kinds of ideas we are left to simply replicate the status
quo. And it seems to me that the equitable education of all children
through the auspices of a caring, critically conscious school leader-
ship ought to be something that we live and work for.

Educational leaders and those who prepare them must contextu-
alize our work in the realities of every day school life for countless
numbers of our children. Our struggle must be to prepare leaders
to teach and facilitate environments for Lisa Delpit's other people's
children. Essentially, as bell hooks argues, our work literally has to be
grounded in what she calls transgression. I recognize that as up-
standing, law abiding educational leaders, the idea of transgression
is almost anathema to most but I would offer that hook's notion of
transgression is one of the sure ways to provide radical transforma-
tion of our field, the schools we serve, and ultimately the broader
society. Our responsibility as educational leaders must be to prepare
our students to transgress against the hegemony of racist perspectives
and homophobic prejudices. Our work as educational leaders must be
to transgress and to teach our students to transgress the boundar-
ies and limitations as constructed by repressive thinking where no-
tions of gender and ability, class and ethnicity are concerned. Our re-
sponsibility it seems is toouch school finance, school law, facilities, and internships within the contested topographies of accepted and often promoted sexist mentalities and the atrocities of color blindness insensitivities. We must prepare leaders for transgression against believing that education is about only passing state mandated tests and to substitute that reductionistic notion of education to one that argues that education is about critical thinking and problem solving and offering solutions through inquiry and experimentation to societal issues.

Educational leadership is about shepherding struggle. For years I have heard a mindful and soulful colleague of mine, Dr. Khaulah Muradah speak about the work. She has unashamedly grounded research, teaching and service in the throes of what she calls the work. Essentially, for her and what I have come to understand is that the work is not the scholarship. The work is not the teaching, per se. And the work is not the service. The work is the extension of all these. The work is how these are used to bring about radical change and substantive transformation to the lives of children and families that have for so long been marginalized and beaten down by systemic procedures and policies. The work is about changing our own perspectives so that they represent democratic and equitable ways of dealing with human beings. The work is all about schools becoming spaces where the collision of cultures and ideologies, perspectives and paradigms is welcome and the goals of understanding and appreciation are more to be pursued than a unification of thought and the obliteration of difference. In the midst of closing achievement gaps and freeing students to become critical thinkers we must be ourselves and prepare our students to become organic intellectuals. There is so much going on that militates against our living in a genuine democracy that we cannot afford the luxury of teaching reading, writing, and arithmetic without also teaching resistance, reimagina-
tion, and dare I say revolution in order to contend with the plethora of mind sets, predispositions, and prejudices that impact so much of the policies and practices in our schools. I wish to challenge each of us to become those public intellectuals or those organic intellectuals who contextualize the work that we do in the broader civil rights work of bringing about a radical change in the lives of those who are the left overs and the left outs of our society. Our work, our research, teaching and our service are only valid if through them one less student drops out of school. Our publishing, obtaining tenure and promotion are only legitimate if a principal or teacher ceases to look atseptic environment where they will not have to come to grips with

doing so the right thing. We have to align our work with the plight of the children. We have to engage the issues that face the children everyday as the fodder for our research. That is our work. That is our challenge.

In the second part of this address, I would like to commission UCEA to continue what Glen Singleton in his book calls courageous conversations. Since my time with UCEA the annual conventions and even the discourse in between sessions have broached topics that breed consternation, deep thought, debate and yes, sometimes out and out cussing, name calling and fighting. I applaud all of this because as are our schools, UCEA is a contested terrain where multiple ideologies and voices need to be heard. I believe, however, that we can make these courageous conversations more useful if we were to adopt what Paulo Freire believed to be the six essentials for dialogue, those being: love, humility, faith, mutual trust, hope, and critical thinking. To Freire love is an essential ingredient for genuine dialogue to take place because love does not exist in a relation of domination. Love, according to Freire is an act of courage not of fear, love is commitment to others. Dialogue cannot exist without humility. How can I dialogue, Freire asks, if I always project ignorance onto others and never perceive my own? How can I dialogue if I start from the premise that naming the world is the task of an elite and that the presence of the people in history is a sign of deterioration, thus to be avoided? I cannot dialogue without hope for hope is rooted in people's incompleteness. That is, the only way I can enter into dialogue is through my clear understanding that I am unfinished, that there is much left for me to learn, that the answers are not necessarily grounded in my research and my research alone. But in engaging with others and hoping that they will help me to become a little less unfinished, therein lies the efficacy of dialogue.

Over the years I have witnessed our membership deal with courageous conversations on competing epistemologies, inquire about the efficacy of quantitative research over qualitative research, discuss the overabundance of the ideas of social justice in the convention sessions and the limited exposure of the notions of educational administration. We have tackled the leadership/administration binary and we've even argued against the usefulness of such binaries. And all of that to me is a representation of the maturity and strength of this organization. What we don't want are the competing voices to become silent and the diminishing of points of view and perspectives. UCEA still has to be a safe place for people to publicly come out of the closet while others question why that public admission should have occurred here. UCEA must address the contextual realities of schools and locate educational leadership in a discourse that questions the celebration of certain forms of repressive pedagogy over more liberating ones. We have to continue the difficult conversations on the primacy of accountability. We have to determine our positions on P-16 or even P-20 education. We have to labor with notions of locating social justice in the center of a discourse in educational leadership as opposed to having it on the periphery where it can perhaps be more critical. We have to continue the deep discussions on racism and the opportunities for people to address their own prejudices and to come to grips with how those predispositions about people have clouded their thinking and behavior where people of color are concerned. We have to struggle with these notions because that is the only model our students will have that will free them to do likewise. Our conversations will help them to see that educational leadership is not carried out in a vacuum. There is no antiseptic environment where they will not have to come to grips with single parent households, crack addiction, feelings of superiority and elitism. There are no schools where our students can walk down the halls and avoid students who are without issues or concerns. We have the responsibility to prepare our students for the realities of student life in schools; which also means that we have to find ourselves out of our offices and spending time in the schools. Even this idea is a contentious one and needs to continue to be discussed by our membership. My encouragement to UCEA is to continue these courageous conversations. Allow the differences to surface. Keep the dialogue intense but do so from a perspective of love, faith, mutual respect, humility, critical thinking, and hope. And then, take from those courageous conversations opportunities for more inquiry and questions for future research.
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Finally, I wish to challenge UCEA to initiate conversations about becoming our own credentialing agency. As a field, recently, we have had to face many numbers of critical assessments. I strongly believe that if we were to serve as our own credentialing agency that we would not only provide a rigorous procedure that would demand high quality but we would also no doubt willingly include ways to assess social justice and the importance of diversity in our preparatory programs. This is a phenomenally important endeavor for our organization and one that demands a great deal of thought and dialogue. If we are indeed to be a professional organization, a learned society, that believes in accountability and really wants to ensure that the prospective leaders of schools are not only trained academically but also have the dispositions essential to leading twenty-first century schools then we must explore the efficacy of providing our own criteria to the credentialing of departments of educational leadership. As one of my last acts as president, I would hope that the members of UCEA would continue to engage in a thoughtful dialogue regarding this challenge.

I close with this story that I have shared before. For those who have heard it, I once again ask your indulgence. I close with this. Because of another hat I wear, I not too long ago came across a young man who by all standards would be considered to be a thug, straight off the streets, and I mean the roughest streets of Cincinnati, Ohio, sagging pants, do-rag, bling bling, gold tooth, I mean straight up thug. This young, twenty-something man kept hounding me to get the chance to meet with me. He would not let up. Every Sunday following the service he would make his way to get to me and express his urgency to speak with me and he would not deal with speaking with anybody else. So I finally relented and met with him one Thursday evening in my church office. At that time he shared with me some detailed engineering drawings of an invention he wanted to patent and see come to fruition. This was an invention that he felt the military would surely be interested in. Not being an engineer myself, I had to let him know that I was completely ignorant of what he was showing me but that it looked impressive. He shared with me that he had been working on these designs since high school. I asked when had he graduated and he said that he gotten to the twelfth grade and had three months before graduating and woke up one morning and decided to quit school. When I asked him why he would get so close and then drop out of school, he told me that he could not take it anymore. I asked what he meant and he said school was a joke. The teachers would give out worksheets that he finished with plenty of time to spare and he would look at the rest of his peers and wonder what was taking them so long, this stuff, he said was so easy. So while waiting for the rest of the students to finish, he, like many other bored students, would get himself in trouble. And in our typical style, he was sent to the office and given in school suspension, which he said he absolutely loved. I said, “You loved being suspended?” He said, yeah because in in-school suspension, the teacher would give us some more of those easy worksheets and I would finish them and then for the rest of the day I would just sit there and think. He said that being in in-school suspension was the only place and time in the school where he could just sit and think. And he finally decided that since school really was not a place where you are given the opportunity to think that he didn’t feel like wasting another day there. So in April of his senior year, he dropped out of school. The irony to me about this is that this young man had to be punished in order to be given the opportunity to think in school. There is something terribly wrong when thinking in school comes as a result of punishment. We as educational leaders can change this. We can understand the context of educational leadership, engage in the courageous conversations and then hold ourselves accountable to make sure that schools become thinking places for all of our children. Thank you for your attention.

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

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

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

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

If you have already included UCEA in your will or estate plans, please contact us so we can update you as a UCEA Partner for the Future.
REFLECTIONS ON UCEA’S PROFOUNDED TRANSFORMATION: AN INTERVIEW WITH 2006 UCEA PRESIDENT FENWICK W. ENGLISH

UCEA: How did you become involved with UCEA?
FE: When I came to the University of Cincinnati in 1988 I really learned about UCEA. I attended one of the first UCEA conferences which was sponsored by the University of Cincinnati. Later I wrote the sabbatical review for UCEA for the University of Kentucky and the original application for UCEA at Iowa State University.

UCEA: What is the most gratifying aspect of your involvement with UCEA?
FE: The most satisfying part of my participation in UCEA has been the profound transformation which is still going on. UCEA has changed from a nearly all white heterosexual male enclave where only one kind of research was acceptable, to a wider participation of women, persons of color, sexual orientation and diverse views about research. The conversation today at UCEA is very different than when I first came to that conference in Cincinnati. I think it is a lot healthier, less parochial, with a much wider inclusionary focus than in the past. It’s still going on because there is more to do. But I am encouraged by the respectful climate which prevails for increasing diversity and engaging in real critical reflection. There’s a lot of people responsible for this change. I’ve been grateful to have worked with them in UCEA to foster this transformation.

UCEA: Discuss Your Current Goals for UCEA
FE: First, I want our profound transformation to continue. By that I mean that we should continue to expand our conceptions of research, especially towards leadership. I’d like to take up Michael Dantley’s recommendation to engage in our own accreditation of educational leadership programs. I’m tired of the politics surrounding the revision of the administrative standards. If the Chiefs or other practitioners want to publish their own standards than let them. Many want to make money from their participation and are not open to reconsidering some of their original assumptions. The standards and the procedures that have been developed are profoundly antithetical to research institutions, especially from NCATE. The process which is in place has dumbed the preparation process down to number crunching involved in the additive approach to accreditation. Our standards lack intellectual rigor and epistemological coherence. They can only be propped up by raw political power. In the long run they cannot be sustained unless they have intellectual legitimacy and rigor. So my goal is to cut us loose and create standards which possess the characteristics we know to promote democratic schooling, diversity and positive change as opposed to conformity, sterilization and standardization. This position is not based on some dry read of obtuse academic texts, but by walking through schools and classrooms from coast to coast which have become mind numbing test prep factories centered on getting higher test scores at the expense of a thoughtful, engaged, purposeful schooling experience. We cannot inspect our way to excellence.

A second goal is to reawaken our commitment to the concept of public service as the raison d’etre of our doctoral programs instead of continuing to center the Taylorian goals of efficiency bound up with market logic in contemporary bizspeak. For this mission the profit motive is not the appropriate metaphor, nor should it be the orientation for the leadership we provide. The last national poll by U.S. News and World Report showed that educational leaders commanded more respect from the public than business leaders or Congress, though one would never know it from some of the foundations and right wing think tanks hell bent on privatizing public education.

UCEA: What are some of your professional goals and research interests?
FE: I continue to write about the epistemology of professional practice. We constantly are compared to the medical profession. I’m convinced that those who do that are not well read in the history of the medical profession. Nearly all of the modern breakthroughs in medical practice, beginning with the discovery of penicillin, were out of paradigm. That means that no research process which used existing thinking or methods would have led to a similar discovery. Standardizing research methods embraced by the National Research Council would have only reinforced a practice barren to the medical breakthroughs which have saved so many lives today. I’m not opposed to culling and codifying what we believe to be good practices. I am opposed to enshrining them as the ultimate ends of preparation. My other goal is to work to restore a balance between the science and art of leadership. Researching leadership involves science. But practicing leadership is an art and it has deep roots in the humanities. Leaders are not only researchers and managers, but they are also poets, philosophers and performers.

UCEA: What contemporary research do you consider most important and original with a high probability of leading to significant improvement in our understanding of educational leadership?
FE: The research/scholarship which I believe will have long term implications for how we think about our work is Jackie Blount’s “Destined to Rule the Schools” because it finally sets the record straight about women in leadership. I think Jackie’s work is on a par with Callahan’s masterpiece “The Cult of Efficiency.” I’m mightily impressed with Kate Rousmaniere’s recent biography of Margaret Haley because this is the first detailed portrait of a social justice educational leader. It illustrates how hard true social justice educational leadership will be. Thirdly, Eugenie Samier’s multidisciplinary re-centering of leadership in the humanities in Canada and on the European Continent will be far reaching. Few Americans have heard of her, but they will. Finally, the UK’s Helen Gunter’s critical analysis of new labor’s agenda and its intellectual contradictions are simply stunning. Notice that all of these contributions are by women. I’m smiling as I write this because for so many years some of UCEA’s founding institutions were controlled by men who were fearful of the “feminization” of the profession. UCEA’s profound transformation happened because the number of women reached a critical mass in UCEA leadership circles which initiated the changes we are experiencing today. Michelle Young’s leadership was and remains the centerpiece of this intellectual renaissance resulting in our great growth in membership and attendance at the annual conference.
From the Director:
Developing Principal Quality Data Systems
Michelle Young with Ed Fuller

Introduction
Over the last decade, policymakers and researchers have become increasingly interested in principal quality. Much of this interest has been generated by research that suggests principals play a critical role in developing high-performing schools and the realization that we know very little about the effects of preparation programs on principal quality or even about the career paths of principals.

UCEA has been long been interested in gathering more and better quality data about principals and the preparation programs that prepare the principals. Most recently, UCEA has joined forces with the Teaching in Educational Administration SIG to create The Joint Research Taskforce on Educational Leadership Preparation. The primary aims of the taskforce are:

- to provide a foundation about existing research and theory in the field of leadership preparation
- to identify gaps and new directions for research on leadership preparation
- stimulate more, better quality research in the field of leadership preparation
- to encourage new and experienced researchers to undertake research in the field.
- to provide a community of scholars for on-going conceptual and methodological work.

One focus of the Taskforce is the collection of better data on the preparation of school leaders and the outcomes of preparation programs such as the production of graduates, employment rates, retention rates, mobility patterns, and the effects of program graduates such as improved working conditions, increased teacher quality, decreased teacher attrition, and ultimately student achievement. Texas is one of the few states that collect fairly detailed data on administrators. Specifically, the state collects information on the production and employment of certified administrators and includes information on the characteristics of the individuals (age, race/ethnicity, gender, certification score, and years of education experience). The data allows researchers and program evaluators to track the production, employment, retention, and mobility of administrators across almost 8,000 schools in over 1,200 school districts. However, this data is but one piece of an ideal principal quality data system.

This short article lays out some of the fundamental data elements that preparation programs and state education agencies should collect to create an ideal PQ data system that would allow policymakers and researchers answer important questions about both preparation programs and principals. We believe that without attention to the collection of such data, policymakers, practitioners, and the public will not have information they need to improve principal quality in meaningful ways.

As far as we know, less than a handful of states have even a rudimentary PQ data system that allows programs and researchers to track principals from their preparation programs into schools in various positions (teacher, assistant principal, principal, central office administrator, or superintendent). The remainder of this piece will provide recommendations on the important characteristics of an ideal PQ data system as well as the type of data that should be collected by preparation programs and SEAs.

Characteristics of an Ideal PQ Data System
The most important characteristic of an ideal PQ data system is that the various data sets can be linked together over time. More specifically, each data set must include common, unique, and consistent identifiers for students, teachers, principals, teacher and administrator preparation programs, schools, and school districts so that each data set can be linked to the other data sets. For example, a data set that includes the graduates of teacher preparation program could include both the individual’s social security number and other unique identifier that is included in other data sets such as school employment records and certification test records.

Data Elements of an Ideal PQ Data System
There are many diverse elements that could be included in an ideal PQ data system. In the section below, we describe the elements in phases, with the first phase including the most essential elements and the final phase containing less important and/or more difficult elements to obtain.

Phase I Elements
The first phase of data should include information about entrants, graduates/completers, those obtaining certification, and employment.

Entering Students
Administrator preparation programs should collect fairly detailed data on their students. For example, programs should collect data on graduates’ race/ethnicity, age, gender, teaching experience, certifications held, and the types of schools in which they have taught. In addition, programs should endeavor to collect information such as GPA, GRE scores, and coursework completed.

In addition, programs should collect more qualitative information from each entrant. A survey of entering students should collect students’ reasons for entering the program, all instructional experiences they have had (e.g., teaching experience, teaching younger children in day care or at church, etc), all leadership experience they have had (e.g., department or grade level chair, scout leader, or leadership in other positions), their education experience, their reasons for wanting to be a school leader, their experiences with and perceptions of school leaders, and their thoughts on the roles and responsibilities of school leaders.

Graduation/Completion
Programs should also collect data about who does and does not graduate. The characteristics of those graduating and those not graduating—particularly within a specified time period—should be compared to identify any significant differences in the characteristics of the individuals in the two groups. One of the
key elements necessary to conduct an evaluation of any program is a detailed description of the course content and other instructional experiences completed by each graduate. The course content data should include a basic description of what each course covers in terms of knowledge and skills. Such information is absolutely critical if programs are going to be able to evaluate their effectiveness in preparing effective administrators.

Finally, programs should collect information about the perceptions of the program from students during the program and from graduates at the end of the program. This perceptual data must be collected through surveys of enrolled students and be administered each semester until completion of the program. The surveys should gather information about their perceptions of the coursework taken and students’ perceptions of how well they feel prepared to be a school leader. More detailed surveys should be administered at the end of the internship experience to assess the overall program effectiveness in general and the internship experience in particular.

Certified Administrators

State education agencies (SEAs) should collect data on all administrator preparation program graduates obtaining certification. In fact, since SEAs administer the certification tests and collect the certification scores, the SEAs should make such information available. The information should include test-takers’ race/ethnicity, gender, date of birth, name and type of preparation program attended, certification test scores, and all certificates obtained by an individual. Some states have interpreted the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) in such a way that this information is confidential. However, FERPA would apply in these cases only if taking and passing the tests is a requirement for graduation from a preparation program. Otherwise, FERPA is not applicable. SEAs should also require certain personal information be provided by prospective administrators in order to receive a certificate, such as basic demographic and contact information. The contact information could be used for research purposes and for contacting individuals with necessary information.

Employment of Administrators

Both programs and SEAs should collect data on the employment status and the employment location of graduates. However, programs must collect this data through surveys, which typically suffer from low response rates. SEAs, however, can compel school districts to submit administrator assignment data. In this way, SEAs can collect data on the employment location and status of every administrator in the state, thus allowing preparation programs to track their graduates into schools and follow them over time. Some states, such as Texas and New York, already collect such data, thus allowing researchers to examine administrator placement, employment, and retention as well as conduct assessments of the effectiveness of programs in preparing administrators and linking programs to school-level outcomes such as teacher turnover, teacher quality, and student achievement. This data can provide extremely valuable information for policymakers, such as urban principals are recruited to the suburbs in New York (Papa Jr., Lankford, & Wyckoff, 2002) and that only 50% of principals remain at the same school over a 3 year time span in Texas (Fuller & Reyes, 2006).

School Information

SEAs should collect and make available extensive data on schools and school districts. At a minimum, the following information should be collected and made accessible through a state-maintained website:

- School demographics
- School size and grade enrollment
- Expenditure data
- Enrollment and outcome data (e.g., SAT, ACT, AP, graduation rates, and dropout rates)
- School achievement data by student demographics and grade level
- Test exemption data by student demographics and grade level

For example, Texas collects a wealth of data on schools and makes it available through the internet (http://www.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/aeis/)

Phase II Elements

Phase II data should include additional information about those obtaining certification and employment as well as information about administrator shortages and employment in public schools other than that of being a principal. This second phase of data is typically more difficult to collect.

Certified Administrators

Not only should the state collect certification test scores, but the state should also collect domain scores. Specifically, the state should collect the overall score, but also domain scores for domains such as creating school-community leadership, instructional leadership, finance, and management. Preparation programs can use such data to identify strengths and weaknesses in their preparation of school leaders.

In addition, the state should require prospective administrator to complete an on-line survey before a certificate is given. The survey could capture teachers’ perceptions about the efficacy of their preparation program, where they would like to become a school leader, how long they intend to stay in the profession, quit the profession, or move from one school to another. The Center for Teaching Quality (www.teachingquality.org) has already administered such surveys in a number of states and has found strong relationships between specific working conditions and teacher retention and student achievement. In fact, in many instances, their research has shown that school leadership is the most powerful factor influencing teachers’ stated future intentions of staying or leaving a school (http://www.teachingquality.org/twc/whatwedo.htm).
Invitations could be emailed to participants. The surveys would have districts describe their mentoring and induction program and data statewide would make more sense. An ideal situation would formation on mentoring and induction programs, collecting the information can assist preparation programs and school districts in their efforts to improve their programs aimed at preparing and retaining school leaders. 

While SEAs and preparation programs may possess the objective characteristics of teachers that may help explain attrition or mobility, surveys of school leaders actually leaving the profession would provide important information about the reasons school leaders leave the profession or move to another school. Such information can assist preparation programs and school districts in their efforts to improve their programs aimed at preparing and retaining school leaders.

Phase III Elements

The third phase of data is typically even more difficult to collect than the data in the first and second phases. Data in this phase includes information on professional development, mentoring and induction, exit surveys, and observations.

Professional Development

SEAs and/or programs should collect data on not only the basic number of professional development hours completed, but also information about the type, timing, and perceived efficacy of such professional development. At the very least, educators could be asked about the number of hours of professional development taken, the areas in which they believe they need more help, the professional development that actually led to changes in leadership behavior, and whether the changes in leadership behavior are perceived to positively affect student achievement.

Mentoring and Induction

While programs and school districts could collect information on mentoring and induction programs, collecting the data statewide would make more sense. An ideal situation would have districts describe their mentoring and induction program and provide a list of participants (both mentors and mentees). The participant lists could then be collected by the state and surveys invitations could be emailed to participants. The surveys would assess the details of the mentoring and induction program as well as participants’ perceptions of the efficacy of the different facets of the programs.

Exit Surveys

SEAs and/or programs should collect data from those leaving the profession to discern their reasons for choosing to move out of a school leadership position. This information could prove valuable to preparation programs in better preparing individuals to enter and remain in the profession.

Observations

One valuable piece of data that is costly and difficult to collect is observations of principals in their school settings. Preparation program personnel could conduct such observations. This information would be extremely useful in analyzing the connection between preparation program activities, the behavior of principals, and important outcomes such as working conditions, teacher quality, teacher retention, and student achievement.

Non-education Employment data

While a number of states collect employment data across a variety of job categories, rarely is this data linked to administrator employment data. Such data can be extremely useful in examining the reasons why administrators leave the profession—such as for higher salaries—and from what other professions people enter school leadership.

Implications

We believe preparation programs should invest in collecting such data and use it for both evaluation and research purposes. While many will argue that such endeavors are expensive—and they would be correct in most cases—we simply cannot ignore questions about the effectiveness of our programs. If we continue to not collect and analyze such data, someone else certainly will and then we will have lost control over the very tools that can potentially provide evidence that our professions is critical to the field of education.
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Point/Counterpoint:
At Home or Afield: Where Should Administrative Field Experience Be Gained?

Julie F. Mead, Point-Counterpoint Editor

The culminating activity for most administrative training programs is the guided field experience, the opportunity for students to begin to apply the theories learned in coursework to the real practice of educational leadership. How to best structure that experience is a challenge faced by all preparation programs and raises the question: Should pre-service administrators serve clinical field experiences/internships in the schools in which they teach or in different school settings?

To consider that question, we depart slightly from the two essay format. First, we offer the reflections of two individuals who have recently completed their field experiences through the University of Wisconsin’s Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis and who provide a vivid illustration of the realities that face our students. Jennifer Borst, now principal of Douglas Elementary School in Watertown, Wisconsin, describes the potential benefits that may be available for students completing “in-house” internships. Michael Gonzalez, Social Studies Teacher at LaFollette High School in Madison, Wisconsin, reflects on the challenges he faced while teaching and interning in the same school. Using these two experiences as context, we then offer two academic discussions of the question. Nancy A. Evers, Professor in the Division of Educational Studies and Leadership and the Center for the Study of Leadership in Urban Schools at the University of Cincinnati, argues that the location is less important than the structure of the experience itself and describes a framework for examining a quality practicum program. John C. Daresh, Professor of Educational Leadership at the University of Texas at El Paso, counters that while an external placement may be an ideal out of reach for many students.

Internship Site Selection as an Integrated Aspect of Planned Field Learning Experiences

Nancy A. Evers

Our field of educational leadership has held a strong value for clinical field experiences as an important aspect of leadership preparation for a long time. From 1933 to the mid-1980’s, the field experience in school administration programs in the United States (Wheaton, 1950; Newell, 1952; Davies, 1962; Dobb, 1974; McQuarrie, 1988), and in 1989, the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) adopted a set of standards for the quality preparation of educational administrators which included a focus on supervised clinical practice (UCEA, 1989). More recently in 2002, the Interstate School Leadership Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards were integrated into the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) / Educational Leadership Constituency Council (ELCC) Program Standards for evaluating the quality of leadership preparation programs (Young, et. al., 2005). The NCATE/ELCC program standards state that the clinical field experience or internship should provide significant opportunities for candidates to synthesize and apply knowledge and developed skills through “substantial, sustained, standards based work in real settings, planned and guided cooperatively by the institution and school district personnel” (National Policy Board for Educational Administration, 2002, p. 16).

The question posed for this “Point/Counterpoint” is: Should pre-service administrators serve clinical field experiences/internships in the schools in which they teach or in different school settings? Within the caveat of a well conceptualized and integrated planned field experience, I believe that the student should be guided in making a selection of the school site for the planned field experience. One of those decisions is choosing the practicing administrator mentor and school site for the planned field experience. Student selection of the mentor and site is an important integrated aspect of the student’s planned field experience.

Conceptualization of the Planned Field Experience

Evers and Gallagher (1994) developed the Reflective Administrative Practice (RAP) Model as a comprehensive and integrated conceptual framework for field based preparation of educational leaders. The RAP Model is based on several key premises and describes a student’s progress through four interrelated stages.

The first premise of the model is that the educational administrator is a professional, a problem solver in a particular context applying specialized knowledge, skills, and values, and that through interaction with the situation the educational administrator develops professional knowing or knowing-in-practice as described by Schon (1983). If the primary function of professional educational administrators is to solve problems, they should be given the opportunity to practice problem solving in the context of real educational environments under guidance and prior to entry into administrative positions. Before individuals in preparation assume educational administrative positions, they benefit from learning-in-doing. As they participate in more cases, individuals develop a more diversified repertoire of knowledge, skills, and values applicable to professional problem solving. The novice administrator interacts with the situation assessing the contextual problem(s). After establishing the problem set, the novice takes action to solve the problem. The novice chooses the appropriate action based on personal perception of what is needed and continuously reflecting upon the action and interactive variables. This exercise of professional judgment is guided by the knowledge, skills, and attitudes developed through coursework, by the situation of context or the field experience, and by the insights of others working with the individual in preparation, such as the practicing administrator/mentor, the university professor, and other students.
A second premise of the model is that the planned field experience is a collaborative effort among the student, the practicing administrator and the university professor. All three of these parties focus their talents and energies on providing the student a quality learning experience. This primary goal of providing the student a quality learning experience can be accomplished most effectively when each person makes a commitment to the novice administrator’s professional development. The collaborative nature of the planned field experience requires the team of three individuals to have clear and common goals, an adequate structure for achieving these goals, open communication, the necessary resources to achieve the goals, and a means for rewarding each person for working toward the goals.

While the primary goal of the planned field experience is providing the student the opportunity to grow by reflecting-on-practice, a secondary goal may be to help the educational organization in which the experience occurs to accomplish its goals, and a tertiary goal may be to extend general understanding of the educational administration profession through meaningful discourse.

A third premise of the model is that student learning—in-doing is enhanced by reflection with other students who are also engaged in planned field experiences in other sites; student cohorts are an important instructional component of the planned field experience. While the student is engaged in the planned field experience, meaningful reflections on practice can occur in discussions with other students who are engaged in planned field experiences at multiple sites. Seminar discussions, which are problem solving in nature, help the student reflect on the uniqueness of the situation in which he/she is working, discover commonalities across field sites, give and receive professional help among developing administrators, and connect the knowledge base developed in the classroom with the knowledge developed in practice. Working with a cohort of novice administrators, the student obtains immediate insights into the practice of administration and begins to develop a value for collaboration within the profession.

A fourth premise of the model is that evaluation is an important function which contributes to selecting a practicing administrator/mentor and site, establishing relevant direction for the planned field experience, planning appropriate activities, implementing reflection in action, and determining the effects of the planned field experience. Evaluation is the function of gathering information and placing some value on that information to make sound decisions. Within the context of the planned field experience, evaluation serves to enhance individual and collective decision making by the student, practicing administrator/mentor, and university professor.

The RAP Model describes the planned field experience as progressing through the four interrelated stages of assessment, planning, implementation, and evaluation. Each stage will be described briefly in terms of process, roles and responsibilities, and purpose.

In the assessment stage, the student (1) selects a practicing administrator/mentor and site for the planned field experience and (2) assesses the school’s needs and her/his professional development needs in order to set direction for the planned field experience. First, the student identifies two or three prospective practicing administrators and their schools for consideration as sites for his/her planned field experience. The identification of possible sites should be based on the administrator’s reputation of being a good educational leader and mentor, and the school’s mission and accessibility to the student. The student interviews each administrator and visits each school to assess the administrator’s leadership, professional background and commitments for the future, views on mentoring and availability for mentoring, and desire to mentor the student and the school’s mission and goals for the year, culture, student and staff demographics, and student outcome indicators. After careful consideration of the assessed information and conferring with the university professor, the student selects the mentor and site. Second, through systematic means the student identifies the problems and opportunities facing the school. In addition, the student identifies her/his strengths and weaknesses relative to performing administrative work. After assessing the school’s needs and her/his professional development needs, the student translates both sets of needs into goals. Next the student validates the assessed needs and goal statements with the practicing administrator and the university professor. Once agreement is reached on the assessed needs, the student is ready to plan a set of activities or project which will accomplish both his/her professional development goals and the goals of the school.

In the planning stage, the student plans a set of activities aimed at accomplishing the identified professional development and school goals. The plan is articulated explicitly in a written document or contract which presents the goals, activities, needed resources, timeline, and evaluation criteria and procedures. The plan should be reviewed and agreed on by the practicing administrator/mentor, the university professor, and the student, before the student initiates implementing the plan.

In the implementation stage, the student begins engaging in the activities associated with the planned field experience. With the initiation of action the student begins reflection. While engaged in the practice of activities, the novice is reflecting upon those activities, seeking meaningful improvement as an administrator. The basic work of the administrator is problem solving and through planned field experience he/she develops or refines a repertoire of problem solving capabilities. The novice administrator is guided by sharing reflections with the practicing administrator and the university professor and other students who are also in planned field experiences. Each of these individuals can listen, observe, and give feedback for improvement to the novice administrator. Facilitative structures for meaningful reflection should be used during implementation. One such structure is the writing of individual journals by the novice administrator. This journal can be reflected upon individually and shared with others for feedback. A second structure is regular and frequent discussions with the practicing administrator, who can help relate the context of the school to solving the site problems directly observe the implemented actions and give ongoing feedback. A third structure is regular discussions with the university professor who can help relate the general knowledge base to solving the site-based problems and provide feedback. A fourth structure is regular problem-solving discussions or seminar with a cohort of students who may have different contexts to deal with but have similar problems.

In the evaluation stage, the novice administrator assesses how and the degree to which the planned field experience goals of the school and his/her professional development have been met. The evaluation is carried out according to the plan developed in the planning stage. The results of the evaluation are reviewed, discussed, and agreed on by the novice administrator, the practicing administrator and the university professor at the same time. The results of the planned field experience evaluation may be used for four purposes: improving the novice administrators practice, further improving the planned field experience, improving the sphere of coursework, and improving the sphere of practice. The evaluation may provide insights into what
areas the novice administrator needs to further develop. It may also provide insights into how to improve the process of the planned field experience: how to plan better; how to implement a set of actions and reflect on them to drive improved practice; how to evaluate the effects of practice and the overall process. Beyond these typical purposes, evaluation of the planned field experience can provide insights into what and how to improve the classroom learning. Institutions of higher education may need to reconsider content and methodology of classroom learning. Evaluation of the planned field experience can also provide insights into needed improvements in the sphere of administrative practice. The practicing administrator can benefit and grow through interactions with the student and the university professor. The practicing administrator may need to reconstruct his/her practice and work with other professionals in changing the sphere of practice for professional development of educational administrators.

Student Choice
Throughout the planned field experience the student engages in reflective practice, making professional decisions and learning in action. The first decision is selecting the practicing administrator/mentor and school site. The student assesses two or three different educational administrators and their settings and decides upon which person and site will likely provide a good situation for her/his internship learning experience, after conferring with the university professor. The decision outcome may be that the student will be an intern in the same site where he/she is a teacher or in a different school. There are potential advantages and disadvantages associated with leading an improvement effort as an “insider” and as an “outsider” (Havelock, 1995); however, because every context is complex, filled with problems and opportunities, and in flux (Fullan, 2001), there is great potential for learning-in-action in every setting. The challenge for selecting a mentor and site is choosing “the best fit” for the student’s growth as an educational leader. The decision for the potential “best fit” should be made by the student with guidance by the university professor as an integrated part of the learning experience and should be based upon sound criteria.

The rationale for giving the student the legitimate decision making authority for choosing a mentor and site is multifaceted. First, if the student decides upon the mentor and site with guidance from the university professor, it is likely that the student will have more ownership for the learning experiences. There is potential for increased commitment to learn in context, and when change or turbulence occurs in the site, the student has an investment in making appropriate adaptations and learning through the process. Second, because the mentor and student relationship is a key element for a quality field learning experience and socialization into the administrative role (Brown-Ferrigno & Muth, 2004), the student’s perception of her/his relationship with the mentor and site is important. The relationship between mentor and student needs to be mutually beneficial (Crow & Matthews, 1998); therefore, the student’s perception of the relationship is one perspective which must be accounted for in mentor and site selection. Third, the mentor and site need to be accessible to the student, and the mentor and site should be able and willing to provide the student a good learning situation. Accessibility is relative to the student’s circumstances. The student’s financial, personal, and professional commitments and circumstance will influence his/her ability to access particular mentors and school sites. Knowing her/his unique circumstances, the student is in the best position to consider mentor and site accessibility issues.

The student’s choice of a mentor and site should be based upon an understanding of the mentor role and reasonable criteria. Having access to a quality school administrator, who is also a good mentor, is key to a good internship (Williamson & Herndon, 2001). Effective mentors give students significant responsibilities to perform, opportunities to try without risk of reproach, time for constructive feedback and processing of experiences, and understanding of stories and thinking associated with administrative decisions and actions. In quality mentoring situations, the practicing and aspiring administrator develop a trusting relationship that supports their mutual efforts toward school improvement (Barth, 1990). The student should be guided by the university professor to consider the following criteria in selecting a mentor. The individual is a licensed and currently practicing school administrator at the level for which the student is preparing. The individual holds a reputation as an effective educational leader. The individual has expressed a willingness to assume mentor responsibilities. The individual has made a commitment of his/her time for mentoring the student. The individual enjoys learning and helping others learn. The individual is open to the student/intern leading the school with his/her guidance. In addition, the student should be guided to consider the following criteria in selecting the school site. The school’s administrator meets the above criteria for serving as a mentor. There is a match of the school’s stated goals and the student’s internship interests. The school is open to the student/intern providing leadership to the school with the school administrator’s guidance. The school system is open and committed to providing the student/intern multiple leadership development experiences related to the agreed upon field experience goals. After the student has chosen the mentor and school site and obtained a mutual agreement for working together through the planned field experience, the student focuses on building and maintaining a good working relationship with the mentor and other members of the school community throughout the internship experience.

Conclusion
The comprehensive and integrated conceptualization of the planned field experience described in the RAP Model places the student at the center of the clinical learning experience and gives the student the responsibility of selecting a mentor and school site which will facilitate her/his professional development as an educational leader. The internship site selection should be viewed as an important aspect of the student’s planned field learning experiences. With the guidance of the university professor, the student gathers information on several possible mentors and school sites, considers each option in relationship to valid selection criteria, makes the selection, engages in relationship building actions, and reflects upon his/her selection decision and actions at the beginning of the internship and throughout the assessment, planning, implementation, and evaluation stages of the planned field experience. The student may decide to choose either her/his school where she/he is employed as a teacher or a different school. The important issue is the student’s learning through the selection of the mentor and the site and the connection of that decision with the other elements of the planned field experience.
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My Internship Experience: Building on Existing Relationships
Jennifer Borst

I attended the University of Wisconsin – Madison to complete my master's degree in Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis while I was a full-time elementary classroom teacher. I attended courses at the university for two years before I began my official internship through the master's program. As I attended classes, I often focused the work and final project on the school in which I was working. By the time I began my official internship, I had already worked closely with the students, staff, and families. The transition into the internship was smooth, and in many cases, I had already begun to take on responsibilities within the school before the official start of my internship.

The most valuable part of completing my internship within the school I was teaching was the rapport I was able to build with my building principal. As I had worked with him for two years before he officially served as my mentor for my internship, the relationship that we had built was very positive. He had worked closely with me as I developed projects for my various graduate courses. Since I would be completing my internship on-site, we were able to spend much time outlining projects and areas within the school and within the district during the internship.

Since we had developed a trusting relationship, he was able to share with me many of his thoughts and ideas for the direction he saw the school taking, the obstacles and challenges he saw facing the school, and his plans for overcoming those obstacles. Since the relationship was built over years, rather than weeks or months, he knew he could share details with me that he might not be able to share with an unfamiliar person. The honest conversations we were able to have allowed me to understand the complex nature of schools, the importance of having a clear vision for student achievement and growth, and the difficult decisions that were required of a building principal on a daily basis. During our dialogues, my principal was able to ask pointed questions that allowed me to look at issues from various perspectives. He shared his honest opinion on how to handle complex situations. My principal also shared that he enjoyed our conversations, because they allowed him to reflect on his practice as an administrator and begin to become aware of the many aspects of his job that had become automatic over the years.

I was also able to build trusting relationships with the staff members. Many teachers allowed me to complete observations and evaluations of their teaching. As a future administrator, this was extremely beneficial because I was able to practice what I feel is one of the most important aspects of a building principal's position—but that is often overlooked in educational leadership programs. Due to various union constraints, these observations and evaluations may not be permitted in a typical internship. I also received honest feedback from my colleagues after I had led inservices, staff meetings, and trainings on various topics. Because they understood my role in the school and my future career goals, they were eager to share their perspective on various issues. I was able to spend time talking with teachers about best practices as they related to tasks such as scheduling.

My work with the children and families at my school was also strengthened due to the long relationship I had built with them. The students understood my future goals as an educational leader and the goals I had while teaching. When it came to working with families,
I received very open and honest responses, since they were already comfortable with me and with my unique role within the school as both a teacher and an administrative intern. Many families in our school community lived in poverty and felt very connected to the school due to the positive relationships the teachers, staff, and principal had built over the years. Because the families had seen me both at school and around the apartments and neighborhoods at home, they did not view me as an outsider. Rather, the families appreciated the perspective I was able to present and the information I was able to add about their child. This was very important, especially when dealing with difficult issues that arose throughout the year.

The long-range perspective I gained while completing my internship was also valuable. The district had set long-term goals in literacy based on student needs according to standardized testing data, district assessment data, and teacher observation. Because I had been a teacher in the district for several years, I saw how teachers and administrators developed goals and a timeline to implement teacher training and staff development. I also heard the discussion teachers had regarding the pros and cons of the long-term implementation plan. In fact, as a teacher in the district myself, I was able to observe areas in which the plan met the needs of the teachers and students and areas in which additional work and planning needed to occur.

As an “outside” intern, I would not have had the historical perspective on the literacy curriculum initiative.

During my internship, I had opportunities to observe various principals in the area. I dedicated time during my school breaks to shadow principals in surrounding districts. I had the chance to see how various administrators approached their work in different buildings and different districts. This allowed me to reflect on the way in which certain programs, curriculum, and ideas were implemented in different schools, based on the context of the school. It sparked many ideas that I know I will use in future positions.

I officially finished my internship in mid-May as I completed my master’s degree and coursework. However, my work was not done. I continued to work closely, and more importantly, continued to reflect upon my work with my building principal through the end of the school year. During that same time, I obtained my first administrative position as principal. The apprehension I began to feel as I embarked on my new position was tempered by the support I received from my principal and colleagues at my school. My principal provided me with thoughts and ideas I could use as I began the school year in a new community and new school environment. He also continued to ask pointed questions that allowed me to reflect on my practice.

The experiences I had within my school both before and during my internship and through my coursework have given me many opportunities to learn about the work of building principals and district administrators. As I now embark on my new position as a principal, I realize that I will often be faced with situations, issues, and problems that were never “covered” in my coursework. However, through my work, I developed the problem solving and critical thinking skills to draw from while dealing with the situations. I also know that I can rely on my current administrative colleagues in Watertown as well as my internship mentor when I need additional thoughts or ideas. This will be imperative as I continue in my career in education.

---

THE VALUE OF THE “OUTSIDE” INTERNSHIP
John C. Daresh

The personal reflections on internship experiences provided by Jennifer Borst and Michael Gonzalez identify the pros and cons of engaging in field-based experiences either within one’s own school, or in another school. My assigned task here is to provide a critique of the “in-your-own school” internship and provide a supportive statement on behalf of requiring all aspiring principals in university-based preparation programs to serve as interns only in schools in which they do not currently serve as teachers. In general, I welcome the opportunity to praise the values inherent in the “outside” internship, but I confess some ambivalence in this task. I have been involved with the design, implementation, and evaluation of field-based learning experiences in five different universities during my career. In two settings (The Ohio State University and the University of Northern Colorado), I also had the opportunity to work with colleagues in devising approaches to internships for candidates serving in experimental programs supported by the Danforth Foundation. While it was usually desirable to provide future principals with learning opportunities in settings outside their own schools, there have always been impediments to mandating that students travel away from their own schools. After all, most of the students with whom we worked over the years were examples of “teachers by day and scholars by late afternoon.” In other words, mandating experiences outside of the schools in which individuals serve during the day might mean that individuals would be required to take unpaid leaves to work in another school. To be honest, in my years of service, I have only found a few people who had the personal resources or motivation to step away from a regular job so that they could work in another school or district on a full-time basis. And substantial financial support from external agencies (e.g., private foundations, state legislatures, or school districts themselves) is rare these days. So my response here is a description of the ideal, with a recognition that the ideal may not necessarily be achieved.

The issue may not be one of deciding if an “outside” internship is better than an “inside” experience. Rather, the real factor that might be considered is the value of the internship itself, and whether that value might be enhanced or limited by the place where the internships is carried out.

Consider the potential benefits of field-based learning in preparing people for the role of school principal, regardless of where the learning occurs. In reviewing the literature on field-based learning experiences and their value for preparing school administrators (Capasso & Daresh, 2001), we discovered several identified benefits for internships and other forms of practica. Well-designed programs offer participants many benefits:

1. Field-based programs enable interns to develop administrative competence progressively through a range of practical experiences.
2. Interns are allowed to apply knowledge and skills gained through universities in a practical setting.
3. Interns can test their personal commitment to a career.
4. Interns are provided with an opportunity to gain insights into the preparation of school, its goals, and how those goals may be achieved.
5. Interns gain insights into their progress toward personal and professional goals.
6. The internship experience can serve as a way to showcase the talents of interns as potential school leaders. Is it likely that all of these benefits may be derived by an intern carrying out their work in their own school, or is it more probable that the benefits can better be achieved through service in another school?

The first issue concerns the likelihood that an intern might be able to learn actual administrative behavior progressively. In this case, it seems unlikely that the location of the intern experience will have much impact on the extent to which one works in a familiar or unfamiliar environment. Perhaps even more critical to this benefit is the quality of the principal who will serve as a mentor to the intern. In the cases of both Ms. Borst and Mr. Gonzalez, excellent principals were available to provide guidance and consultation in terms of the administrative tasks that were assigned to the interns. On the other hand, interns talk about how they were disappointed with their experiences because they learned very little about providing leadership in a school. They may have been assigned to work with an administrator who saw the arrival of an intern simply as a way to get someone to do work that did not appeal to the principal. We have often seen cases where the intern “learned about administration” by doing little more than handle discipline referrals or load buses. Principals do, of course, engage in similar activities, but they do more. And so should interns. Another issue often faced by interns concerns the problem of having to work with a poor role model. Conventional wisdom suggests that “You can learn a lot from watching a bad principal.” I do not agree with that statement. I have always wanted our students to see good practice from good leaders. As a result, I might give a bit of an edge to outside internships in that they may allow interns to “shop around” for quality mentors. Staying in your own school might be great for our two reflecting UW interns, but there are many cases that forced people to make do with a local principal only because of convenience.

Interns can apply theory to practice. Again, I see little evidence in the reflections of Borst and Gonzalez to suggest that either person was unable to use the internship to see the real-world application of textbook learning. I think there is not likely to be an absolute definition of a better intern experience in this area based solely on where the internship takes place. A slight edge, however, may be found in the opportunity to work in a “foreign” environment, particularly if the school is an example of a school serving very different children, or a different community. Spending one’s whole career in an upscale community may be comforting. But there are many different challenges that face administrators in rural or urban settings. An intern who can see different places may learn a great deal more than one who is seeing the same type of setting at all times.

Internships are places to decide if administration is truly a career for an individual. Most people moving toward jobs as school principals have already spent several years working in schools and they have seen what principals do from afar. They have also studied what principals are supposed to do in their graduate courses. But they have typically not had experience in sitting in the administrator’s “hot seat.” Admittedly, internships can do little more than provide a test ride to the “warm seat,” but the view from the internship can give individuals—either in their own schools or in less familiar settings—insights into what the job of being a school leader is all about. The only recommendation that I make here is that in order to fulfill this potential benefit, I might suggest that at least a part of the intern experience be required earlier in students’ academic programs so that they can get a glimpse of their future before spending a considerable amount of time and money pursuing a career that may not be as appealing as first thought.

The preparation of a school, its goals, and strategies for achieving the goals are certainly not matters with which an intern with prior time spent as a teacher will not have experience. But the matter of how to lead an organization toward the attainment of the goals is quite different from the role of a leader. And it is most definitely a different challenge when leadership toward goal attainment must be carried out in a “new” or “different” school. Since the majority of beginning principals are likely to come from either schools or districts that are different from the ones in which they previously worked, I believe that having the opportunity to watch over the shoulder of an expert practitioner in a new or foreign environment may have considerable value for an intern. I believe that in this case, the potential value of engaging in an “outside internship” may be much greater than staying in a person’s “home” school.

Gaining insights into one’s personal professional growth and development as an educational leader will always be a matter of personal reflection. Again, the location of an internship makes little difference to the extent to which a person is able to use a learning experience as the source of personal reflection. As the reflective interns show, they gained many insights into their individual capabilities, whether they worked in their own school or not.

Finally, a huge benefit often forgotten as part of the internship experience is that people who have normally been viewed in terms of being classroom teachers have a chance to give observers an insight into their probable future success as school leaders. When we insisted that our Danforth interns spend at least part of their field-based programs in schools and districts other than their own, we noted that there was considerable movement of people to other settings when they finally had the credential required to serve as principals. Often, districts tend to overlook their own talented individuals, but when they get a look at outsiders, there is more interest.

Reading the reflections by interns Borst and Gonzalez gives an important insight into what may be the most critical aspect of responding to whether it is acceptable to stay in your own school for an internship, or whether it is better to go to a new site. We may overlook at times a reality for our students in graduate educational administration programs. They are learners who have different needs, interests, and backgrounds. Like Ms. Borst and Mr. Gonzalez, they are capable, highly motivated, bright, insightful, and dedicated educators seeking opportunities to serve students through service outside the classroom. But some individuals seek the security of places where they know the “turf.” As Ms. Borst noted, it was a very important part of her learning experience to feel the trusting relationships that she had developed in her school. Mr. Gonzalez was looking for the challenge of new places and faces. One intern enjoyed the feeling of relying on people that she knew; the other felt a need to establish a new identity as an administrator. Neither person is wrong. And so the internships they completed were neither absolutely right nor wrong. Perhaps the critical issue to be addressed by university faculty members intent on providing meaningful internships for future administrators is that “one size will not fit all.” Choices and alternatives are needed in terms of placements for internships.

References
My Internship Experience: Balancing Dual Roles
Michael Gonzalez

While an undergraduate in college, I was first introduced to an axiom that still resonates with me. This adage holds that “the distance between theory and practice is always so much smaller in theory than in practice.” My recent stint as a principal-intern at the high school level verified the validity of this statement. Though professionally enriching and intrinsically rewarding, the internship still illustrated the wide chasm between theory and practice in educational leadership. Because of countless irrepressible realities and unforeseen events, my tenure as a principal-intern – from beginning to end – was fundamentally altered beyond recognition.

This tension between idealism and actuality reared its ugly head immediately as I pondered possible internship locations. Interns are encouraged by K-12 educational leadership programs to look beyond the familiar world of their own school building to build new professional support networks and to gain a taste of the principalship in unencumbered, politically neutral environments. However, I was not afforded the luxury of a placement separate from my place of employment. Years of chronic state budget shortfalls in public education at the state level forced my district to take drastic measures to assure basic financial solvency. As a result, certain “surplus” programs not directly related to classroom expenditures were cut.

In 2003, as soon as I began graduate studies, my district experienced a budget reduction over $3 million. Part of these cuts included the highly successful and innovative “Grow Your Own Principal” initiative, which had targeted district staff members who aspired to be administrators. Semester-long (18 weeks) internships were organized for program participants who successfully completed graduate school requirements and obtained state certification. I intended to utilize the “Grow Your Own” program to focus exclusively on the rigorous demands of the internship without having to balance full-time teaching responsibilities. Due to the district’s dire financial circumstances, I needed to remain at my current location and pursue an unpaid practicum.

The following description of my experiences as a principal-intern is not meant to be an indictment. In fact, I felt extremely blessed to have worked under my head principal, who happened to be one of the most dynamic, diligent, and focused school leaders in the state. Overall, I feel that my internship was replete with informal learning opportunities that provided me with unique insights on the principalship. These lessons certainly shaped, altered, or confirmed my beliefs regarding the pertinence of education in our society. Moreover, I realized that school administrators are pivotal change agents who influence a school’s culture, performance, and personality. Yet many things about my internship left much to be desired, thus leaving me with a feeling of incompleteness as I attempt to pursue future employment as a K-12 administrator.

Balancing the dual roles of classroom instructor and quasi-administrator within the same building was immensely difficult. For an entire academic year, I had to squeeze in 150 hours of practicum experience under the guidance of a certified administrator. During the previous summer, I met with my mentor to draw up a contract outlining the specific requirements to be completed over this timeframe. Honestly, the physical demands on my time were overwhelming. A typical day lasted twelve hours. I arrived to school before dawn to prepare lessons for the day and run classroom-related errands. From 8:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m., I taught three consecutive 90-minute periods. A half-hour lunch preceded my prep time, which was spent exclusively on fulfilling my responsibilities as a principal-intern. After school, I usually stayed for a couple of hours to tie up loose ends and prepare for the next day. Supervising extracurricular events extended my workday to fifteen or sixteen hours. Concurrently, I also had to complete three graduate-level courses in order to complete the state certification process.

If these physical demands were not enough, I also endured the emotional toll of being forced to straddle a fine line when dealing with my colleagues in the building. First of all, based on my experiences, the field of educational administration is not viewed as the most desirable or productive career option by a fair share of teachers. I received plenty of “flack” and subtle jabs from individuals who were close, personal friends of mine. I found it extremely difficult to process their sarcastic comments at first. This obviously had a draining effect on me.

Furthermore, my professional and personal interactions with all staff members were tainted because of my dual roles. As a teacher, I was full-fledged dues-paying member of a union, with access to all rights of representation. Yet, as a principal-intern, I was privy to confidential and sensitive information. Some colleagues inquired about potential “scoops” regarding the future direction of our school’s 4x4 Block schedule, which was perhaps the most pertinent topic for every stakeholder in the building. When the four-block issue was decided, internal worries shifted to budget cuts that threatened to eliminate up to twelve positions in our school. The emergence of these and other issues always placed me in the “crossfire” between the staff and administration, thus I needed finesse to my daily interactions and actions. To avoid compromising situations, I avoided union meetings and daily conversations in the teachers lounge.

Our school’s climate was undergoing a drastic change as well. My mentor accepted a position as a superintendent for an out-of-state district. Besides balancing duties at his current location, he had to also to conduct interstate travel to juggle the responsibilities for the new position. As a result, our time for reflection and possibly altering the internship was extremely limited.

In addition, my mentor’s personal leadership style and educational philosophy differed starkly with mine in certain areas. Granted, our relationship was very cordial and he offered wonderful lessons on the managerial aspects of the principalship. Due to a confluence of factors previously described, however, much of my internship was self-directed. Committee work dominated my internship requirements and I did not have many opportunities to act upon realistic scenarios as encountered by principals on a daily basis. Furthermore, I was not able to practice “hands-on” administrative approaches tied to continuous improvement in student learning. I often wonder if an external placement would have been different in many respects.

Regardless of these difficult circumstances, I feel confident that this experience prepared me in many ways for a position in administration for the near future. Effective leadership in education requires maximizing productivity with limited resources. In this regard, my principal internship provided me with much practice.
Competency Based Leadership Training at the University of Minnesota

Karen Seashore, Ann Werner, and Neal Nickerson

In 1996, the Department of Educational Policy and Administration at the University of Minnesota was faced with two immutable challenges. The most immediate was internal: five of the six faculty members who were most involved with the preparation of school administrators were retiring, and there was no enthusiasm in the Dean’s office to replace all of them. On the political front, the winds of the competency movement hit hard in Minnesota, and the state decided to “sunset” all of the existing licensure programs, and to require that they be standards-driven. While many of the other institutions re-configured their programs simply by adding a competency requirement, our department took the double challenge as an opportunity to create a radical alternative to the assumption that “seat time” was the best approach to preparing leaders.

While our program has evolved considerably over the past decade, our five fundamental principles have changed very little since we began our redesign task:

1. The University of Minnesota is committed to the support and development of high-level thinkers and practitioners to fill the challenging roles of educational administrators for the 21st Century.

2. The licensure program for educational administrators must be user friendly and reflect the needs of candidates currently employed while fulfilling the licensure requirements.

3. All appropriate existing knowledge and experiences will be acknowledged and incorporated into the total preparation and evaluation of each candidate.

4. The program will incorporate the expertise of field practitioners with doctorate degrees in the development of the program, course instruction for students, and evaluation of licensure candidates.

5. The licensure program will be distinct from the M.A. and doctoral degrees offered by the department, although a student may be enrolled both in a degree-seeking and a licensure-seeking track.

At the core of the program that emerged from our planning year was the basic premise that our program should be driven by the portfolio process, in which students would be required to demonstrate mastery of the state’s identified competencies (which now number 21 for the principal’s license with 97 sub competencies.), and that the determination of initial qualification for a license would be judged by a panel composed of licensed practitioners and a representative of the University. The portfolio had to present “artifacts” that demonstrated the ways in which the candidate met the competence. Most artifacts cannot stand alone, and candidates would be asked to address at minimum, the following reflective questions: Why is the exhibit representative of the competency and what makes it significant? How does the experience/artifact relates to my values and beliefs? How can the experience improve my current/future practice?

So far, this story does not sound very different from the program discussions occurring in most UCEA institutions at this time. However, our actions were more dramatic. Starting with the goal of candidate demonstration of their ability to know and do, we eliminated all pre-existing university admission and course requirements for licensure, allowed significant individualization based on a preassessment, and took advantage of pre-existing coursework and experiential pathways to lead the candidate to demonstrate attainment of competencies. The program adheres to state statute, but allows students to obtain the specified credits in a wide variety of flexible ways. In addition, we greatly strengthened the requirements for documenting the internship experiences as part of the portfolio.

Finally, we built into the portfolio assessment process the requirement that evaluators develop a professional development plan for candidates who have one or more sub competencies that are identified as below entry level. The candidate must demonstrate all 93 sub competencies to receive University endorsement for licensure. The assumption is that individuals, given the necessary time, rigor, relevance, and mentorship, can reach initial mastery levels as demonstrated through our rigorous portfolio assessment process.

As we began to enroll the first students in this radical new plan, we soon realized that the portfolio process required a steep learning curve even for experienced administrators coming in from out-of-state, and added a requirement for a portfolio seminar and a one-credit introductory course that explained the licensure competencies and requirements. In theory, aside from these two courses, a student could complete licensure based solely on experiences and knowledge acquired elsewhere. Students could, of course, enroll in other courses taught by the department that would assist them in meeting the competencies, and we began to offer a wide variety of one-credit “skills” courses, taught by practitioners, in areas ranging from scheduling to school budgeting. The courses taught by our faculty could be taken for graduate school credits (thus ensuring that they could transfer into a degree program later), but the “skills” courses could not be used as part of a degree program at the University of Minnesota.

The initial response from the field was very positive. Within two years we went from no licensure candidates (during the transition year) to completing between 45 and 60 licensures in all areas (principal, superintendent, special education, and director of community education) each year. As the program expanded, we became aware that nearly 30% of the candidates were determined to have not fully satisfied their portfolio review committee at the first meeting, which meant that specific suggestions for remediation needed to be drawn up. We, and our practitioner collaborators, were swamped with the work of portfolio review, and decided that offering more courses—a non-degree “track” for those who had little previous leadership experience—would be helpful in ensuring candidate success. The courses that are a (strongly) suggested path for rapid movement from admission to the program to the final completion of the portfolio, and for novices interested in the principal’s license include: financial management, law, administration of human resources, administration of teaching and learning, data-driven decision making, the principalship, and building the master schedule. Students who come into the program with experience, including licenses from other states, can demonstrate comparable knowledge. Although we stood firm for the first decade in our decision that licensure should be distinct from advanced degrees (remember that Minnesota statute requires an MA for entry into an initial administrator licensure program), we will be adding an Educational Specialist degree (Ed.S.) as a credit-based/degree option. In addition, we have added a program for leaders of charter and non-public schools, where an administrator’s license is not required, but preparation is important, and this group now comprises nearly a quarter of our program participants.

It could be argued that the addition of required courses for inexperienced applicants, as well as adding the Ed.S. option, make our program less radically alternative than it was previously. We do not
agree with this assessment, since far fewer than half of the people seeking a license are co-enrolled in a degree program in our department. In addition, our assessment process remains the rigorous core of our program: Although we have reduced the number of students who need additional work after the first portfolio assessment, 15% still receive a professional development plan that stipulates additional work and documentation of competence.

Many of our colleagues have asked how we do it – how can we afford to require fewer credits and focus more on the competencies? The answer is not simple, but the department dedicates the income from the licensure activities to the program, so that it has become self-sustaining. The number of tenure track faculty members dedicated to leadership preparation is smaller than it was in the past, and the licensure program is run by two full-time former principals, who participate fully in the department but whose responsibilities emphasize outreach to our practitioner colleagues, teaching a few courses, advising students through the portfolio process, and working with state licensing bodies.

Based on our experience trying to do leadership preparation differently, what have we learned? A few thoughts include:

- Collaboration between the University and practicing school leaders is essential for training school leaders who have the needed knowledge, skills, and dispositions
- The process of becoming a good beginning school leader is not straightforward -- people come to the role with different strengths and the process of becoming competent is highly individualized
- Collaboration between the University and practicing school leaders is essential for training school leaders who have the needed knowledge, skills, and dispositions
- The process of becoming a good beginning school leader is not straightforward -- people come to the role with different strengths and the process of becoming competent is highly individualized
- People who want to be school leaders need support from mentors, peers, and faculty, but most novice school leaders need some structured (course-based) support
- Detaching licensure from degree programs has resulted in strengthening both.

If we compare our licensure candidates now and in the past, some unexpected benefits include the increased engagement and hard work among the applicants, the higher-than-expected quality of people recommended for licensure, and the role of the portfolio in providing a framework for professional development beyond initial mastery. In sum, if asked, none of the faculty (and certainly none of our collaborating principals and superintendents) would go back to the old “seat time” approach.

Karen Seashore Louis is Rodney S. Wallace Professor in Educational Policy and Administration; Ann Zweber Werner is the coordinator of administrative licensure, and Neal Nickerson is Professor Emeritus, and architect of the current approach to licensure.

Minnesota statute requires that candidates for administrative licensure must have 3 years of successful classroom teaching experience while holding a teaching license at the level appropriate. Candidate must also complete a specialist or doctoral program or a program consisting of a master’s degree plus 45 quarter credits in school administration at a Minnesota graduate school. Candidate must complete field experience of 320 hours or 8 weeks in 12 continuous months at the elementary or secondary level as an administrative aide to a licensed and practicing administrator specific to the license of preparation.

Michelle D. Young Elected Chair of the National Policy Board for Educational Administration, 2007-2009

Michelle D. Young, the Executive Director of the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) and Associate Professor of Educational Leadership and Policy at the University of Texas, was elected Chair of the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA). The NPBEA is a consortium of national organizations in the United States that focus their program efforts on educational leadership.

The NPBEA was formed to advance school and school-system leadership by promoting periodic national reviews of preparation for educational administrators and professors; advancing the professional standards of administrator preparation programs; encouraging the development of high-quality programs; fostering meaningful dialogue on critical national policy issues in education, including: encouraging professional growth of administrators through advanced national certification; and holding forums for discussions of issues in educational administration. In her role as Chair of NPBEA, Young will work with professional organization leaders, practitioners, and state and national leaders to continually improve the preparation and practice of school and school system leaders and to create a dynamic base of knowledge on excellence in educational leadership.

Young routinely works with states and universities on program improvement projects and serves on a number of national boards that focus on increasing knowledge of and improving practice in educational leadership. Young serves or has served on the ECS MetLife Leadership Project Advisory Board, the Wallace Foundation’s Education Advisory Committee, the Institute for Educational Leadership’s E-Lead Advisory Board, the National Policy Board for Educational Administration, the Educational Leadership Licensure Council (ELCC) Audit Committee, the National Commission for the Advancement of Educational Leadership Preparation and the Kansas Laboratory for Educational Leaders (KLEL) SAELP project. She also served on the National Advisory Board for ERIC through December 2003.

Young received her Ph.D. at the University of Texas at Austin in Educational Policy and Planning. Before joining UCEA at the University of Missouri, she served as an Assistant Professor in the Department of Policy, Planning and Leadership Studies at the University of Iowa. Her scholarship focuses on the preparation, practice, and evaluation of school leaders and school policies that facilitate equitable and quality experiences for all students and adults who learn and work in schools. Young is the recipient of the William J. Davis award for the most outstanding article published in a volume of the Educational Administration Quarterly. Her work has also been published in the Review of Educational Research, the Educational Researcher, the American Educational Research Journal, the Journal of School Leadership, the International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, the International Journal of Educational Administration, and Leadership and Policy in Schools, among other publications. She currently serves on the Editorial Board of the Educational Administration Quarterly, Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership, Educational Administration Abstracts, Education and Urban Society, School Public Relations, and the Journal of Research on Leadership Education.
Jerry Starratt Receives the 2006 Roald Campbell Award for Life Time Achievement

During the 2006 UCEA Convention, Jerry Starratt, a professor at Boston College, was honored with the Roald Campbell Award for Life Time Achievement. This award is granted annually to senior professors who have exhibited superior contributions to the field of educational leadership through a lifetime of distinguished service as a teacher and researcher, and recognized efforts to improve the field, especially the preparation of educational leaders and future professors. The following remarks were delivered by Professor Starratt upon receipt of the Campbell Award:

I wish to thank the UCEA Nominating Committee for choosing me for this award. To my way of thinking, your decision must appear a bit quirky to some members of our club. Nonetheless, stepping on to this pedestal named in honor of one of the giants of the field where so many distinguished scholars have stood is a humbling, yet a marvelous experience. I wish to thank Leonard Burrello for his role in promoting my nomination and Paul Begley for his most generous comments. I wish to take this occasion to thank Paul for his leadership of the UCEA Center for the Study of Values and Leadership, which has been a stimulus and an outlet for most of my recent work in the ethics of educational leadership.

I want on this occasion to thank Tom Sergiovanni, my teacher, scholarly colleague, and loyal friend for having a reckless faith in one of his research assistants back in 1968 to invite him to co-author a book on Supervision, a book that has recently emerged in its Eighth Edition. Without that early launching into scholarship, my career might have turned out quite differently than it has.

Over the years I have received encouragement and support from many of you in this audience, and I thank you for that. As we all know, positive feedback from our peers is enormously important to scholars who, though they’d be loathe to admit it, feed their fragile egos with the pat on the back, the brief “well done!” That encouragement helps us to continue the struggle to cast some light and hope on the complex processes of education. Among those voices of encouragement, I wish to single out my colleagues at Fordham University—Barbara Jackson and Bruce Cooper— and my colleagues at Boston College—Irwin Blumer, Andy Hargreaves, Diana Pullin and Betty Twomey—all of whom have been in their own way, sources of inspiration and support in the demanding work of preparing the next generation of scholars and practitioners.

Finally, I wish to acknowledge the profound support I have relied on for the past twenty years—my dear wife and best friend, Ruth. She has served as cheerleader and critic, therapist and teacher, caregiver and admirator, as I meandered my way into some insight or other that eventually made its way into my teaching and into print. On this occasion, it seems appropriate to offer a few brief reflections on my work, its sources and influences, and on the nature of our scholarly life as professors in the field of education.

As for being a scholar, I consider myself a very late bloomer. My first thirteen years of formal schooling were, in retrospect, a waste of time for me. I emerged from those years almost totally untouched by my teachers, although I suppose some of it stuck, like the residue of the Palmer method exercises in my handwriting, or my gradual awareness of the difference between a noun and a verb through our eighth grade exercises in diagramming sentences. My collegiate years weren’t much different, with the exception of one experience that left an indelible impression on me. My freshman literature professor used to assign a weekend essay. He would select one or two from the pile every week to read to the class as exemplifying some aspect of style or argument or insightful metaphor. Halfway through the semester he selected my essay to read to the class. Though I cannot remember the particular aspect of the essay he singled out for praise, I remember the enormity of the moment, the enormity of realizing that perhaps I had something worthwhile to say, that perhaps I had a mind. Up until that moment school work was simply something to be suffered through, a matter of remembering enough from the textbook and the teacher’s lectures to pass the tests. My real life was lived outside of the realm of school work, playing sports, making friends and enemies, working at various jobs, surviving four older brothers and sisters. That one experience, however, launched me as a reader, as a thinker, and as a writer. However, by that time I was miles behind my contemporaries, so even though I tried to catch up to them, I never did. To this day I keep encountering colleagues who are five or ten years ahead of me in the number of books they have read, and, what’s worse, in their ability to speak intelligently about the authors they have read.

Paradoxically, that feeling of being so far behind has kept me going, doggedly keeping my nose to the grindstone, and probably will stay with me to the end. Right now, our two residences have shelves groaning with so many books to be read, so many stimulating conversations to be had with the authors of those books.

Another paradox. Having wasted so many years in classrooms and courses that never touched me, never spoke to me about who I was, who I could be, or shouldn’t be; about the fascinating, beautiful, tragic, and mystifying aspects of the worlds of culture, of nature, of human history, I find that I am able to write now about how my education should have been, and about how the education of so many of today’s youth should be!

Having experienced the full spectrum of boredom, alienation, mystification, and purposelessness in year after year of my education, I can write with a deeply felt passion about what authentic learning might have been for me, and what it should be for today’s students, whether it be in kindergarten, in fifth grade, or in doctoral studies. Some educators over the years have said to me that they have been inspired by my writing; others puzzle over the seemingly hopeless idealism in my work. Well, the source of both the inspiration and the idealism comes from my disappointments with my own education. Shows how we can transform years of wasted time into
an eventual harvest of light and hope.

Some scholars in education study the outsides of things in education, and write about those outside things—what works, what doesn’t, and how to make things better. Some scholars study the studies of outside things in education and take them inside to speculate about why things work that way. Some scholars start from the inside of things and speak to the insides of their readers. I think the latter two rubrics describe how I, a classical introvert, work.

In an essay commemorating the influence of Bill Foster on the field, and on my own work in particular, I struck the phrase, “the dialogue of scholarship.” In writing that essay, I probed my own life’s journey as an educator and how my experiences helped me to understand what Bill was saying, but also to talk back to Bill, both directly and in my own writings. All the other scholars who had influenced me entered into that conversation I was having with Bill, just as the scholars who had influenced him became part of that conversation. I realized that I could not have put into words what I had to say to educators if I had not read widely and deeply in John Dewey, Alfred north Whitehead, Loren Eiseley and Ernest Becker, in Piaget, Vygotsky, Kohlberg, Gilligan, Kagan, and Erikson, in Anthony giddens, Paulo Freire, James McGregor Burns, Max Weber, Hans Gadamer, Michael Polanyi…and so many, many others. When I emphasize the dialogue of scholarship, I mean that being a scholar is not simply a matter of mastering what someone like Dewey actually meant (though that’s part of the story); rather, it require that we not only listen, but talk back to other scholars, that we say to them, “This is how I can fit your ideas into my ideas, how you make my ideas bigger or deeper, or more nuanced. In other words, our reading and dialoguing (either actually or imaginatively) with other scholars both opens us up and feeds us and, furthermore, calls out of us our response. It is our response that forms the core, the ongoing essence of what we have to contribute to the field.

So we find another paradox here, namely that we cannot enter the scholarly community unless we listen attentively not only what other scholars have to say, and say to us, but also unless we find within our souls, hearts and minds (in that order, for me anyway) ourselves responding, and in that response we tacitly grasp ourselves and what we have to contribute to the community of scholars. Of course, that is risky business, speaking our mind, especially when we are junior members of the community. But unless we do speak our minds, we have nothing to contribute, except, perhaps, the second chapter of our dissertation—a good review of the literature. So, to you younger members of the scholarly community, I say, read on, but also read yourselves and your own experience. Don’t be afraid, in the process, to find yourself as you respond from your own reality, however tentative and conditional you experience it. Speak your mind and your soul— with the proper attributions, of course.

I’d like to close by reading an adaptation of a poem by Jane Hirshfield entitled Bees and Writers, Words and Honey, a poem I read often to my students at Boston College.

Bees and Writers, Words and Honey, Teachers and Curriculum,
Students and Learning (adapted from the words of poet Jane Hirshfield)

Flowers are always present—daffodils, lilacs, sage, honeysuckle,
the tiny florets of wild thyme and heather, roses and apple blossoms.
But only the bee can enter their hollows and intimate hallways,
can draw from their essence and, in a process unceasingly miracu-

That is the agony and the ecstasy of our vocation. Blessings and thanks to you for so honoring me by this award.

Andrea Rorrer Receives the 2006 Jack A. Culbertson Award

Andrea Rorrer, an Assistant Professor in the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at the University of Utah, is the 2006 recipient of the Jack A. Culbertson Award. This award is given annually to an outstanding junior professor of educational administration and policy in recognition of her/his contributions to the field.

In addition to her faculty position, Andrea is the Director of the Utah Education Policy Center at the University of Utah. She received her Ph.D. from the University of Texas, Austin. Her dissertation Leadership and Equity: From Reproduction to Reconstruction: An Institutional Analysis was awarded the American Education Research Association, Division A—Education Administration—2001 Dissertation Award. Her scholarship focuses on districts and the state as actors in organizational and institutional change, particularly those changes aimed at increasing equity in student access and outcomes. Her publications have appeared in Educational Administration Quarterly, Theory into Practice, UCEA Review, and the Journal of Educational Policy. The 2006 Politics of Education Yearbook, “Power, Education, and the Politics of Social Justice,” which she co-edited with Catherine Lugg, has recently been published as a special issue of Educational Policy. She has acquired funding from Centro de la Familia de Utah, the Utah State Office of Education, and the Utah Legislature for recent policy research and evaluations on educational topics such as the Latina/o achievement gap, Comprehensive School Reform, charter schools, and alternative language services in the state. She teaches courses such as organizational change, program evaluation, qualitative methods, districts in educational reform, women in educational leadership and policy, and the politics of equity and social justice in educational leadership and policy. She also is an associate editor for Educational Administration Quarterly, a features co-editor for the UCEA Review, and an editorial board member for the Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership. Her prior professional experiences include serving as a policy analyst, research associate, school administrator and a classroom teacher.
Jim Scheurich Receives the 2006 UCEA Master Professor Award

Jim Scheurich, Professor and the Head of the Department of Educational Administration and Human Resource Development at Texas A&M University, is the recipient of the UCEA Master Professor Award. This award, which is supported by an annual donation from Information Age Publishing, is granted annually to an educational leadership professor who has a sustained record as an outstanding teacher, as attested to by students and faculty peers; is an outstanding advisor and mentor; has taken a leadership role in their academic unit and have gained a regional and national reputation, as an educational leader and innovator; has provided outstanding leadership in promoting and supporting diversity in faculty, students, staff, programs, and curriculum in the field of educational leadership and administration; and has provided outstanding public service through participation in public or private agencies, or both at state, national, and international levels. This year the selection committee included Dr. Juanita Simmons (University of Missouri), Dr. Susan Printy (Michigan State University), and Dr. Sally Zepeda (University of Georgia) who is the 2005 Master Professor.

Professor Scheurich graduated with his doctorate from The Ohio State University and served as a professor for 12 years at the University of Texas at Austin. His research interests include equity in education, schools and districts that are successful with historically marginalized students, educational accountability, and qualitative research methodologies. Since 1998, he has been the Editor of the International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education. He is the author or co-author of five books, including Research Method in the Postmodern, Anti-Racist Scholarship, The Knowledge Basis in Educational Administration: Multiple Perspectives (the latter with Robert Donmoyer and Mickey Imber), Leadership for Equity and Excellence, and Educational Equity and Accountability (the latter two with Linda Skrla). He is also the author or co-author of over 30 articles in such journals as Educational Researcher, Educational Administration Quarterly, Phi Delta Kappan, Urban Education, Journal of Education Policy, and Harvard Educational Review. His most well known and widely cited articles “Coloring Epistemology” which appeared in Educational Researcher and was co-authored with Michelle Young, and “Policy Archaeology: A New Policy Studies Methodology,” was chosen in the UK as one of the best policy articles published in English-speaking countries in the past ten years.

He serves or has served on several editorial boards, including EAQ and the UCEA Journal of Cases. In addition, he has served on several committees in UCEA, including the Executive Committee, and AERA, including as a member of the AERA Publications Committee and the AERA Presidential Nominating Committee. Moreover, he has helped prepare over 20 doctoral students who are now university professors and he has chaired to completion 27 doctoral students. One of his students won the Dissertation of the Year from two different AERA Divisions (D & G) in the same year. Finally, he has raised over $6 million in external funds, all focused on improving schools for low-income children and children of color and most of them focused on urban districts.

The Jay D. Scribner Mentoring Award was established in November of 2005 to honor faculty in educational leadership who have dedicated themselves to mentoring and socializing doctoral students into the profession, particularly for future roles as university professors; introducing students, especially from under-represented groups, to the broader network of scholars at UCEA and beyond; mentoring, advising, and supporting junior professors in their trajectory toward tenure; and providing guidance, support, advice, friendship, reinforcement, encouragement, and/or constructive examples to others, which has had a positive impact on their understanding of academia writ large. The inaugural Jay D. Scribner Mentoring Award was presented to Jay D. Scribner in November of 2006.

Professor Scribner has served in a variety of educational roles in the public schools and higher education. Early in his career he was appointed “teaching-principal” in a rural school, followed by serving as the first principal of a middle school in a medium size city. After receiving his doctorate at Stanford University and joining an international group of educators as an Alfred North Whitehead Fellow for Advanced Study in Education at Harvard University, he ascended through the academic ranks in higher education at UCLA. Subsequently, he served as Dean of the College of Education at Temple University, and is currently a Professor at The University of Texas at Austin.

While Dean of the College of Education at Temple University, he participated in the acquisition of $1.9 million and $23 million grants for multilingual research and training of military personnel to teach recruits in the basic skills. He also developed an international program with Abraka Teachers College in Nigeria where faculty provided an on-site masters program for African teachers/administrators. He recently co-directed the Border School Research and Development Initiative and a national study on Migrant Education Policy in Texas funded by the Texas Education Agency.

He has served on the UCEA Executive Committee, and has also been President of the Politics of Education Association, the Pennsylvania Educational Research Association, and UCEA. Over a 150 scholarly publications and paper presentations have been amassed during his career.

He has conducted studies within large urban areas, such as Los Angeles and Philadelphia, and in smaller communities in Texas, particularly in the Borderland Schools. His research has been supported by major federal, state and foundation grants, and has involved graduate students and other faculty. In addition to the research grants, Scribner has been successful in receiving funding support for major training grants for pre-service and in-service educators.

Professor Scribner’s research focuses on educational politics and policy at two levels: (1) micro-level studies involving inquiry into (a) the effects of organizational politics (conflict, power, policy) on change within schools, and (b) community participation/parental involvement and student success; and (2) macro-level studies involving inquiry into (a) effects of institutional collaboration among school districts, universities and communities, and (b) effects of political culture on state and local educational policy.
Immigration and human rights in a global context:

An Interview with Angela Valenzuela

Recently, interview co-editor Gerardo R. López (Indiana University) spoke with Angela Valenzuela (University of Texas) on the issues of immigration and human rights. The interview provides a cogent reminder of the need to think globally and act locally with regard to these pressing human concerns. A portion of their interview is transcribed below:

GL: Thanks for taking the time to talk with me today. As I mentioned to you earlier, the theme for this particular issue of the UCEA Review is on global and international education—which were central components of the 2006 convention in San Antonio. At UCEA you delivered the inaugural Texas A&M Social Justice Lecture on topic of immigration. Why did you feel this was an important topic for professors of educational leadership?

AV: It was important for me both personally and professionally. As the director of the newly formed Texas Center for Education Policy at the University of Texas at Austin, I feel that future policy leaders need to focus on pressing issues that are central to the field of education. Currently, immigration is one of those issues that significantly impacts our work at all levels. As such, we can not afford—as a field, as a state, and as a nation—to ignore these issues. As a matter of fact, the intersection of immigration and education is an area that is severely under-studied. Most researchers focus either on immigration or on education, but very few focus their work on the intersection of these two areas from an educational policy perspective.

GL: Why do you think this is the case?

AV: I think this corresponds to a general lack of focus surrounding the unique needs of immigrant students in general. I mean, we do focus on them in education, but it’s usually from the perspective of the English language learner. For example, we have specialized areas in curriculum and pedagogy that focus on the needs of language minority students. But we know that student performance is impacted by a multitude of issues. The immigrant experience is an additional factor that some children must contend with—on top of language and poverty issues, and a host of other things that they deal with on a day-to-day basis. And I think this lack of understanding is a serious issue in the field, because the writing is on the wall. We can no longer afford not to know more about this particular population.

GL: I know your previous work has crossed multiple borders—from gender, to language, to race, to poverty. Is the area of immigration a recent research interest of yours?

AV: I’ve always had an interest in immigrant children. They are the most disenfranchised group in our school system, and their reality is grounded in so many different intersections—from race to class, to nationality, to dialect, to gender. There is not one intersectionality that doesn’t get addressed when dealing with the immigrant community. As I said in my talk in San Antonio: if we can solve the problem of providing a good education to immigrant children, then we can solve most of the problems in the field education. Rather than being on the margins of policy formulation as they are now, however, they need to be dead center. That’s what’s exciting to me about research with this particular group: they force us to look at policy in a more robust and profound way.

GL: What are you currently working on right now?

AV: Next year, I’ll be in Mexico. My intentions are to study the Mexican government’s role in migrant education in the United States. There’s a federal government agency in Mexico, the Instituto del Mexicano en el Exterior [Institute for Mexicans in the Exterior], that connects to local grassroots organizations in the U.S. through their state agencies in every state. The Instituto serves as a hub to local communities, and offers things such as internet access, scholarships, and educational opportunities like the Mexican bachillerato [baccalaureate or high school diploma]. I want to learn about the infrastructure that’s in place, so that we can, perhaps, contribute in some way. When we’re talking about a transnational migrant community, a binational approach to mutual problems promises a more constructive and creative, if not enriched, conversation on immigration. We not only share, in many instances, the same student population, but also similar problems and potentialities. So it doesn’t make sense for policies and interventions to stop at the border.

GL: Why would that be important for educational leaders and policymakers to know?

AV: There’s several ways to answer this. Most commonly, scholars and policymakers point to economic development and how it is closely related to immigration. These grassroots organizations play a critical role in social and economic development back in Mexico by providing money and sponsoring local rebuilding efforts that involve Mexican nationals in the U.S. who wish to return home to Mexico someday. So we need to figure out a way to partner with these communities to help them build their schools, clinics, and work cooperatives and other programs endorsed by the Instituto. We need to understand that the primary reason why people immigrate to this country is because of the lack of economic opportunities back at home and not because they seek benefits in the U.S. It’s also important for us to understand that the Mexican government isn’t sitting idly by, but is actually doing some pretty creative things and with few resources. As such, it’s in our interest to partner with them in that regard. Along these lines, I think that it’s more important to create a new sensibility about what it means to live in a more globalized context—and how it is unfair for global relations to be limited to commercial and economic transactions devoid of human will. Why do we have policies that allow capital and merchandise to move back and forth across borders, but don’t allow people to do the same? But the economic argument bothers me at some level because...
by these macro forces that impel their parents to migrate. Their problem is a humanitarian one. It is hard to find any group that suffers as much social exclusion and domination as this one, living under the constant threat of deportation. This fact of existence structures their lives and means that they do not avail themselves to the degree that they can or should of the services that we as a state and nation do provide. This is not only counterproductive, it is fundamentally unjust. Educational leaders and practitioners are on the front lines of this humanitarian crisis and no one is well served by an educational system that under-educates or mis-educates immigrant youth—particularly when this subpopulation is experiencing the highest rate of growth in our nation’s schools. According to recent Census bureau data, the number of immigrants, many of them from Mexico, living in U.S. households rose 16 percent over the last five years. They’re even bypassing states like Texas and California and going directly to Midwestern, Northeastern, Rocky Mountain and Southern states like Georgia where there were no Mexican nationals prior to 1990. These are really extraordinary times.

GL: You raised these issues in your talk at UCEA. You also mentioned that we need to make shift from a civil rights discourse to a human rights discourse. Why is it important to make that shift?

AV: I think that human rights engenders more of a global discourse. It connects to civil rights in many ways, but by definition, civil rights only applies to citizens. So if you’re not a citizen, you are not within the framework of rights and responsibilities that apply to the official designation of a citizen. I’m certainly not implying that we abandon the concept and the unending pursuit of civil rights, but that our focus needs to be broader. For example, immigrant communities suffer numerous abuses and exploitations precisely because of their positionality as non-citizens.

GL: Can you give an example?

AV: For example, there are “family unit” prisons—like the ones in Hutto and Taylor [TX]—that are specifically designed to detain immigrant families. These are human rights abuses, and in many cases civil rights abuses, because some of the kids who are in these prisons were born in the Unites States, and are U.S. citizens, but have no place to go because their parents are undocumented. Unless something is done to stop this, these prisons will continue to mushroom in other areas across the country. There has been a strong perception that that human rights abuses only happen in developing countries, but there is a growing movement to look inwardly and recognize the human rights abuses that happen within our own borders. So the potential of adopting a human rights perspective is powerful. For example the Triqui Indians from the state of Oaxaca [in Mexico], had little access to the courts. But human rights organizations intervened and they now have access to Triqui language translators in Los Angeles courts. City councils and school boards can similarly work to extend such rights to members of their international community.

GL: How would you respond to the teacher who asks, “What does an immigration prison in Hutto have to do with me?” or the principal who insists “Hey, I’m just a principal. What do the Triqui Indians in California have to do with the work I do?”

AV: I think that as educators, we are the ones who have the most immediate access to these populations. The groups I’m talking about are the most disenfranchised groups in this society. How we perceive them is directly related to how we treat them, how we teach them, and how we administer programs for them. Unfortunately, many of these groups have too often been relegated to the dustbins of history, and have been readily dismissed—oftentimes by teachers, educators, and policymakers themselves. In an earlier era, when these groups represented a small fragment of the population, this might have made some sort of economic or cost-effective “sense,” but now that these groups are increasing significantly throughout our nation, we can’t afford to treat them with so little regard. So we need a seismic shift in our attitude that recognizes that these issues are not only directly connected to how we interact with students on a daily basis, but that also embraces and understands that their fate is ours as a state and nation.

GL: What does it take to create that seismic shift in our thinking—particularly with our immigrant students?

AV: I think it begins with changing the rhetoric and the discourse about immigration itself. What we’re experiencing at this point in our history is a global issue. Migration is happening around the world and is a continuing chapter of the human story. If we think that migration is solely a part of the contemporary American story—and that the spoilers are the Mexicans—then we’re really failing to understand immigration in a more holistic fashion. The fact of the matter is that migration is only a matter of legality or illegality from a nation-state perspective that presumes the existence of rigid boundaries that need to be enforced. Yet historically, this wasn’t always the case. From the 1890s until 1932, and later from 1940 to 1954, these were times of industrial expansion, and Mexican nationals traveled back and forth with great ease. My grandmother’s generation referred to the border as “la linea,” because for them, the border was little more than a line in the sand. From this view, one can argue that border enforcement itself—tied to the self-serving demands of the U.S. economy and need for low-wage, exploitable labor—is what creates illegality. That said, undocumented migration today is really about those broader social, economic, and political factors that often force individuals and their families to make critical and life-changing decisions despite our country’s historical myopia and our current focus on whether folks are here legally or not.

GL: Well thank you for spending some time to talk to me about immigration in a global context. I think your research is critically important, and I wish you the best in your work and next year in Mexico.

AV: Thank you for talking with me.
International Insights on Evaluating Leadership Preparation: An Interview with Allan Walker and Olof Johansson

Recently, doctoral student Leslie Hazle Bussey (Saint Louis University) interviewed Allan Walker (Chinese University of Hong Kong) and Olof Johansson (Umea University in Sweden) regarding the purposes, practices, and contexts of evaluating leadership preparation in their institutions.

LHB: Could you start by briefly describing the school leadership preparation program at your university?

AW: We run several programs here, but I will talk mainly about the beginning principals program. This program is funded by Hong Kong’s Education and Manpower Bureau (EMB). All new principals in Hong Kong are invited to participate in this program at the end of their first year. What we do is we place them in what we call “learning squares.” Each learning square is comprised of an experienced principal called the sponsor - their job is to sponsor the new principals into the profession – who is matched with three beginning principals. They work together through the 12-14 months of the program in those learning squares. They are responsible for selecting their own period to meet and we meet with them about seven times during that period during three full day academic-type workshops.

OJ: The national principal training program in Sweden is a similar program. All of our students have been principals for at least 1 – 1 ½ years. The program is all paid for by the government, so the school or district is just paying for participants’ travel, books, and of course, their salary while they are away. The program has been there for almost 30 years. Participants will meet with us for three days at a time, four times a year.

LHB: It sounds like these principal preparation programs are not part of a traditional academic degree program.

AW: That’s right. Historically, principals here have not had to be accredited at universities or do university degrees to become a principal or stay a principal, though policies changed in 2002 to require aspiring principals to obtain accreditation. Our beginning principal program, for individuals after their first year in the principalship, is not tied to our academic degree program.

OJ: Neither is ours, though there is an option for students to participate for credit as part of a masters program.

LHB: What are some other ways, besides principal accreditation, that the policy context influences your programs?

OJ: The university exerts influence when our students opt to pursue graduate credit toward a masters degree. Of course when you do that, you have all the university bureaucracy and their ideas about what credits are and so on. That also is another form of evaluation – that we need to be up to standards. We need to have a syllabus that’s good enough. We need to have a level of demand of the students (principals) that is high enough. But I find that it’s quite interesting to do it. We find that active principals gain from having us putting demands on them, saying this is the level of high performance that we expect but at the same time all our education must improve practice and be delivered in a way that gives the principals time to reflect against their own practice.

LHB: In the U.S., critics of leadership preparation say it “doesn’t work,” driving evaluation efforts to try to “prove” that it does. To complicate matters, there is divergent thinking about what programs should prepare leaders to do. What purposes do you aim to achieve through evaluation of your program?

AW: During the whole program, we’ve got this structure of sponsors and head sponsors that we very much encourage to go to each other with problems rather than coming to me. The whole thing that we’re trying to do is we’re trying to embed this culture of learning and professionalism where they’ll eventually start to take over these sorts of things themselves. With our evaluation, then, we’re trying to see if it makes a difference when they get back to school. Now I wouldn’t necessarily frame that difference in terms of academic outcomes. We try to track their relationships with staff. It’s very important to us to see that the networks we have worked so hard to establish endure. So, do they still meet and talk with each other? Do they still get advice from each other, etc. Are they developing habits of professionalism and building relationships that they can continue to turn to for support throughout their careers?

OJ: Most of our evaluation is aimed at making program improvements – making it more relevant to participants based on their feedback. We especially are interested in learning how our principals feel the program impacts their practice. We give them assignments in which they are supposed to show how their learning has affected their practice. We have lots of contact with the 45 school districts in my area. They send us teachers who want to become principals to participate in our recruitment education program. Then, some of these people become principals and the districts ask us to do introductory courses for them, so we take the principals when they are very fresh. Then, about a year later, they send the same person back again and ask us to give them the whole principal training program. Districts invest a lot of money to get good principals. So if the program doesn’t work, they should stop sending their principals to us. And then we should be worried. But as long as we have principals wanting to come to us, we will see that as evidence that the program works.

LHB: What kinds of measures and methods do you use for evaluation? In other words, what is it that you do to evaluate your program?

AW: Firstly, we evaluate each individual event that we have. Was it useful? What would you do next time? We also make them do a number of journals throughout the program. The sponsors also have to send in a record of when they met, what issues are that they’re dealing with in their group, any problems that their principals are facing. We also have an external examiner. He comes in three times – when a new cohort starts the program, halfway through the program, and nine months after they have completed the program. He goes into the schools and looks for evidence of whether there’s been any difference in the school in terms of how principals lead, in terms of influences on school outcomes, on school life, etc. He’s very clever at talking to people without asking them direct questions, so he suits very well with the Chinese way of doing things. We also ask the EMB to come in halfway through the program and ring up each participant in the program to ask, “How’s the program?” They’re more likely to complain to the bureaucrat than to me.

OJ: The government of Sweden, which funds our principal preparation program, has conducted evaluations about 4-5 times over the life of the program. For the first evaluation they hired an external
evaluator. Since then, the national agency for schools in Sweden has conducted the evaluation. It has generally been very positive. However, we engage in an ongoing annual cycle of evaluation in concert with the national agency. We submit annual reports addressing issues of concern that they identify. Then we meet with them to discuss any program changes we have made, why we have changed, and what we have tried to achieve with the changes. It’s very much a dialog. Then the agency reads our report and they come back to meet with us and talk about what they think about the changes we have done. It’s a very friendly way of evaluating.

Of course, we also do our own evaluations. After each session of three days, there is an evaluation. We give out an evaluation form or assign an essay or just ask them. We try to assess whether principals understand the meanings of the readings they’ve had, and how they can use that reading or exercise in their daily practice. In their last semester, we give them an assignment to write about their learning journey with us, telling us what they have done differently in their schools because of the program. We ask them if there is anything missing in the way that we have been teaching them.

LHB: The collaboration you describe between your program and your funders is quite a departure from the typical relationship between universities and accrediting bodies in the U.S.

OJ: Our program is part of a system where it is natural for us to cooperate. We maintain strong relationships with the superintendents of the 45 districts of our area. These people of course are the employers of the principals. I meet with them regularly and they give me feedback. I also meet with politicians. We are going to have a conference with politicians in January and we will do things in that conference that we do in our program. And then we will tell them, this is something we discuss with your principals. They will feel that they learn something about what is going on with the program.

AW: In our program, we relate differently to our program participants. Our program is led, in part, by participants. We work with a group of six people who are actually on the program right from development through implementation through completion and evaluation. So these people, all participants, are involved in every step of the way deciding what goes into it, what the structure is, whether it will be effective, whether it’s working in the schools. They’re the working group, but they’re working in the program as well as overseeing and developing the program. Our program is also structured to reflect that we acknowledge these people are adults. I acknowledge they are professionals and we don’t have to be telling them that it’s about student learning, they know that. Instead, we focus on creating structures and opportunities where they can pursue learning related to issues they are having in their schools. I think we recognize we can’t make them learn.

LHB: These are radical ideas in relation to the American sentiment that we can make anyone do anything if we just put our minds to it! Both of you have opened up alternative paths for thinking about evaluation of leadership preparation, while also shedding light on the ways that policy constrains or supports leadership preparation. Thank you for your time with me today.

Willower Award of Excellence – 2006

The Board of Trustees for the Willower Center for the Study of Leadership and Ethics, a UCEA Program Center housed at Penn State University, has selected Associate Professor Pauline Leonard of the College of Education at Louisiana Tech University as the recipient for the Willower Award of Excellence for 2006. This award is in recognition of Professor Leonard’s scholarship in the field of leadership and ethics in education, as well as the instrumental role she has played in establishing and institutionalizing the Willower Center organization as a UCEA Program Center.

The Willower Award of Excellence was established in 2005, the tenth anniversary of existence for the research center. It is an annual award intended to recognize the work of an outstanding scholar attending and contributing in a significant way to the center’s annual conferences. The Willower Award of Excellence takes the form of a permanent wall plaque that is mounted near the center offices in the Rackley Building at Penn State University and a smaller version of the plaque awarded to the recipient.

The Willower Center is devoted to the support, promotion and dissemination of theory and research on values and leadership. This is the core criterion for receipt of the award – a scholar who, in the informed opinion of board trustees, has made an exceptional contribution to theory development and/or research on valuation processes and ethical leadership practices. Pauline Leonard is a very worthy recipient because of her active involvement in center affairs since 1996.

Journal of Research on Leadership Education

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

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

Journal of Research on Leadership Education
c/o Edith A. Rusch, Ph.D. Editor
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
jrle@unlv.edu
http://www.ucea.org/JRLE/about.html
SAGE Publications is delighted to inform you that SAGE Journals Online, SAGE’s online journal delivery platform, has been enhanced with a new look, and improved features and functionality. The enhanced SAGE Journals Online platform went live beginning on November 15, 2006. Enhancements to the SAGE Journals Online platform include:

- Improved navigation across entire platform
- Easy-to-locate, site level quick search function
- Enhanced advanced search options, including “Fielded Boolean Search”
- Refined search possibilities, including search history and saved searches
- New “My Tools” tab providing all personalization and alert features in one easy-to-find location
- Improved marked citations, including email, print or save option
- RefWorks compatibility
- New and improved contextual “help” system
- Institutional branding on interface

SAGE is committed to providing both high-quality content as well as a platform that is consistently improved with new features and functionality. We know the importance of our online platform in disseminating the journal content that we publish on your behalf to association members, researchers and students worldwide.
The 2006 convention theme drew attention to the tensions between theory, research and practice, particularly with regard to democracy, social justice and globalization. The theory, practice and research concerning democracy, social justice and globalization are embroiled within a contemporary struggle, as many groups within and outside of the educational establishment struggle to have their perspectives, values, and reform agendas take precedence. Educational administration is centrally about providing democratic and moral leadership in educational institutions with the purpose of supporting the education and development of all students. However, what democratic moral leadership means, how such leadership is developed, and, even, whether this should be the goal of leadership development is subject to intense debate. Likewise, notions of social justice and globalization and their meanings for educational leadership are similarly contested. As the United States and countries across the globe become increasingly interconnected, the promises and contested intersections of globalization, democracy, social justice and educational leadership emerge in sharp relief.

UCEA invites presenters at the 2006 convention to submit their papers for publication in the third annual conference proceedings. The conference proceedings will be edited by David C. Thompson, Kansas State University, and Faith E. Crampton, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, and will be Web-based. Previous conference proceedings for the 2004 and 2005 annual conventions may be viewed at http://coe.ksu.edu/ucea.

Please submit your paper as an email attachment to Faith E. Crampton at fec@uwm.edu by March 1, 2007. Any questions regarding submissions may be directed to her as well.

UCEA Call for Convention 2007 Volunteers

If you are interested in serving as a Proposal Reviewer, a Session Chair, or a Research Session Discussant for the UCEA Convention 2007, please complete this form and return it to UCEA, or by filling out an online form on the homepage of www.ucea.org. Only university faculty may serve in the above capacities. The UCEA Convention Program Committee will use forms received to identify potential reviewers, chairs and discussants. Return this form by March 15th to UCEA via the online form, or by mailing, Attn: Anne Lynch, UCEA, University of Texas-Austin, Dept. of Ed. Administration D5400, 1 University Station, Austin, TX 78712.

Name (First, Middle Initial, Last) __________________________________________
Academic Title __________________________
Department/Program __________________________
Institution __________________________

Address __________________________________________
City/State/ZIP __________________________________________

E-mail __________________________________________
Tel. __________________________________________
Fax. __________________________________________

I am interested in serving as:


___ Session Chair for UCEA Convention 2007

___ Session Discussant for UCEA Convention 2007

Have you served UCEA in one of the above capacities in previous years? ___yes ___no
UCEA Convention 2007 Call for Proposals

“Fostering Compassion and Understanding Across Borders: An International Dialogue on the Future of Educational Leadership”

Alexandria, Virginia, November 15-18, 2007

I. General Information. The 21st annual convention of the University Council for Educational Administration will be held in the West End of Historic Alexandria at the Hilton Alexandria Mark Center. The convention will open at 5:00 pm on Thursday evening (November 15, 2007) and close at 1:00 pm on Sunday (November 18, 2007). The purpose of the 2007 UCEA Convention is to engage participants in discussing research, policy, and practice in educational leadership and administration. Members of the Convention 2007 Program Committee are Stephen Jacobson (The University of Buffalo), Andrea Rorrer (University of Utah), and Lauri Johnson (The University of Buffalo).

II. Theme. The 2007 UCEA Convention theme, “Fostering Compassion and Understanding Across Borders: An International Dialogue on the Future of Educational Leadership,” is consistent with the message given by the Dalai Lama in a recent address at the University at Buffalo (September 2006). In it, he said that, “the world has emerged from a century of bloodshed and violence, in part because education has failed to pay sufficient attention to inculcating values of the heart.” He called upon educational institutions “from kindergarten to the university to instill compassion and understanding in order to turn the 21st century into a century of dialogue.”

As countries across the globe become increasingly interdependent, it is surprising how little we know about the educational systems of other nations. For example, how do educational leadership and policy address issues of race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation and disability across and within other nations? How do educational leaders prepare to engage practitioners in reflective practice?

This UCEA Convention theme serves as an invitation to participants from diverse geographic, cultural and political contexts to share their perspectives about theory, research, policy and practice in educational leadership and administration. Moreover, this convention is intended to be an opportunity for members of an expanding UCEA community to engage in dialogue that promotes compassion for and understanding of schooling among educators across international borders. Below is a representative list of issues we believe deserve examination from diverse geographic, cultural and political perspectives:

- How are the underlying goals, values and purposes of education defined and enacted? For example, how are social justice and equity defined and enacted? What is the role of civic engagement in education?
- How is educational leadership defined, developed and determined effective, and to what ends? For example, how do we prepare school leaders to be culturally responsive and promote academic success and global citizenship for all children?
- How are schooling processes created and sustained to be more responsive to race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation and/or physical and learning disabilities?
- How do national policies affect educational leadership, educational reform, teaching and learning? For example, what effects have accountability measures and high stakes, standardized testing had on curricula, pedagogy and other educational processes?
- How is education funded? How are these resources distributed across schools? How is funding used to promote improvements in teaching and learning?
- What leadership practices and/or organizational factors promote compassion, understanding, dialogue and action within the school and/or the community?
- How has technology impacted the educational landscape?
- What is the role of research in improving educational leadership and/or educational policies?
- How can cross-national research be successfully conducted?

III. Session Categories.

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

2. Symposia: A symposium should examine specific issues, research problems, or topics from several perspectives and allow for dialogue and discussion. Session organizers are expected to chair the session and facilitate discussion. Symposium participants are expected to develop and provide copies of papers.

3. International Community-Building Sessions (NEW): These sessions, regardless of format (i.e., paper, symposia, conversation, etc.), require participants to be from 2 or more different countries. The focus of these sessions must be examinations of critical issues from these multiple international perspectives. Given the conference theme, these sessions will be given priority. The proposal summary should describe the purpose of the session, the format participants will employ, and a list of the national contexts that will be represented.

4. Conversations/Dialogues: These sessions are intended to stimulate informal, lively discussions using a series of provocative questions or vignettes. Session organizers may organize a panel of participants who facilitate and guide the conversation about critical issues, concerns,
and perspectives. Alternately, these sessions may be organized as a dialogue where the organizers and audience discuss together an issue or series of questions in small groups. The proposal summary should describe the purpose of the session, the ways in which participants will engage in conversation/dialogue, and examples of questions or areas to be addressed.

5. Interactive Roundtables: These sessions are intended for small group focused discussions such as book discussions, “fireside” chats, research in progress, practitioner voices, and issues in teaching in educational leadership. The proposal summary should describe the focus and purpose of the session and the format(s) used to engage participants.

6. Point-Counterpoint Sessions: Point-counterpoint sessions are intended to stimulate review, debate, and discussion around a specific and current issue related to the field of educational leadership. The proposal summary should describe the focus of the session, the alternative, competing or opposing points to be presented, the format in which the various points of view will be aired (e.g., debate format), and opportunities for audience participation. Session organizers are expected to chair the session and facilitate discussion.

7. Innovative Sessions: Proposals utilizing innovative presentation/interaction strategies are encouraged. The proposal summary should describe the focus and purpose of the session, the innovative format, and how the format will enhance adult learning and discussion.

IV. Criteria for Review of Proposals. All proposals will be subject to blind, peer review. The proposal must not include names of session organizers or presenters. Proposal evaluations will be based on (1) significance of research problem/topic and contribution to the field; (2) thoroughness and clarity of the proposed presentation; (3) theoretical framework, methods, and analysis (for empirical research); and (4) the format of the session. All proposals must be submitted electronically and will be reviewed electronically.

V. Participation Guidelines and Proposal Deadlines. Anyone involved in research, policy, or practice in educational or youth-serving agencies may submit proposals for consideration. Individuals may present or participate in no more than three sessions. Paper presenters are required to provide an advance copy of their paper to the assigned discussion leader and a minimum of 30 copies for distribution. By submitting a proposal, the lead author agrees to review at least three (3) convention proposals. An author’s failure to live up to this commitment may lead to his or her proposal being removed from consideration.

Proposals must be received on or before May 7, 2007. All submissions must be submitted electronically at http://www.ucea.org.
What an exciting convention we have in store for you this November! In 2007 we meet within 10 minutes of the US Capital. Our convention hotel is located in the West End of Historic Alexandria at the Hilton Alexandria Mark Center Hotel. This elegant and modern facility with a unique lakeside setting is within view of the nation’s capitol and just ten minutes from the Smithsonian, the historic monuments of Washington D.C. and the quaint waterfront galleries, restaurants and shops in Old Town Alexandria, VA.

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

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

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

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

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

For more hotel information, please visit http://www.alexandria.hilton.com on the web.

For tourism information, please visit:

For information on proposal submission, see page 28.
Alexandria, Virginia

Featured Speakers

Dr. Jonathan Jansen is the Dean of the Faculty Education at the University of Pretoria, South Africa, and is closely involved in forging a new order in South Africa, building a multi-cultural education system to underpin a multi-cultural society. A curriculum change evaluator and teacher education specialist, he has undertaken more than twenty international commissioned research and evaluation projects including a review of USAID curriculum support to the Namibian Government after independence and an assessment of curriculum change in Zimbabwe since independence. He obtained his PhD at Stanford University and MS in Science Education from Cornell University. He received a Fulbright Senior Africa Research Scholar Award in 2000-2001.

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

Dr. Fenwick English is the UCEA President and serving a second term as a member of the Executive Committee. He also serves UCEA as Chair of the Publications Committee where he took the lead in the development of a contract between UCEA and Roman and Littlefield for the publication of UCEA monographs and books in the future.

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

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

Interview Editors:
Gerardo Lopez (Indiana University)
lopezg@indiana.edu and
Mark Gooden (University of Cincinnati)
Goodenma@ucmail.uc.edu

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

Innovative Program Editor:
Kanya Mahitivanicha (University of Texas)
kanya@post.harvard.edu

Managing Editor:
Chad Sayre (University of Missouri-Columbia)
cws422@mizzou.edu

---
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