My exposition of “an anatomy” of professional practice was aimed at showing that the proponents of professional preparation standards fail to deal adequately with the epistemological foundations which support the codification of them. Nowhere in the ISLLC/ELCC standards is there an exposition of the epistemological conclusions which would have to be in place in order to support the concept of a knowledge base or the delineation of the content of professional practice in educational leadership.

Another issue is the “Pasteur problem”. This issue represents an interesting conjecture in the codification of professional practices. Prior to Pasteur’s work, if an effort had been made to poll the most outstanding medical practitioners of the day regarding the “best practices” in medicine, the results would produce nothing approaching modern medical thought or methods today.

My point is that Pasteur’s work was not in medical practice and he was not even a medical doctor. The culling of “best practices” is no guarantee that they are “true.” What assurances can anyone give us today that we have not similarly culled educational leadership practices that are also not true? Has our Pasteur arrived? If so, what is the evidence? And if there is no such evidence, what implications do these have for how we view the efficacy and permanence of the standards?

Failure to Deal with Social Justice Issues
A consistent flaw in our leadership practices over time has been their failure to deal with social justice issues. This is not an accident. Larger societal ideologies permeate social science thinking. They emerge from our assumptions, values and metaphors.

It has taken some time and sustained scholarship from many colleagues to bring to our collective consciousness the pejorative ideologies that have permeated our mindsets and our practices over time. The struggle continues to this day.

Exploring Cognitive Aesthetics and the Zone of Transference
When examining the manner in which we have traditionally pursued our research on educational leadership, my line of argument begins with the faulty assumptions of “correct science” proffered by the National Research Council as inappropriate for any new discoveries as it pertains to educational leadership (English, 2007). I am extremely dubious that calls for more “rigorous research” following the same lines of inquiry resting on the same epistemological foundation will yield much we don’t already know.

I want to open this conversation by beginning with a seminal work by John Dewey (1934/1958). Dewey believed that the capacity of art to include significant “non-rational” factors in the human equation were critically important. He saw the limits of empirical rationalism, especially concerning matters of engaging in amoral discourse, and he conceptualized performance as an art form saying, “Indeed, it may be questioned whether any scientific systems exist... equal artistic structure in integrity, subtlety, and scope” (Dewey, 1964/1926:144).

Taking Dewey’s notion of “artistic structures”, I then extended this line of thought to include Brown’s (1977) notion of “cognitive aesthetics” which consists of criteria by which research can be conducted to resolve the distinction between art and science. He called this theoretical move “the poetics of sociology” (p.3). Brown’s criteria for research which included cognitive aesthetics were:

1. Makes use of a variety of individual points of view, perhaps borrowing a specific individual’s “angle of vision” when it suits the purposes of the piece or the nature of the inquiry;
2. Utilizes a dramaturgical or theatrical technique of “showing not telling” and momentarily becoming “objective” within this perspective;
3. Engages in generalizations from narratives using critical comments;
4. Assumes a panoramic view of events, presenting a narrative of simultaneous happenings or sometimes disassociated scenes that a narrator-agent could cover only by the use of the most improbable devices; 
5. Discovers, describes “multiple traits and facets of characters (or cultures) understudy readily and plausibly without having to work things around to bring any single point of view within discovery range” (Brown, 1977: 2).

In the next move, I imagined a kind of “zone of transference” where science and arts cross into one another. My conceptualization is supported by some remarks by Atkinson (1990) who indicated that to try and cleanly separate science and art where the former represented the “facts” and some sort of “exactitude” and the latter something akin to “personal” and “subjective” would be letting oneself be “hoodwinked by uncritical everyday prejudices” (Atkinson, 1990: 10). It is my contention that research conducted in the zone of transference offers the most promise for new discoveries in a study of leadership. It is here we are most likely to encounter our “Pasteur moment” in our field. To determine if the scholarship in our field was moving in this direction, I undertook a limited examination of published articles in the Educational Administration Quarterly, 2004-2006. That review involved eighty published pieces. In that time frame 34% of the published pieces were quantitative and 31% qualitative with 32% conceptual-theoretical or opinion pieces and only 2.5% mixed methods. My review showed that 55 articles or 69% contained one or more of Brown’s “cognitive structures” criteria. Ten articles had 4 or more of Brown’s criteria. While I determined that ten articles in three years does not constitute a “trend,” it does show that scholarship in our field is reflecting portrayals in the zone of transference.

Summing Up
At this point, let me sum up the five major points of my “anatomy of professional practice.”

1. Professional standards must reveal the epistemological claims regarding truthfulness to be judged useful to the future of a profession;
2. Social justice issues are not tangential to the practice of educational leadership but part and parcel of fiddling professional standards and practices of detrimental ideologies and negative stereotypes;
3. The concept of a knowledge base should be replace by the idea of a knowledge dynamic;
4. Research about educational leadership is not likely to lead to many new significant discoveries unless it includes aesthetics and the traditions of the humanities (the moral dimensions);
5. The continued slide towards marketization and for-profit metaphors in reparation programs removes the moral imperative to improve the common good in society. This trend is profoundly antidemocratic.

Re-Staking the Ed.D. to Civic Humanism
Finally, I would challenge us to re-commit the doctor of education degree in our institutions to once again take on the mantle of civic humanism and to become the beacon which represents what Houston (2006) has called “the spirit of the commonweal that has always been the central expectation of public education” in America.

References

[NOTE: Dr. English’s complete speech can be obtained in the book by the same title published by Rowman and Littlefield, copyright 2008]
Call for Proposals to be Released in spring of 2008 For EAQ

In the spring of 2008, UCEA will issue a “Call for Proposals” to UCEA member institutions concerning editorial hosting functions of the Educational Administration Quarterly (EAQ). EAQ has been hosted at the University of Utah under the editorship of Diana Pounder. The current term will expire in June of 2010. The CFP will be distributed to UCEA plenary session representatives, department chairs and deans. If you have questions before that time, please contact UCEA headquarters at ucea@austin.utexas.edu.

CALL FOR NOMINATIONS FOR UCEA AWARDS

The Jack A. Culbertson Award
Jack A. Culbertson Award was established in 1982 in honor of UCEA’s first full-time Executive Director, who retired in 1981 after serving 22 years in the position. The award is presented annually to an outstanding junior professor of educational administration in recognition of his/her contributions to the field. Individuals nominated must have been professors for six years or fewer, and currently serve in a UCEA University. Award recipients are selected by a committee of UCEA members.

The Roald F. Campbell Lifetime Achievement Award
The Roald F. Campbell Lifetime Achievement Award was instituted by UCEA in 1992 for the purpose of recognizing senior professors in the field of educational administration whose professional lives have been characterized by extraordinary commitment, excellence, leadership, productivity, generosity, and service. Award recipients are selected by the UCEA Executive Committee. Donations to the Campbell Award Fund are tax deductible.

The Jay D. Scribner Mentoring Award
The Jay D. Scribner Mentoring Award honors Educational Leadership faculty who have made a substantive contribution to the field by mentoring the next generation of students into roles as university research professors, while also recognizing the important role(s) mentors play in supporting and advising junior faculty. Faculty from UCEA member institutions are eligible for this award, including faculty belonging to partner member institutions. Award recipients are selected by a committee of UCEA members.

The UCEA Master Professor Award
The UCEA Master Professor award is given to an individual faculty member whose record is so distinguished that the UCEA must recognize this individual in a significant and timely manner. Nominations are welcome from any faculty member(s) of UCEA institutions and educational leaders/administrators from PK-12 educational systems. A committee under the direction of the UCEA Executive Committee will review and evaluate the nominees.

NOMINATIONS MUST BE RECEIVED NO LATER THAN MAY 30TH, 2008.

CALL FOR PROPOSALS FOR UCEA CONVENTION 2008

The Call for Proposals for the UCEA Convention 2008 can be found on pages 24 and 25.

An E.C. Minute
By: Stephen Jacobson

This second edition of an E.C. Minute reviews the November 2007 UCEA executive committee meeting in Alexandria, Virginia, which immediately preceded our annual conference. The meeting was presided over by Fenwick English, with the following individuals in attendance: Gary Crow, Michael Dantley, Stephen Jacobson, James Koschoreck, Khuala Murtadha, Andrea Rorrer, James Scheurich, Alan Shoho and Michelle Young (recorder).

In this E.C. Minute, I will briefly discuss the E.C.’s transformative agenda and UCEA’s first renewal review, conducted October 18-19, 2007 at my own institution, the University at Buffalo (UB).

UCEA’s transformative agenda:
At the August 2007 UCEA leadership meeting in Chapel Hill, President Fen English, President-elect Steve Jacobson, Associate Directors Linda Tillman and Catherine Lugg, and Executive Director Michelle Young discussed the idea of drafting a paper that would describe some key initiatives that UCEA hopes to undertake over the next few years. Fen agreed to take the lead on this writing exercise, with the others agreeing to review, react and revise. That working group produced what it called UCEA’s ‘transformation agenda,’ which included the following five initiatives:
1) Expanding the intellectual, conceptual and research boundaries of the professional field and re-positioning the Ed.D. degree in educational leadership;
2) Investigating leadership program evaluation and improvement center;
3) Internationalization of the educational leadership preparation conversation;
4) Towards civic centered values, social justice, ethics and diversity;
5) Changing our name - from University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) to University Council for Leadership in Educational Administration (UCELA)

The E.C. reviewed the document and after making some revisions, decided to use it as a focus of discussion during the plenum. Specifically, the E.C. removed item #5—changing our name, arguing that such a move was premature and could detract from more substantive conversations about items #1-4. To the remaining four items, the E.C. added another four questions (some containing secondary questions) to be considered by the PSRs:
1) Are there some unifying themes within programs of educational leadership preparation that are distinctive? What is it that makes UCEA programs distinctive?
2) Research that impacts the work of school leaders, especially in addressing academic success and emotional well-being of those student groups that schools have historically failed; what kinds of research would accomplish this? What venues would such research be promoted in? Who should we partner with to accomplish this?
3) In a climate of increased accountability, it is imperative for public institutions to define the data needed to collect to support program evaluation and improvement. What role do we want to play in shaping the future of accreditation?
4) How do we as a consortium and as programs in individual...
At the plenum, eight groups of PSRs met and discussed these issues. At our next E.C. meeting in Orlando in late February 2008, we will have a chance to review the brief reports submitted by each group, and then consider our next steps.

To provide a sense of how one of these discussions went, I served as discussion leader for a really lively conversation around agenda issue #3: Internationalization of UCEA. Participants in that group included Beverly Irby, Bernita Krumm, Mark Gooden (who graciously agreed to serve as recorder), Corrie Giles, Janet Finch, Sheryl Gowen, Philip McCullum, Shuangye Chen, Charles Russo, Eric Freeman and Gordon Gates.

The group was unanimous in its support for making internationalization a UCEA priority.

Among numerous suggestions that were made, it was recommended that we first talk to UCEA members about what they already do in terms of internationalization in their programs, and also to find out what UCEA member institutions want. It was felt that UCEA should facilitate exchange to develop a better understanding of what leadership looks like internationally, perhaps through conference sessions or by helping scholars fund international projects; using media and technology to make internationally linkages more accessible (perhaps extending the conference); and by creating an RFP for a new UCEA international program center. It was also suggested that UCEA should go after more international members and partners and even hold the conference outside the U.S. (perhaps in Toronto, Montreal or Vancouver to start).

In addition to these recommendations, there were several cautions and concerns. For example, the group felt that in our efforts we shouldn’t impose our western views—we need to consider the culture and climate of other countries and potential partners. Also, if we begin to work on international issues, will it take resources and attention away from issues in American schools?

This proved to be a very thoughtful conversation, and I think I can speak on behalf of the other members of the E.C. in saying that we look forward to learning more about what transpired in these breakout groups, so that we can begin considering our next steps.

UCEA’s renewal process:

The idea of the renewal review began as an E.C. conversation several years ago when it became obvious that UCEA’s old sabbatical review process was simply too unwieldy in light of the growth of the Council and other accreditation demands being placed on member institutions. The sabbatical review was intended to be a once every seven year examination to determine whether member institutions had remained faithful to UCEA’s criteria for admission. But UCEA simply did not have the human resources to conduct such substantive reviews, which gave our current membership figures a great deal of weight.

In addition to initial membership site visits that have numbered about one or two a year for the past few years, Nor were UCEA member institutions very interested in undertaking the time, energy and expense of another high-stakes examination given what they are already spending on reviews for NCATE and other accrediting bodies. So after considerable deliberation, the E.C. came up with an alternative, voluntary process that I have likened to renewing one’s marriage vows (or vows of civil union as Jim Koschoreck reminded me). In other words, it is a reaffirmation of a program’s commitment to the mission and vision of UCEA, but without a penalty or sanction if there has been some slippage over the years.

With that in mind, I asked my colleagues at UB if they would be willing to pilot this new process. Since we had recently completed an external review of our department that was mandated by UB’s Provost, we already had in hand a report that described in some detail our current program. So, with the faculty’s approval, Margaret Grogan and Michael Dantley visited UB’s Graduate School of Education on October 18-19, 2007 to conduct the first ever UCEA renewal review. Margaret and Michael met with the faculty, our Dean Mary Gresham, Department Chair Bill Barba, students and alumni. They also sat in on several classes, both with and without the instructors in attendance. The meetings with the faculty were purposefully two-way in that not only were we providing Margaret and Michael with information about our existing programs, we are also picking their brains about how to improve aspects of our programs that were troubling us, specifically our desire to find an acceptable alternative to the dissertation as the final product of our Ed.D. degree. Margaret Grogan’s experiences at Mizzou were especially informative in this regard.

At the E.C. meeting, Michael reported his perspectives of the UB site visit and I reported mine. Similarly, at the plenary session meeting, Michael and Margaret reported about the process from the perspective of reviewers and two of my UB colleagues, Corrie Giles and Lauri Johnson, provided the perspectives of the reviewed.

I think it is fair to say that to a person, we felt the renewal review was a valuable experience. It gave the UB faculty an opportunity to look at our programs through the eyes of colleagues we greatly respect. We were able to draw on their experiences and observations to help work through some minor programmatic adjustments we had in mind and, to our delight, we found that there are things we’ve been doing that they would like to introduce to their programs. Needless to say, we were quite proud of our students (and ourselves), when Margaret and Michael told us that their conversations with our current students and alumni had revealed an approach to preparation that had done an exemplary job of blending theory with practice.

I would encourage other UCEA member institutions to consider engaging in this renewal review. It is a relatively painless process, especially since the material thereview team needs can be gleaned from your most recent accreditation report. And, the opportunity to engage in a conversation about the quality your program with knowledgeable and experienced colleagues, like Margaret Grogan and Michael Dantley, is invaluable. Simply contact Michelle Young if you’d like to learn more about scheduling a UCEA renewal site visit.

Hopefully, this latest installment of the E.C. Minute continues to make the activities of the E.C. more transparent. We welcome your comments and responses as I turn over the next two editions to President-elect Jim Koschoreck, who will report about what transpires at our next two E.C. meetings in Orlando.

2008 UCEA Convention & Proposal Information is located on pages 26-28
Functions:

Standard 1: An education leader promotes the success of every student by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by all stakeholders.

Functions:

A. Collaboratively develop and implement a shared vision and mission
B. Collect and use data to identify goals, assess organizational effectiveness, and promote organizational learning
C. Create and implement plans to achieve goals
D. Promote continuous and sustainable improvement
E. Monitor and evaluate progress and revise plans

Standard 2: An education leader promotes the success of every student by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.

Functions:

A. Nurture and sustain a culture of collaboration, trust, learning, and high expectations
B. Create a comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent curricular program...
James Koschoreck is new president-elect of UCEA

James Koschoreck, an associate professor in the Educational Leadership Program of the University of Cincinnati (U.C.), is now president-elect of the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA). The organization is a network of 79 doctoral degree-granting institutions in educational leadership that is dedicated to providing research and professional development to build the success of school children by addressing the challenges affecting school leaders. Koschoreck will spend his first year of the three-year appointment as president-elect of the organization.

Koschoreck, who resides in Hebron, Kentucky, earned his doctoral degree from the University of Texas at Austin and joined U.C. Division of Educational Studies and Leadership in the College of Education, Criminal Justice, and Human Services, in 2000. The division’s programs of study provide research opportunities plus give students a foundation in the psychological, social, and cultural issues examined by school leaders. Koschoreck’s research background includes accountability in relation to promoting diversity in school systems, including lesbian and gay issues in public education.

As a leader of UCEA, Koschoreck says he and other members spent a day on Capitol Hill briefing lawmakers on the educational challenges of the 21st century. “I think that one of the biggest challenges that educational leaders have today is that their role is not as narrowly defined as it used to be,” he says. “At one time, those duties focused on hiring teachers or making sure all of the children got on the bus. Today, that role has evolved into setting visions for schools and finding new and innovative ways to bring parents, teachers, community members, and students all together in a unified vision of public education,” says Koschoreck.

As president-elect of UCEA, Koschoreck is planning the agenda for the organization’s annual meeting, which will be held October 30 through November 2, 2008, in Orlando, Florida.

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.
Districts who “grow their own” educational leaders:
An Interview with Andrew Cole

Recently, interviewco-editor Gerardo R. López (Indiana University) spoke with Andrew Cole (Fairfax County Public Schools) about their ongoing effort to prepare educational leaders in their district. Cole, who is the director of the Learning, Empowering, Assessing, and Developing (LEAD) Fairfax program in the district (a.k.a. “LEAD Fairfax”), talks about the impetus for “growing their own” leaders and the philosophy behind their leadership training. The interview provides a unique perspective on issues relating to alternative leadership preparation and the partnerships required to make this a possibility. A portion of their interview is transcribed below.

GRL: I wanted to thank you for participating in this interview. One of the things UCEA is doing as an organization is to learn from effective practices and really figure out what effective programs are doing with respect to leadership preparation. When Michelle Young mentioned your school district, she mentioned that you are doing some unique things with respect to leadership preparation of educational leaders. I’m curious to know, how it all got started.

AC: About ten years ago, we began to look at our retirements, and we noticed that within five years of 2001, we were going to lose about 70 percent of our sitting educational leaders. That’s a lot of people for a district our size—roughly 129 new principals and even more assistants principals. So we needed to figure out how we were going to replenish our leaders. We decided that as an organization, we needed to “grow our own,” because we felt we had a great organizational culture, and we needed to maintain that culture. So many of our programs emerged from our particular needs as a district, and what we wanted to maintain as we moved forward. They also emerged from the strengths we already had. For example, we had a group of very experienced leaders who had a wealth of knowledge and experience. So we decided that one of the focal points should revolve around coaching and mentoring by these particular leaders. Another focal point was that our programs needed to have experiential components built into our curriculum so that prospective leaders would be provided with high-quality professional experiences.

GRL: Where did the money come from to fund a program of this nature?

AC: Because we were interested in leadership reform, we applied for a Wallace Grant. We also invested $500,000 of the district’s funds into our intern program. Fortunately, we were one of 12 original sites that received a $5 Million five-year grant to really focus on reforming and redesigning our leadership program. That was an enormous help. But what it really helped us do was buy us the necessary time to develop outstanding programs and practices that focus on developing leaders.

GRL: Speaking of outstanding practices, I noticed that one of the organizing philosophies is to give people a strong emphasis on the self, the site, and the system when thinking about organizational reform. Tell me a little bit about how these three components interact and how you choose them to ground your particular program.

AC: When we think about leadership, we really need to think about how to have an impact on that leadership. And the first impact needs to surround the individual. We believe that part of developing the individual, ought to focus on how the individual assesses themselves and their own personal development. Then, as they develop an understanding of their strengths and abilities, they need to apply their learning to their particular site. Finally, we believe that the most successful leaders are those who are able to have success outside of their site. So it’s a logical conclusion that if we are to have an impact on the preparation of educational leaders, we need to prepare them to have an impact that extends outside of their classroom and building. In other words, we need to prepare leaders who can have an impact on the entire system.

GRL: Tell me about the curriculum you offer and how this relates to this notion of systemic leadership.

AC: First off, when we designed our curriculum, we made sure that it connected to the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards. But we also had our own focus, which directly emerged from the needs of our district: (1) Leading People, (2) Leading Learning, (3) Managing the business of schools, and (4) Being able to develop themselves and others. Our entire curriculum fits into one of those four areas. Our thought was that in “Leading People,” the focus needed to be on developing leaders who could move all of the adults to focus on what’s good for children. In “Leading Learning,” we felt that leaders also needed to have the ability not only to know what good instruction was, but how to get people to work together and collaborate in effective teams in order for good instruction to flourish. In this regard, our emphasis on “Leading Learning” was directly connected to our emphasis on “Leading People.” Then, we felt that our leaders also needed to know how to “Manage the business of schools.” In other words, our leaders need to know the technical aspects of managing the books, budgets, and buildings—the part that most leadership programs focus on in years past. Finally, in our situation, since we hire about 1,400 new teachers, and we had a 70 percent replacement of our leaders, we felt that it was really important for our leaders to be active developers. In other words, we felt that it was not good enough for leaders just to be leaders, but they needed to find ways to empower themselves and others and identify and nurture the next generation of leaders, otherwise the leadership stops with those leaders who are currently in place. In effect, we needed to develop leaders, but we also needed to develop leadership capacity for our schools and district.

GRL: Tell me about the curriculum you offer and how this relates to this notion of systemic leadership.

AC: That’s right. We’ve really focused on developing professional learning communities here. Those are grounded in teamwork, collaboration, and relationships. So if you can’t develop the self while developing others, then the whole system becomes stagnant.

GRL: Tell me about the different cohorts you run with respect to educational leadership.

AC: One of our cohorts is the “Administrative Intern” program, where we take teachers and we provide them with a year’s experience with a mentor at a school. They are basically there in an overstaff position. The design of the program is to provide them with experiences that would make them great educational leaders. We select people that are already good teacher-leaders and we try to focus them on how to become a great administrative leader. They spend a year in the program with a mentor principal and they are both provided professional development—the mentors are provided professional development on being a mentor and the mentees...
are given training on being a mentee. Throughout the year, the administrative leaders also do various programs. They are released from their school responsibilities twice a month so a cohort and they are given a treatment that focuses on the four aforementioned areas: 1) Leading People, 2) Leading Learning, 3) Managing the business of schools, and 4) Being able to develop themselves and others.

GRL: I do like the mentoring component. Very interesting.

AC: A different program is called the “Administrative Certification” cohort and it’s done in partnership with the University of Virginia. In that program, we pick teacher leaders that are more experienced and probably would not go into administration because of things like salary compression, etc. But they are selected into a program and modules are presented in five different areas: (1) School Law, (2) Supervision, (3) Instruction, (4) Human Resources, and (5) Finance. This cohort is given additional programs that focus on what they should know and what they are able to do. They also have an internship that runs through summer school. And over the course of a year’s time, they get their certification. So this particular cohort undergoes a blended experience: we choose them, they take their courses at different times and it’s very intense work. It is not “less time” than going through a traditional program, but it’s a lot more intense — there’s a lot of weekend work.

GRL: Right, the time is structured differently, so it’s a little bit different from the other schedules.

AC: Yes. There’s another program, a “Succession Program” for our student service areas such as counselors or people who want to become directors of student services. That program is a cohort program that runs over the course of a year as well. Again, they get a similar treatment: 1) Leading People, (2) Leading Learning, (3) Managing the business of schools, and (4) Being able to develop themselves and others. They are selected by the Department of Student Services for their potential as leaders.

GRL: Interesting. I do like the idea about leadership in a broader context — as opposed to a specific building leader.

AC: The last program I want to talk about is the “Support Program” for our support leaders. That would be anybody who is in instruction. We look at the same basic items except there is not so much instructional focus: 1) Leading People, 2) Managing the business of schools, and 3) Being able to develop themselves and others.

GRL: It seems as though you try to capture various leadership roles that different personnel can take both within the school system as well as in the school system. I’ve really interested in the “Aspiring Principals’ cohort. Can you talk about that?

AC: Yes, definitely. The “Aspiring Principals’” Cohort is comprised of individuals who are designated as high flyers by our Cluster of Superintendents. They typically are within 12 to 18 months of the principalship. We take these individuals through a program that is very similar to the ones I describe above, but we also run an induction program for first year principals where we try to front-load much of the work so that they are better prepared when they get started. For example, we’ve partnered with the Center for Creative Leadership out of Greensboro, NC. The Center performs a 360 degree assessment on our “Aspiring Principals,” and the students get participation opportunities to get a focus on their personal leadership style. Then they are given other program offerings that really focus on getting them ready for the principalship. For example, they’ll do mock interviews, resume writing, data driven decision-making, ethics, system thinking, planning, and managing change, etc. These are very non-traditional courses, but they are very focused on what the need is for the leader once they get in that particular role.

GRL: Are the students who are nominated for the “Aspiring Principals’” program typically the same students who have already gone through the “Administrative Intern” program or the “Administrative Certification” program?

AC: Many of them will be, but not all. It’s not automatic. You need to remember: we’re producing those people, but they may not be the ones chosen because they might not be ready for the “Aspiring Principal’s” Program. But interestingly, we’re finding that many of them are, in fact, nominated for the program — largely because they are very well trained.

GRL: Tell me a little about the partnership you’ve developed that contributed to the delivery of your programs.

AC: We call them strategic partners because we see a distinction between a person working with us as a partner and one who works with us in a vendor relationship. A partnership means that we are in this together, as opposed to a vendor who assumes that they have all the expertise that we hire to do a particular job. We have a lot of strategic partners: the Center for Creative Leadership, the Gallup Organization, ASCD, Standby Systems, the University of Virginia, Virginia Commonwealth University, the University of Richmond, and a group called CaseNex (which does case studies) are all engaged in working with our aspiring leaders. The State Department of Education is also a strategic partner in that they work with us on the alternative routes to deliver our programs. We also organize the Multi-District Leadership Institute in conjunction with New York City. So we really have a strong group of people involved. Some have an educational focus; some of them have a focus that is not education but address the needs of education.

GRL: Would you say that what you are doing is unique — or are there other school districts that have attempted to do something similar with respect to growing their own?

AC: I think the 12 Wallace sites are all doing something unique in that they are approaching the issue of leadership preparation in very different ways. For instance, Springfield, Massachusetts is doing a program where they are certifying their own people without the university being involved. New York City runs the New York City Academy which runs in conjunction with some of the universities, but is not necessarily working in partnership with them. So all of them are doing slightly different programs. So I would say “yes” — we are unique, but there are at least 12 unique programs out there. I think we’re unique because we are a very large system, and things happen to us before they happen to a lot of districts throughout the country.

GRL: There are many critics out there that are very skeptical of the whole “grow your own” philosophy. Somewhat as far as arguing that these programs are actually competing with more traditional university-based programs that have historically been in the business of leadership preparation. What would you say to those critics?

AC: I don’t think what we do is inconsistent with working with universities at all. In fact, we have some very robust partnerships with four universities here in Virginia. So it doesn’t change the traditional approach. When we say we’re “growing our own,” that doesn’t mean that we are focused on excluding universities from the partnership. What it means is that we’re taking a bigger role in the development of our own personnel. From the university perspective, you are talking about leadership preparation. From a district perspective, we’re looking for readiness. They are similar, but they are not the same.
need people who are going to be ready to come in and be effective immediately throughout our organization.

GRL: But there is still the issue of whose job it is to prepare educational leaders.
AC: Universities used to say “this is our work.” But in actuality it is the school district’s work to identify the type of leaders we need. The issue of production is how do we work together to figure out what we need. You see, you can’t get what you need, if you don’t know what it is you need. So, to be without a partnership, sometimes don’t make a whole lot of sense. Many people in universities haven’t been in a school since the No Child Left Behind Act was passed. And No Child Left Behind changed, fundamentally, a lot of the ways in which schools and districts operate. So there needs to be a partnership. It doesn’t mean we exclude somebody. But if the focus is solely on preparation, then what you end up with are people who are certified and not practicing. In contrast, we need people who are going to move into roles immediately and who can fit into the overall culture and structure of the district. So I don’t see a conflict at all.

GRL: On that note, what advice would you give UCEA and its member institutions in regards to moving towards better collaboration and partnership with local school districts?
AC: You have to communicate and the conversation has to be different than the way it has been in the past. Universities can’t tell districts “this is what we’ll do for you.” You need to begin with a different set of questions: “What are your needs? What type of leaders do you envision? How can we help you with your vision?” It needs to go beyond that to an agreement between two parties because both sides really need to sit down and talk about what’s needed and what will be needed in the year to come. The standard operating procedure — where universities tell you “here is what we can teach” — won’t work. Once you design a program around needs, then it works for everyone because it makes perfect sense. Another thing I would add is that it needs to be grounded in experience or have an experiential component built into the program. It can’t be an internship in the same way that it’s been historically defined. The Southern Regional Educational Board has a focus on 3 parts of an internship: (1) Observing, (2) Participating, and (3) Leading. The first two levels have traditionally defined the internship experience at most universities. But then there is a third level, when you actually lead an organization, it is perhaps the most meaningful. Any internship has to have all 3 parts if they are going to be effective.

GRL: That certainly makes sense. Watching, learning, and leading makes the internship both meaningful and insightful.
AC: Right. But in order for that to happen, you need to have robust internships. And in order for those to flourish, you need to have partnerships with the people that are actually leading the internship — i.e., school districts.

GRL: I’ve really learned a lot. I think that what you’re doing at Fairfax County Public Schools is both unique and comprehensive. It ensures a leadership succession that not only meets current your needs, but your future needs as well.
AC: I think that what’s most important is to develop leaders for the future, not for the present.

GRL: Any final thoughts?
AC: That would be it.

GRL: I want to thank you very much for your time.
AC: You’re welcome.

Interview with Stephen Jacobson, UCEA’s Newly Inducted President
Pei-Ling Lee, The University of Texas at Austin

PL: How did you become involved with UCEA?
SJ: I became involved with UCEA almost immediately after assuming my first academic position as an assistant professor at the University at Buffalo (UB) in 1986. UB was one of UCEA’s founding institutions, and UB’s Troy McKelvey was UCEA President from 1974-76. UCEA-related issues and materials were a regular part of my work environment. For example, senior colleagues, like Jim Conway, Bob Heller and Austin Swanson, introduced me to monographs, case studies and simulations produced by UCEA that were marvelous instructional tools for my courses. The late Professor Emeritus, Ollie Gibson, regaled me with stories of his involvement in UCEA’s early years, as well as offering insights into events that had transpired during the International Intervisitation Programmes (IIP), which were originally co-sponsored by UCEA and the Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration (CCEA), now known as the Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration and Management (CCEAM). Arguably the most notable IIP was the 1974 Bristol conference, which triggered the famous T.B. Greenfield-Dan Griffiths debate, and Ollie was one of the first to understand that phenomenology and logical positivism, the theoretical perspectives at the heart of this disagreement, were actually complementary perspectives. (For those unfamiliar with Dr. Gibson and his involvement with UCEA, as well as a further history of our organization, I would encourage a read of Jack Culbertson’s Building Bridges: UCEA’s First Two Decades.)

It was particularly through these conversations with Ollie Gibson that I came to realize I was part of a profession with a professional association that had a rich history, and, like Ollie, I wanted to become more actively involved in UCEA. I got my first chance to serve in 1988, when my colleagues at UB elected me to be their Plenary Session Representative. I held that position until 1994, and then again from 2000-2002, when I was elected to my first 3-year term on the Executive Committee. From then, UCEA has always been an integral part of my life in the academy. In fact, of the 21 national conferences UCEA has held from 1987-2007, I’ve missed only 3, and I’ve attended IIP conferences held in 1990 (Manchester, England), 1994 (which UB co-hosted with the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) at the University of Toronto) and 1998 (Barbados). Subsequent quadrennial CCEAM meetings attended, which were held in 2002 (Sweden) and 2006 (Cyprus), are no longer called IIP, but maintain the IIP format of formal presentations and school visits. Which leads me directly to your next question:

PL: Discuss Your Current Goals for UCEA.
SJ: There are two goals I’d like to work towards over the next year. The first is the further internationalization of the Council, which is a key initiative listed in the first draft of UCEA’s transformative agenda. Internationalization at this time might include increasing the number of member institutions from outside the U.S.; making topics of international importance a regular part of our annual
conference; and developing an RFP for a UCEA International Center. The fact that someone as experienced and talented as Bruce Barnett has just been appointed to be UCEA’s Associate Director for International Relations means that that Council has taken the appropriate first steps to build an infrastructure with the capacity to meet this goal. Initially we need to find out what UCEA members already do in terms of international relations within their existing programs, and then, what UCEA members want. In the future, I can imagine UCEA facilitating student and faculty exchanges and collaborations; using advanced technologies to connect scholars, e.g., creating conference links that would allow people from around the world to participate at the conference virtually. UCEA might also fund international projects, encourage doctoral students to work on international issues and continue to support activities, such as the soon-to-be-published handbook on leadership preparation co-edited by Gary Crow, Jacky Lumby and Petros Pashiardis, that will help to broaden our collective understanding of what educational administration, management and leadership in the preparation of school leaders looks like internationally. I think the conference theme in Washington was a wonderful beginning for this initiative and Jonathan Jansen’s keynote address a powerful reminder that we now live in a world of interconnected nations that requires us to look outside our borders if we are to truly understand our neighbors and ourselves.

My second objective is to continue the initiative begun with the Day on the Hill event that preceded our meeting in Washington DC. Frequently I’ve heard academic colleagues complain that political figures at both the federal and state levels seem not to listen to what we have to say. Our visits on the Hill suggested to me that one of the reasons they may not be listening to us is that we haven’t really taken the time to talk to them. Expecting that they read our research and then think about how to shape policy to support our recommendations is unrealistic and perhaps even naive. Meeting with the staff of U.S. Senators and House Representatives was incredibly informative. It forced those of us who participated in the event to distill our presentation into a set of talking points that could be delivered in no more than 15 minutes; not a simple task for a professor. In any case, it was a valuable learning experience and I applaud Michelle Young and her graduate students at UT-Austin for all their efforts. If UCEA is to become a key player in shaping educational policy across the U.S., we must develop collectively the skill sets and the alliances necessary to make our voices heard in Washington and at state capitols.

PL: What are some of your professional goals and research interests?
SJ: For the past six years, I have had the pleasure of working on a research project examining successful leadership in high poverty schools with my UB colleagues, Lauri Johnson, Rose Yimaki and Corrie Giles, as well as a former doctoral student and Jackson Scholar, Sharon Brooks, who is now an assistant professor at Georgia Southern University. Supported initially by grants from the Wallace Foundation and the New York State Education Department, our team focused specifically on schools in the Western New York region. At the same time, our case studies were coordinated with those of other research teams examining successful principals in seven other nations (although high poverty schools were not the only schools studied by those teams). Known as the International Successful School Principalship Project (ISSPP), this collaborative research undertaking has produced more international case studies than any other study of its kind (in addition to the U.S., there are research teams in Australia, Canada, China, Denmark, England, Norway and Sweden). In the concluding article of a special issue of the Journal of Educational Administration (2005) devoted to initial findings from the ISSPP, Ken Leithwood wrote that this project is making “progress on a broken front.” As the ISSPP continues to grow in membership and evolve in its research focus (we have just added teams from Cyprus, New Zealand and Turkey, as well as a second U.S. team from the University of Texas – San Antonio, and added a longitudinal element to the study by revisiting some of the schools we first examined five years ago in order to see whether their success has been sustained), I’m hoping that the project can fill some of the methodological and empirical gaps that Leithwood enumerates. Most importantly, ISSPP researchers are looking for commonalities, as well as differences, in leadership philosophy and practice across these diverse contexts that support improved student academic and affective performance.

PL: What has been the most gratifying aspect of your involvement with UCEA?
SJ: This is a very easy question for me to answer; the most gratifying aspect of my involvement with UCEA has been the personal relationships I’ve developed with colleagues. Over the past twenty years, UCEA has become something of an extended academic family for me. I get to see senior colleagues like Bruce Cooper and Betty Malen who were always generous with their time and support when I was new to the field, and I get to return that favor with junior colleagues whose energy and enthusiasm will guarantee UCEA’s and our field’s future success. I am also grateful for the opportunity over the past five years to share ideas with members of the Executive Committee and Executive Director, Michelle Young. Our meetings tend to be long, but very productive, and what I like best are those times when, to borrow a phrase from my former Dean, Hugh Petrie, the conversations get ‘yeasty.’ Sitting in a room with really smart colleagues who are respectful of divergent opinions, yet working their hardest in the best interests of the Council, reminds me of how lucky I am to have chosen this path in life. For fear of unintentionally leaving off a name, let me simply say ‘thanks’ for the privilege of serving beside you.

PL: What contemporary research do you consider most important and original with a high probability of leading to significant improvements in our understanding of educational leadership?
SJ: In great measure because of my involvement with UCEA, I have had the chance to work for just over a decade on numerous projects with Ken Leithwood, serving with him as co-director of the UCEA Center for the Study of School Site Leadership, as co-editor of Leadership and Policy in Schools, and as a research colleague on the ISSPP study. In my opinion, Ken’s collective body of work, including studies of expert problem solving, transformative leadership and, more recently, distributed leadership, represents the most important and sustained body of empirical research in school leadership. His 2003 review, with Carolyn Riehl, of the extant literature, “What do we already know about successful school leadership?” which was prepared for the AERA Division A Task Force on Developing Research in Educational Leadership, provided a groundbreaking for the next generation of leadership research. In fact, the core practices of successful school leadership (regardless of context), which Leithwood and Riehle enumerate: setting a direction, developing people, and designing the organization, provided the conceptual underpinning of the ISSPP. We have determined that these core practices do, in
fact, represent key elements of the skill sets of successful principals regardless of context, but that variations in national contexts mediate how these practices ultimately enables school success. As noted in my response to question #3 above, better understanding these relationships is the central thrust in closing the gaps on the ISSPP's ‘broken front.’

Moreover, I look forward to the final report of the Wallace Foundation study, "Education Leadership: Leading for Learning," that Ken Leithwood, Karen Louis, Kyla Wahlstrom and others from the University of Toronto and the University of Minnesota are currently working on. This project has been tracking educational policy from the State house to the schoolhouse, and even into the classroom. I anticipate that this report will have a significant impact on the field, and will lead to a marked improvement in our understanding of how educational leadership, policy and practice interconnect.

The Field Loses a Great Man—Jack Arthur Culbertson

Jack Arthur Culbertson, 89, of Columbus, died Saturday, December 8, 2007. He was born on July 16, 1918, in Nickelsville, Va. He was the son of the late Otto Cecil and Lola Kate Culbertson. Jack is survived by his wife of 55 years, Mary Virginia; daughters, Karen and Margaret; grandson, Mark; sisters, Mabel Sinclair of Lynchburg, Va. and Betty Wayne Godsey of Weber City, Va.

Jack began his educational career as an elementary teacher in the Scott County Schools in his native Va. Jack also served as a secondary teacher in Calif. and N.C., and as a school principal and superintendent in both Va. and Calif. He graduated from Emory and Henry College, with a A.B. degree, in 1943. Jack completed his M.A. degree at Duke University in 1946, and attained his Ph.D. in 1955, at the University of California, Berkeley.

Following an assistant professorship at the University of Oregon from 1955-59, he joined the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) as Executive Director. For over 22 years from 1959 to 1981, he worked to improve the quality of leadership in educational administration. Jack linked people with ideas; mentored and influenced the careers of countless professors and practitioners; and molded a national organization which assumed a leadership role in both shaping and articulating the movements, trends and developments in the field of educational leadership.

His work with professors led to the development of well over 100 books, articles, essays, simulation training materials, and other published works. He helped to establish the Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership, which facilitated the career paths of women and minorities in his field. He also delivered invited addresses from Nigeria to Germany, Brazil, England and Australia.

Following his tenure at UCEA, he held the position of adjunct professor of educational administration at Ohio State University through 1984. Jack was included in Who’s Who in Education; Who’s Who in America; Who’s Who in The World; and The 2000 Outstanding Scholars of the 21st Century. The Jack A. Culbertson Award was established by the UCEA Associate Directors, to annually recognize unusual research and development achievements of talented young professors. Jack also established a yearly scholarship fund in his name through the College of Education at the Ohio State University. He was the recipient of three of his field’s top honors. Jack was named Commonwealth Nations Fellow for 1978. The Roald F. Campbell Life-Time Achievement Award was presented for distinguished service, superior scholarship, and recognized leadership on October 30, 1993. The National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration recognized Jack with the "Living Legend" Award in 2000. In lieu of flowers, friends who wish may contribute to Emory and Henry College, Development Office, P.O. Box 950, Emory, Va. 24327.

If you would like to view or contribute your tributes & condolences to "Memories of Jack Culbertson," please click on the link at the UCEA website www.ucea.org.
From across the pond to UCEA colleagues

By: Angela Thody-Emeritus Professor at the Centre for Education Research and Development, University of Lincoln, UK

My Day on the Hill Has Come to an End…
With apologies to a certain William Wordsworth

I wandered lonely as
Only an English person can be in an ex-colony
That floats on high o'er
Other globe economies, democracies and education systems.
When all at once I saw a crowd
A host of golden UCEA members
Beside the Capitol, beneath the trees
Fluttering with excitement in the breeze.

Continuous as like stars that shine
With workshop learning, briefing case,
We stretched in never ending line
Through security to our picnic place
Ten thousand saw I at a glance
Off office-wards in stately dance.

The sun beside them danced; but they
Out-did the sparkling sun in glee;
A poet could not but be gay (or LTB)
In such a jocund company.
I gazed – and gazed - and greatly thought
What wealth Congress staffers to me had brought.

With colleagues three our message took
Around the Senate; well relieved
They knew our UCEA by look
Our points were very well received.
Then on alone to meetings I raced
Rhode Island heard my faltering lobby
For Title II, my case I carefully paced
For Virginian Scott, Congressman, education was his hobby.

Now oft, when on my English couch I lie,
In vacant or in pensive mood,
That day floats upon my inward eye
Twas Congress that we went and wooed.
And then my heart with pleasure fills
And dances with the daffodils.

My thanks to:
• UCEA for organising this great experience,
• staffers Seth Gerson (Rhode Island) and Mr Dillon (Virginia) for their erudition and politeness in receiving an ignorant foreigner
• Professor Fenwick English and my group for their company and a taxi home.

“Day on the Hill”
A First Ever for UCEA
Katherine C. Mansfield
The University of Texas

The day began as a montage of feelings: excitement, skepticism, ignorance, and confidence as 40 professors and students of educational leadership met for breakfast and legislative advocacy training during UCEA’s annual convention in November, 2007. Workshops, conducted by Kathleen Brown, Gary Crow, Steven Gross, Catherine Lugg, Terry Orr, Diana Pounder, and Andrea Rorrer, focused on communicating the major points of a policy brief titled, “Quality Leadership Matters” (available on the UCEA website), learning about etiquette for visits to the hill, as well as how to elicit promises from leaders supporting high-quality leadership preparation. In addition, workshop leaders engaged participants in capacity-building tools such as learning how to tell stories about one’s program powerfully and succinctly and practicing how to keep conversations focused on the key points during legislative visits.

The workshops were followed by a bus ride to Washington, DC, where participants were greeted by Cynthia Wilkinson, President of 21st Century Group, Inc., a professional lobbying group. Thereafter, CEO, Jack Fields, gave a short talk about his experiences lobbying on Capitol Hill. Following this introduction to the world of legislative advocacy, participants ate boxed lunches and finalized plans for their “Hill” visits.

The evening ended with participants meeting back at 21st Century Group, Inc. for a beautiful, bountiful, and complimentary reception. In the midst of silver trays and the clinking of wine glasses, one could hear the bubbling comments from participants such as: “Wow! That was so fun!” “Everyone was so friendly and attentive!” “They actually asked us to give them ‘language’ for real policy!” In addition, participants shared insights on how to improve the experience, and 100% agreed that the momentum inaugurated that day must continue on the national, as well as state scene.
Innovative Programs-
University of Washington
By Liz Hollingworth

This is the second installment in a series of articles highlighting innovative PhD programs designed to prepare graduate students for both leadership and research positions.

The University of Washington’s College of Education is ranked eighth in the nation, according to The U.S. News and World Report. The college houses the Educational Leadership and Policy Studies (EDLPS) department, which prepares individuals to think and act creatively, responsibly, and effectively in educational leadership roles in P12, higher education and scholarship. The UW EDLPS offers a continuum of professional development for practitioners and coursework to prepare graduate students for positions in both leadership and scholarship.

Preparation for professional leadership in P12 educational leadership occurs in two strands at the University of Washington: the Danforth Program and the Leadership for Learning Program (L4L). Principal certification occurs through the Danforth Educational Leadership Program, a one-year, intensive experience with a half-time internship. Students work together in a cohort with faculty and mentors from the field to earn a Washington State K-12 principal and/or a program administrator certificate and the skills to begin work as leaders in the public schools. L4L is a doctoral program (Ed.D.) comprised of a cohort of accomplished educators who aspire to systems-level leadership anchored in principles of social justice in public education.

Students are prepared for scholarship and research in one of two PhD program strands: the Organizations and Policy PhD program and the Social and Cultural Foundations PhD program. Organizations and Policy concentrates on the ways educational organizations are designed, operate, and change; the nature and role of leadership, and its relation to learning and educational improvement; and the implementation and effects of policies (federal, state, or local) aimed at improving the educational system. In contrast, the Social and Cultural Foundations program explores fundamental questions about the meaning, purpose and significance of education in society, using tools of analysis based in liberal arts disciplines such as history and philosophy.

Preparing Students for Educational Leadership

According to EDLPS Associate Professor Bradley S. Portin, the decision to re-envision the leadership training program at the University of Washington dates back to the 1990s. He says, “We were having this debate about the difference between an Ed.D. and a Ph.D. What we had was a fairly traditional program.” He explains that students used to take their regular graduate coursework next to each other, regardless of whether they were at the university to prepare for a leadership internship or to work toward careers in research. The faculty made the decision to re-imagine what it means to develop people who lead with strong inquiry skills and effective, creative, responsible leadership.

The College of Education retired the traditional superintendent preparation program and replaced it with the Leadership for Learning Program. This was part of a goal to create a continuum of programs to address the variety of student needs and the increasing challenge to school leaders. Underlying the leadership development continuum is the belief that “leadership education” is not confined to the relatively brief time that educators spend in pre-service preparation programs. Rather, leadership development begins early in one’s and continues until retirement. Consistent with this vision, Leadership for Learning is designed for systems-level leaders—those who imagine their influence in districts and policy contexts. Program instruction is modular in nature and taught primarily by core tenured faculty from the university.

Leadership for Learning leads to the Education Doctorate (Ed.D.) and also to the Washington State superintendent certificate. The program prepares experienced educators to become P-12 superintendents, assistant superintendents, and district leaders in administration, business or finance, curriculum, special programs, staff development, and human resources, or educational leaders that link districts to non-profits, municipal offices, or museum educators. L4L is a three-year, part-time program designed for working professionals with courses meeting on weekends per month and summer intensive institutes. Ed.D. students form a community of scholars who spend three years together in the leadership program coming from different perspectives and backgrounds. The curricular focus is not just K-12, but also systems-level interests. Students and faculty bring a diversity of backgrounds to the classrooms. Because students are organized in cohorts, they are able to conduct collaborative work in schools, districts, and states.

The Danforth Educational Leadership Program is in its 20th year preparing educators to be school principals. Because about one-third of the students do not have a Master’s degree coming into the program, students can earn both licensure and an M.Ed.

Students who wish to earn an Ed.D. enter the L4L program. Students complete a capstone project, which is a conceptualization of the dissertation. The capstone project focuses on the embedded problems of practice in real places—often the student’s own work context. Faculty at the University of Washington teach students to bring disciplined inquiry to bear on real school problems in their capacity as either systems-level leaders or school principals, and students are trained to look at school level problems, especially as they relate to equitable opportunities to learn in connection with the system.

Professional Leadership and Professional Scholarship- the PhD

The goal of the Ph.D. track, according to Portin is “to prepare students to contribute to scholarship, and to practice, in a number of disciplines.” Students who enroll in the Ph.D. track are prepared to make academic contributions in policy work, and the career goals of these students are generally academic and policy in nature. As a result, there is a different focus in the coursework. Ph.D. students at the University of Washington are taught to use a variety of research skills to understand problems in education and policy as well as to explore philosophical and historical issues that contribute to what it means to be an educated person.

Portin says the program has not moved into instruction via distance learning over the internet because “so much leadership work is about human interaction, communication, motivation. Working with complicated problems in schools requires personal interaction because it is such a hard thing to. It’s not just transfer of knowledge, but co-construction of knowledge and that takes a social context.” He explains that the philosophical underpinnings of the program...
Core faculty members are also academic researchers, and their goal is to bring research work into the teaching and allow their teaching to inform there research. Portin says there is “no firewall between research work and work with both PhD students and professional preparation work such as Danforth and L4L. They feed each other.”

Leadership for the Practitioner
Non-degree students who are interested in professional development at the University of Washington can select professional development offered by the UW Center for Educational Leadership. The Center’s philosophical mission is grounded in the overarching belief of the EDLPS department that leadership preparation occurs over a continuum of one’s career. The Center (CEL) supports existing school and district leaders who are not necessarily enrolled in a degree program. The focus of the issues addressed by CEL change to meet the needs of the community served. A primary educational issue addressed by the current offerings is the achievement gap. CEL staff and UW faculty affiliates work with leaders and teachers around powerful instruction and using data to ensure that they meet the needs of all students.

Programs are available for principals in early career and mid-career, and there is a District Leader’s Seminar series. In addition, the Center provides technical support by working with districts nationally to provide professional development to teacher leaders and administrators.

The Center for Educational Leadership is self-sustaining. While CEL does not offer degrees, students can transfer their credits later if they choose to apply to any of the other programs on the leadership continuum. There are well over 200 educational leaders a year who participate in leadership activities organized by the Center.

New Vision for Leadership a Success
Portin says, “Ten years ago we had a principal preparation program with fewer than 20 students: small superintendent groups and some Ed.D. students. That was it.” The changes in the structure of the program now allow the University of Washington to attract students regionally. There are 32 students a year in the Danforth principal preparation program, 25-27 in each Leadership for Learning cohort, and approximately 60 Ph.D. students.

For more information about Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at the University of Washington, visit them online at: http://depts.washington.edu/coe/programs/edlps/studyoptions/degprograms.html

---

Visit Pages 26-27 for the UCEA Convention 2008 Call for Proposals

---

EAQ Outstanding Reviewer Awards

The editorial team of Educational Administration Quarterly would like to announce the recipients of the 2006-2007 Reviewer of the Year Award. The six outstanding reviewers selected are: Ron Heck (University of Hawaii), Susan Printy (Michigan State University), Anit Somech (University of Haifa, Israel), Megan Tschannen-Moran (College of William and Mary), Pam Tucker (University of Virginia) and Allan Walker (The Chinese University of Hong Kong). We feel it is important to recognize the efforts of our reviewers who consistently give us substantive and timely feedback. Awards were based on the quality, quantity, and timeliness of their reviews.

We want to thank these reviewers for all of their hard work in helping make EAQ a success.

Think Globally Act Locally: A Challenge to Education Leaders

September 8th-12th 2008, ICC Durban

The 2008 Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration and Management (CCEAM) Conference will take place from September 8th to the 12th in Durban, South Africa at the International Convention Centre (ICC). The Conference is being organised by the Education Management Association of South Africa (EMASA) with the theme:

“Think Globally Act Locally: A Challenge to Education Leaders”

The world has become a global village. In order to address today’s life challenges, we need to broaden our intellectual horizons. This theme challenges today’s educational leaders and managers to think more and act more. The role of Educational Leadership, Management and Administration in understanding, shaping and shaping education for economic and social progress in this global village cannot be over-emphasized. Thus the conference theme invites African and other perspectives of global and local leadership. It seeks to provide a forum for an examination of the interface between schools, other education structures and communities. It wishes to foreground the role of information and communication technology in the leadership and management of education.

For more information, visit: http://www.emasa.co.za/node/17
Administrative Stipends
Jeffrey S. Brooks, Point-Counterpoint Editor

As a university-based educational administration preparation program and school districts seek to increase the number of high-quality applicants in their selection pools, paid administrative fellowship programs have emerged as a promising possibility. Though these programs are configured in myriad ways, they generally provide some kind of stipend in order for students to work in the field and complete certification, or an advanced degree and then enter educational administration for a prescribed term of service. To explore the pros and cons of these programs, I interviewed two educational administration graduate students ascertaining their perspectives. Sheldon Lanier is a fellow in the North Carolina Principal Fellows Program (http://www.ncpfp.org/) and current Masters of School Administration student at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Louis Caruso is a graduate student at Rutgers University. Broadly speaking, they agree that the possibility for rapidly attaining certification and/or an advanced degree from a high-quality university and being able to pay for the program without incurring debt, however, they differ in their perspective on the financial aspects of such programs.

Sheldon Lanier, University of North Carolina

The North Carolina Principal Fellows program provides a stipend of $15,000 the first semester and $15,000 your second semester, so basically it’s $30,000 a year. They pay the university who takes out the tuition and then you are given the rest as a refund and you can live off of that. You are only allowed to work 20 hours a semester that first year because that is when you take all of your coursework. That requires you to take either a leave of absence, or what we call professional leave, so you can keep your benefits, but you are not allowed to teach full-time while you are doing this program. In the second year, you are doing a ten-month internship, which is coupled with a seminar. In the second year, you are getting paid the base level assistant principal salary, so that includes a stipend along with the refund. It works out to be around $40,450, that second year.

It goes from August to May, though you can negotiate when you want to start your internship. I negotiated starting mine June 4th, so I am slightly ahead of the rest of my cohort; I’ll be the first one to start my internship and I’ll be the first one to leave. My last day is April 4th. When you finish, you are certified to be an assistant principal or principal in the state of North Carolina, of course, that’s provided that you pass the state certification examination. That also certifies you for some other states if you were to move. Like the Teaching Fellows, you have to pay back four years to the state of North Carolina in order to not have to pay back that loan. Otherwise, you have to pay all of that money back as a loan at something like a 10-12% interest rate. It definitely behooves you to stay and pay back the loan through service as an administrator. That’s ideally what you are going to do, what you want to do, anyway.

Now, there is no standing agreement with the state or districts that there will be a job waiting for you when you finish the program. You have to go out on your own and find employment on your own. That’s one of the reasons I negotiated for my internship to start early, so it would end early and I’d be on the job market that much sooner. That will allow me to interview in the places I want to serve. If you think about it, not only my cohort, but the rest of the 2008 graduates all over the state will be competing for the same positions. My way of trying to get a leg up, particularly in our top three paying counties, is to finish before the others. There’s a whole bunch of politics involved with getting a placement in one of those districts and I think that having any advantage will help. That being said, while it’s competitive, people coming out of the program are landing assistant principal positions.

First of all, it only takes you two years to complete your master’s degree. If you go part time while you are teaching, it might take you three or four years. More specifically, the way the program is designed you are able to complete the coursework in a year—I took 30 graduate hours in one year. I think that is a great accomplishment. Then you transition into a ten-month paid internship, that is not only a great experience in itself, but it also counts as a year of experience in the salary ladder. Contrast that with when you do your student teaching, which is essentially an internship that you have to pay for! I am moving up in terms of the salary ladder, I’m being compensated while I do it. I’m getting great in-field training specific to the role I will take (the assistant principal) and my earning potential afterward is much greater than it was when I was a teacher. As an intern, I also sit on site and district-level committees. As a member of the Principal Fellows, I also get to go to many of the professional development training seminars that the rest of the administrators attend so I receive specialized training in addition to what I might learn at the university. I’m fully engaged and respected as a participant in all activities. The great thing about that is that on top of the financial benefits, you get to meet the superintendent, the other assistant principals, the principals and the central office staff. These are all the people who will interview me for an entry-level position and I’ve had the opportunity to show them what I can do in a variety of settings for an entire school year. When my application folder comes across their desks they know my face and they know my name. I look at that as a wonderful informal bonus of the program.

Really, you get the best of both worlds. You are not only getting high-quality instruction at the university level, but you also have a chance to experience real-world work situations, receive relevant professional development, and network before you enter the field.

Louis Caruso, Rutgers University

I started my career as a middle school teacher, where I taught for seven years. I knew that getting added certification and advanced degrees at a young age would pay off in the long run as I moved through my career, especially before I had other commitments like raising a family or what have you. By the first semester of my third year of teaching, I had completed my master’s degree in supervision in administration. I had both an administration certificate and an administrative certificate at that time. I basically took two classes a semester during that time and most expenses for the coursework were reimbursed by the district. The out-of-pocket expense was maybe 25% of the total fees I incurred throughout the course of the program. It was definitely a great program and I’m glad I took advantage of it, the incentive was there. When I received certification, I stayed in the classroom for two more years, since I felt I was too young for administration. From there, I started my job search and it took me a year and a half to find the right administration job.
In New Jersey, the problem we are having is that there are tons of jobs. We have administrative turnover in rampant numbers. There are certainly lots of administrators retiring but we also have an issue with strong school boards not renewing administrator’s contracts. So the irony is that there are a lot of jobs but the market is saturated with candidates. There are a lot of people that have supervisory and administrative certificates but they are sitting on them. They basically got it to move up the schedule on the pay scale.

Currently, I am in a doctoral program at Rutgers University. Since I began my coursework so early, I was able to complete the coursework very quickly. Looking back at the semester I just completed, if I was currently at the beginning of the program, I would be frustrated because the job demands have forced me to scale back to one course a semester. I’m glad I started my coursework straight away. With all of my obligations, there’s just no way I can load myself up with classes. Again, being partially reimbursed is a tremendous incentive to continue the courses and finish off the doctorate.

One of the issues I might have with a fellowship is that I couldn’t step away from the job without knowing that I’d have a job waiting for me when I finished. It’s hard to get an administrative job here. For me, that’s a huge risk. Let’s say you leave and spend two or three years completing a fellowship and then you break back into the market. I’d worry that the first question they would ask is, “What happened? Why haven’t you been employed for two years?” I’m not entirely sure that everyone on that interview board would agree that stepping away like that, even if part of it was an internship, would be a viable explanation. Also, while a few years might seem like a brief time to some people, it’s extremely important to be on the cutting edge of what is happening in the classrooms. I’d worry about what I may miss if I step away. Even though you have an internship, you could easily lose touch with what’s going on in the field.

Another huge issue is that I doubt that the stipend could compete with my salary or even a teacher’s salary. The proof of a fellowship is that you can finish quickly and get into the field. A fellowship program might be a great opportunity for someone with ten to fifteen years of experience who can juggle the loss of income. I honestly don’t know many people like that but there are a few. A fellowship might also work well for people taking the alternative certification route. We have some administrators up here who have come from the corporate world and some of them are excellent. They might be more able to take the short-term financial risk and the lure of being able to attain certification quickly makes sense for them. The real problem is money for the average teacher, the people you’d traditionally like to see move into administration. In New Jersey, it is completely cost-prohibitive for most teachers. The housing market is extremely expensive and the general cost of living is high. In New Jersey, a first-year teacher is making somewhere between $44,48,000 or so and you go up from there. The stipend would have to be more than that just so people could get by. After a few years, a teacher will be making somewhere in the neighborhood of $60,65,000 and there is no way they can get by on less because of the cost of mortgages and life in general.

Check out the UCEA website at www.ucea.org
about “bricks and mortar” or “strategic planning” but about person-to-person interactions. As the authors aptly note, “The world is full of people with unhealed wounds, deep insecurities, irritating mannerisms, poor social skills, and dysfunctional backgrounds.” Church leaders refer to them as “EGR people” (or “Extra Grace Required”) while academics dub them the “high maintenance faculty member.” EGRs may be the headstrong, unremorseful individual or the unstable paranoid personality who thinks the boss is out to get him or believes his co-workers don’t like him. They are often recognized as the ones who send out long, angry e-mails to those who have hurt their feelings.

Leaders often report that dealing with EGRs requires a “psychology of hope” or finding meaning in difficult decisions and situations. Leaders do this by creating order out of chaos, discovering the personal learning that took place, and reflecting on how one evolved through the process of working with EGRs. Another way leaders cope with working with difficult people is by engaging in self-talk. By acknowledging that one has done the right thing one can gain a sense of peace. In addition, healthy reactions to dealing with prickly personalities include physical exercise, keeping a journal to note thoughts and reflections, and harnessing support by talking with a discreet colleague.

Coping with emotions on the job requires advanced planning after careful reflection. The authors advance the notion of requiring leaders (and students in leadership preparation programs) to sketch a plan on how to become better leader emotionally. An outline for growth includes emotional regulation, competence, awareness, and a blueprint for learning these skills.

Emotional regulation is the process by which individuals influence which emotions they have, when they have them, and how they experience and express their emotions. Emotional competence is acquiring the understanding needed to cope with the social environment as well as specific skills that can be learned to increase emotional competence. Emotional awareness includes being fully aware of one’s own emotions as well as the impact they have on others. It is important to recognize one’s physical sensations, patterns of behavior, and combinations of emotions and personal reactions to feelings. Finally, the emotional blueprint is a set of “how-to” instructions for achieving regulation, competence, and awareness to enhance leadership.

Closing
The strengths of The Human Side of Leadership: Navigating Emotions at Work include reader accessibility and humbled department. The authors choose to write in a conversational tone without claiming to know all the right answers. The literature review in the beginning of the book was thorough and the authors continued to build on the existing research and literature throughout. This book, as well as the additional resources listed in the back of the book, could be used to develop a course on the importance of navigating emotions at work in Principalship and Superintendent programs. The authors spent little time describing their methodology. How did they acquire their participants? What type of questions did they ask informants? One acknowledges that details such as including the interview protocol may have affected the accessible nature of the book, but one feels that including details in appendices would have been appropriate and helpful.

In addition, there were very few stories about the positive emotions experienced by educational leaders or how managers dealt with emotions at work in a positive way. The authors stress the importance of “emotional planning” but do not give enough information on how to do so. Giving examples from participants’ stories on successful blueprints would have been helpful. The book shares interesting stories that serve as a catalyst for thought and discussion, but one feels that including more details for developing substantial solutions for dealing with emotions at work.

Overall Contribution
Despite limitations noted above, we do believe this book serves the important purpose of getting the issue of emotions in leadership on the table. The authors dare individuals in leadership preparation programs to do something about the dearth of research and teaching on the topic while the excellent synopsis of related materials save interested parties hundreds of hours of research. The authors give a clarion call for those preparing leaders to truly begin training them for the emotional realities of leading in today’s educational institutions whether they are K-12 or Higher Education.
FROM THE DESK OF THE EDITOR,

For many academics, the editing process is the least interesting and most tedious part of composing a manuscript. After months of creative thought and puzzle solving, it is hard to be interested in the mundane task of finding missing commas and awkward phrases. Some of us escape the tedium by hiring others! As editor of JRLE, I am responsible for the final editing of every manuscript and although I have worthy assistants on my editorial team, the last look is always mine. From the outset, I knew this part of my job would be the most difficult—detail is not my strongest suit! However, over the past years, I have discovered a hidden asset in this seemingly mundane, but important task. The reading and rereading of each manuscript in the issue puts me in the middle of conversation with a select group of colleagues. To my delight, I often find that these authors, who reside and work in various parts of the globe, have written intricately connected ideas. The more I read each manuscript, the more I begin to see the linkages in their thinking. At some point in my rereading, a provocative thought emerges that frames this editorial message. As I prepared this JRLE issue for uploading, my conversation with the manuscripts eventually became about silos, a term often used to describe how individuals with common interests isolate themselves and avoid interaction.

Out of curiosity, I looked for a definition of silo and found two. A silo can be (1) a tall cylindrical tower used for storing grain, animal feed or other materials, or (2) a reinforced protective underground chamber where a missile can be stored and launched. I proffer that the second definition is fairly descriptive of how we organize most of our educational settings, is descriptive of how we engage in leadership preparation, and may very well describes how we approach research on leadership education. The authors represented in this issue provoked my thinking and, if you take the time to read all the articles, I think they will provoke yours as well.

In this issue you will read about several silo-breaking ventures. Our authors interrogated some interesting integrated learning environments, e.g. one that joined aspiring and practicing administrators, one with professionals from multiple disciplines, and one that connected teachers with administrators. You will find terms like reciprocal learning, shared accountability, and self-organizing. In each case, you will find strategic examples of breaking out of underground silos, including challenges to engage in more comparative studies with colleagues outside the US. Enomoto’s study of a dean’s ascendency is an example of how underground silos often prevent us from seeing or talking about how the leadership work of a university dean is comparable to leadership roles in K-12 settings. In my mind, I substituted the word superintendent for dean as I reread the article. I invite JRLE readers to try interchanging concepts, ideas, and experiences across the various silos of interest, in an effort to explore untapped possibilities for researching the education of leaders.

Edith A. Rusch, Editor
Journal of Research on Leadership Education
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New Service for Non-English Speaking Authors

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Bruce Barnett is a Professor in the Educational Leadership and Policy Studies Department at the University of Texas at San Antonio, having held similar faculty positions at Indiana University and the University of Northern Colorado. Prior to entering higher education in 1987, he worked at the Far West Educational Laboratory, conducting research and implementing leadership development programs, most notably, Peer-Assisted Leadership, a peer-shadowing program for experienced principals.

His involvement in developing and delivering master’s degree and principal certification programs for aspiring school leaders is reflected in Bruce’s publication record. In particular, his research interests include the use of cohorts in leadership preparation, mentoring and coaching programs for school leaders, leadership for school improvement, and the realities of beginning principals. Bruce’s work in these areas appears in a variety of books, book chapters, and journals, including Educational Administration Quarterly, Journal of School Leadership, Journal of Educational Administration, Educational Leadership, and Administration, and Leading and Managing.

About 10 years ago, he became involved in international leadership preparation and development programs. In 1999, he and his family spent a sabbatical working at the Australian Principals Center, developing the SAGE Mentoring Program, which has prepared over 1000 school administrators to serve as mentors for new principals. This association with his Australian colleagues resulted in several books by Hawker Brownlow Education on school improvement, reflection, culture, and change as well as articles, book chapters, and conference papers dealing with international mentoring and coaching programs for school leaders. He also has made repeated trips to England to work with students in master’s degree programs affiliated with the International Institute for Educational Leadership at the University of Lincoln and the Centre for Educational Studies at the University of Hull. Besides conducting workshops on reflection, mentoring, high performing work teams, and school improvement in Australia, Canada, England, Ireland, and New Zealand, Bruce has organized several tours of American schools and universities for Australian school leaders. Presently, Bruce is co-conducting research on the impact of professional development programs on aspiring, beginning, and experienced school leaders. His coordinating research projects in Australia dealing with two leadership development programs in Victoria: (1) Journey Into Leadership, a year-long program for teachers aspiring to the principalship, and (2) Coaching for Enhancing the Capabilities of Experienced Principals. In addition, he is consulting with the Chicago Public Schools to ascertain how first-year principals’ actions and thinking are affected by their coaching experiences. His future goals are to: (1) expand a network of colleagues who are interested in researching international educational leadership programs and (2) write a book on coaching for educational leaders with his Australian colleagues.

UCEA Congratulates Scott McLeod as the new Associate Director for Communications

Scott McLeod, J.D., Ph.D., is widely recognized as one of the nation’s leading academic experts on K-12 school technology leadership issues. Dr. McLeod is an Associate Professor and Coordinator of the Educational Administration program at Iowa State University. He also is the Director of the UCEA Center for the Advanced Study of Technology Leadership in Education (CASTLE), the nation’s only center dedicated to the technology needs of school administrators.

In 2003 Dr. McLeod and his CASTLE co-director, Dr. Joan Hughes, created the country’s first graduate program designed to prepare technology-savvy school leaders. After the American Institutes for Research validated the program as having statistically significant positive impacts on educators’ technology leadership knowledge, skills, and abilities, Drs. McLeod and Hughes gave the curriculum away to 15 other universities to help improve the technology-related preservice administrator preparation practices. Dr. McLeod has worked with nearly 40 corporate and organizational partners to provide technology-related publications and resources for school administrators. Partners and supporters of CASTLE’s work include Microsoft, IBM, the National School Boards Association, the National Association of Secondary School Principals, the International Society for Technology in Education, the Consortium for School Networking, and the George Lucas Educational Foundation. He also has helped numerous schools, districts, and state departments of education with their technology leadership and data-driven accountability challenges.

Dr. McLeod has received several awards as a result of his extensive vitae of service and outreach to school organizations across the country. Recent honors include being named as a Leader in Learning by the cable industry; an Emerging Leader by Phi Delta Kappa International; and one of the National School Board Association’s 20 To Watch. In 2004 he was the first untenured faculty member to ever receive the University of Minnesota College of Education and Human Development’s Distinguished Teaching Award. Along with his co-author, Dr. Michelle Young, he received the William J. Davis Award in 2002 for the best research article of the year in Educational Administration Quarterly.

Dr. McLeod blogs regularly about technology leadership issues at Dangerously Irrelevant and is the creator of LeaderTalk, the nation’s first group blog written by school leaders for school leaders, and At the Schoolhouse Gate, a group blog on K-12 school law issues. Dr. McLeod also was a co-creator of the wildly popular video, Did You Know?. More information about Dr. McLeod is available at his website, www.scottmcleod.net. More information about CASTLE is available at www.schooltechleadership.org.
Cecil Miskel Receives Roald F. Campbell Award

When Michelle Young told me that I had been selected to receive the Roald F. Campbell Lifetime Achievement Award, many adjectives immediately jumped to my mind—honored, humbled, pleased, proud, to list a few. After some reflection, I concluded that my very positive feelings stemmed from my esteem for Roald and how much I value UCEA. In my brief time in this privileged spotlight, I would like to offer a few observations about both Roald and UCEA, and thank my many colleagues.

Until I moved to Utah in 1982, I knew Roald only by his reputation as a leading figure in our field and a few anecdotes from his former students. I had met him a few times at various meetings, and frankly, I had found him a bit reserved or formal, even standoffish. Early in my Utah tenure, a meeting with Roald fundamentally changed this perception. I have forgotten the topic we were discussing, but he made a statement with which I strongly disagreed and told him so and why. With his characteristic “twinkle in the eye,” his energy level rose and the discussion deepened. During that and subsequent conversations, I gained a trusted colleague, friend, advisor, and advocate who helped me understand and be successful in what some might call the unique culture of Utah. Clearly, the bridge to him was a challenge of ideas. Tim Mazzoni, Betty Malen, Mike Murphy, and other colleagues can regale you with stories of Roald’s unwavering support and encouragement, generosity, concern about the welfare of their families, conviviality in social settings, willingness to be self-effacing, and love of singing. Or as Jack Newell succinctly observed, “He knew how to read his students’ and colleagues’ instincts and open doors for each of us to express our unique gifts—like no one else that I have known.”

Throughout much of the 20th century and from a vantage point of the larger field, Roald Campbell actively participated in the major intellectual movements. During his doctoral work at Stanford in the late 1930s, he knew and worked with early leaders of our field or in Roald’s words, old ground. However, he identified most closely with the recently hired progressive educators from Teachers College. His deep involvement in modernizing curricula and organizational forms in both the K-12 and higher education, while keeping an eye on the political and policy processes, reflected his progressive orientation. Starting in the 1950s, Roald played key roles in advancing knowledge-based approaches to study, education, and practice of educational administration. Until his death in 1988, he always seemed to be ahead of the emergent trends and to be reflecting on their intellectual foundations and likely effects. As Jack Newell stated, “His was a lifelong quest to understand, bring together, and refine knowledge that could improve education.” I would add that for all of his 60 plus years as an educator, he was at the forefront of the intellectual advancement of our field, truly a professor’s professor. Receiving an award named after such a leader and good friend is indeed a great honor.

As a professor of educational administration, I have always considered UCEA to be my primary professional organization. In my doctoral program at Oklahoma State University in the late 1960s, the faculty unabashedly promoted UCEA as a relatively new organization that promised to bring dramatic improvements to the field. Since then, I have debated with myself and others about how much or even whether UCEA has advanced the institution of educational administration. Nonetheless, UCEA has survived and adapted to its changing environment. In doing so, I believe that it has become less elitist, more egalitarian in both governance and membership. UCEA has broadened its organizational goals and programs, and heightened the emphasis on academic knowledge. Importantly, women professors and I have dramatically increased in number and prominence. Professors with long experience as school administrators have shined with renewed interest and influence. While some of these conclusions are subject to debate, what I do not doubt is that UCEA has been an immense help to me individually.

Throughout my professorial career, UCEA has helped me gain recognition and establish professional relationships. From its earliest days, the organization has brought professors from around the country and the world together. In the old days, without email or websites, much less pages on MySpace or Facebook, the meetings, mostly at the Airport Sheraton in Columbus, were low tech opportunities to create networks. I recall many zealous and loud discussions in the hospitality room, #201 as I recall. After all being a professor does have its political aspects and advancing one’s ideas, building a reputation, and even selling textbooks are facilitated greatly by coalitions of like-minded folks.

In particular, the EAQ has held special places in both my head and heart. I vividly recall the day in early 1971 at the University of Kansas when I received the letter from Professor Van Miller, the EAQ editor, notifying me that an article from my dissertation had been accepted. I could hardly contain my excitement and surely made a pest of myself by bragging to my new colleagues at KU. Additional letters of acceptance have been gratifying, and moreover, a few requests for revisions, or rejections, have tested my ego strength. Serving on the editorial board for 12 years and being co-editor for three years helped me keep track of what was happening in the field and kept my name in a prominent location. I feel fortunate to have worked with such quality people as the editors of the EAQ, including Dan Griffiths, Bryce Fogarty, Glenn Immegart, Rod Ogawa, Steve Bossert, and Gail Schneider.

Given the important opportunities that UCEA has afforded me, I am grateful to have been selected to receive this award. Finally, I want to thank my many colleagues in educational administration who have helped me over the years in critiquing my writings, even those with critical and post-modernist perspectives, those offering advice on a variety of topics, and the many of you who were just friendly and enjoined me in conversation. I want to thank my good friend Wayne Hoy for suggesting in 1972 that we co-author a book. My colleagues and friends at Kansas, Utah, and Michigan all helped me think about my work. I must mention Rich Hatley, Yvonna Lincoln, Betty Malen, Mike Murphy, Rod Ogawa, Steve Bossert, Ann Hart, Roald Campbell, David Sperry, Rich Kendell, Roger Goddard, and Brian Rowan. My recent Ph.D. graduates at Michigan helped me grow in new ways and include John Sipple, Julie McDaniell, Mengli Song, Tom Shepley, Jane Coggshall, and Tamara Young. And most importantly, Sue, my wife and best friend of 40 years, has helped me in so many ways that cannot be detailed here. Suffice it to say, I would not be here today receiving this award without unwavering support, assistance, and love.

Again, thank you. I am deeply touched and highly honored.
UCEA Announces 2007 Award Recipients

Leonard Burrello, Jay D. Scribner Mentoring Award Recipient

UCEA is pleased to recognize one of our profession's most beloved faculty members for this year's Jay D. Scribner Mentoring Award. The awards committee was quite impressed by the overwhelming outpouring of affection for this professor from former students. Educator after educator wrote in favor of this gentleman's nomination. They spoke of the profound impact he had on their academic and personal lives. They wrote about how his mentoring went well beyond his time as a student and continued into their professional careers. They mentioned his ongoing telephone check-ups, even decades after they had graduated, and described how he regularly challenged them to take their work and their careers to the next level. Most of all, they said in letter after letter that through his connections, his knowledge, his invitations to participate in various projects, and his unrelenting support, he literally gave them no choice but to be successful.

UCEA believes that this professor's work embodies the spirit behind the Jay D. Scribner Mentoring Award. Mentoring is difficult work but is critical to the development of effective school leaders and educational leadership faculty members. The socialization of educators into the world of academia, the encouragement of students to be more than they thought they could be, the provision of opportunities to be involved in meaningful projects, the support and guidance necessary to make it all work: this year's honoree does all of these things superbly and we are delighted to honor him today.

Meredith Honig & Suzanne Eckes, Jack A. Culbertson Award Recipients

Meredith Honig, University of Washington, and Suzanne Eckes, Indiana University, were honored with the 2007 Jack A. Culbertson Award. This award was established in 1982 in honor of UCEA's first full-time Executive Director, who retired in 1981 after serving 22 years in the position. The award is presented annually to an outstanding junior professor of educational administration in recognition of his/her contributions to the field.

Gary Crow & Colleen Capper, Recipients UCEA Master Professor Award

Gary Crow, Florida State University, and Colleen Capper, University of Wisconsin-Madison, received the UCEA Master Professor Award. The UCEA Master Professor award is given to an individual faculty member whose record (as indicated by the following characteristics) is so distinguished that the UCEA must recognize this individual in a significant and timely manner. The attributes of UCEA Master Professors include: have a sustained record as outstanding teachers, advisors, and mentors of students, developed a regional and national reputation as an educational leader and innovator, provided outstanding leadership in promoting and supporting diversity in faculty, students, staff, programs, and curriculum, and provided outstanding leadership in promoting and supporting diversity in faculty, students, staff, programs, and curriculum.

Lorraine Miller & David Strader, Paula Silver Case Award Recipients

Lorraine Miller, Duval County Public Schools, and David Strader, University of Texas-Arlington, are the co-recipients of the Paula Silver Case Award for 2007. The Paula Silver Case Award was instituted by UCEA in 1999 to memorialize the life and work of Paula Silver, a UCEA associate director and president-elect who made significant contributions to our program through excellence in scholarship, advocacy of women, and an inspired understanding of praxis. A sterling silver bowl is presented annually to the author(s) of the most outstanding case published during the last volume of the UCEA Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership.

Please join us in congratulating all of the 2007 UCEA award recipients!
UCEA Convention 2008 Call for Proposals
“Preparing Democratic Educational Leaders To Foster Quality Teaching
And Student Success: A Time For Action.”
Orlando, Florida   October 30 – November 2, 2008

I. General Information
The 22nd annual convention of the University Council for Educational Administration will be held at the Buena Vista Palace Hotel in Orlando, Florida. The convention will open at 5:00 p.m. on Thursday evening (October 30, 2008) and close at 1:00 p.m. on Sunday (November 2, 2008). The purpose of the 2008 UCEA Convention is to engage participants in discussing research, policy, and practice in educational leadership and administration. Members of the Convention 2008 Program Committee are James W. Koschoreck (University of Cincinnati), Floyd D. Beachum (University of Wisconsin – Milwaukee), and Jeffrey S. Brooks (Auburn University).

II. Theme
The 2008 Convention theme, “Preparing democratic educational leaders to foster quality teaching and student success: A time for action,” acknowledges the urgency for university professors and educational leaders to engage actively in the discourse around the preparation and development of educational leaders and the role of university-based leadership preparation programs.

As policy makers, business people, and the general public participate more in the discourse about the role of public education in a democratic society, we urge university professors and educational leaders to seek new ways to bring their knowledge and skills to the decision-making process rather than simply letting decisions about leadership and public education be made without their input. In this spirit, we invite all members of the UCEA community (1) to share their research and scholarly perspectives on these themes, (2) to offer new suggestions about how research and theory can inform the actual decision-making process at national, state, and local levels, and (3) to discuss insightful ways in which educational leadership can enhance academic excellence, equity, and social justice in P-20 educational contexts. We offer the following issues to stimulate the thinking of participants in the 2008 annual conference:

• How is educational leadership defined, developed, enacted and determined effective, and to what ends?
• What should leadership preparation look like over the next decade?
• What are the roles of university leadership preparation programs in preparing and developing democratic educational leaders?
• How can we advocate for these roles in conversations with national, state, and local policy makers?
• What are the implications of scholar-activism as it relates to educational research?
• As high quality university-based leadership preparation programs face more and more competition from low-quality, preparation options, what can program faculty do to strengthen our commitment to foster quality teaching?
• In what ways can we improve our leadership preparation practices in order to strengthen the promise of leadership's capacity to support student success?
• How can university leadership preparation programs assist educational leaders in developing P-20 schools and programs that value, promote and practice democracy, high quality, and diversity?
• How can program faculty take their collective voices from the university classrooms outside the world of academia in order to influence the direction of the public discourse on education?
• What should educational leaders be doing to prepare students for a technology suffused, globally interconnected future?

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 electronic 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 electronic copies of papers.

3. 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. Alternatively, the 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.
4. **Poster Session.** These sessions are intended for individualized discussions of one’s research and/or development projects. Like a paper session, poster session proposals must include a statement of purpose, rationale, findings, and conclusions. For research reports, also describe data sources and methods.

5. **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.

6. **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.

7. **International Community-Building Sessions.** 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. 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.

### IV. Criteria for Review of Proposals

All proposals will be subject to blind, peer review by three reviewers. The proposal must not include names of session organizers or presenters. Proposal evaluations will be based on:

1. Relevance of research problem/topic to the convention theme and/or broader discourse in the field.
2. Thoroughness and clarity of the proposal.
3. Theoretical framework, methods, and analysis (for empirical research).
4. The likelihood that the format of the session will support the purpose of the session (for conversations, innovative sessions, point-counterpoints, and symposia).

All proposals must be submitted electronically and will be reviewed electronically.

### V. Participation Guidelines and Proposal Deadlines

Anyone interested 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. The lead author of papers are required to upload an advance copy of their paper into the All Academic system through the UCEA Convention webpage three weeks prior to the convention. By submitting a proposal, the lead author of each proposal also agrees to serve as a reviewer. An author’s failure to live up to either of these commitments may result in his or her paper being removed from the convention program. Proposals must be received by Monday, May 5, 2008. All proposals must be submitted electronically at the link to be provided at the UCEA homepage, starting April 1, 2008 (http://www.ucea.org). Submission length must not exceed 3 single-spaced pages (2,000 words, 8,000 characters). References are required and must not exceed 1 single-spaced page (approximately, 400 words and 2,200 characters).

### VI. Participation Limits

To promote broad participation in the Annual Convention, an individual may not appear as first author on more than two proposals. In addition, an individual may not appear on the program more than four times in the role of presenter or participant. The participation limit does not include service as a chair or discussant, participation in invited sessions or any session connected with an UCEA headquarters, committees, publications.
UCEA Convention 2008

“Preparing Democratic Educational Leaders to Foster Quality Teaching and Student Success: A Time for Action”

Buena Vista Palace Hotel, Orlando, Florida, October 30 – November 2, 2008

This year, UCEA will meet in beautiful Orlando, Florida!

Situated on 27 scenic acres, The Buena Vista Palace Hotel & Spa is an extraordinary environment of magic and memories and a showplace of uncompromising quality and triumphant achievement. For two decades, this long-revered meeting site has built a reputation for comprehensive service and warmth. But in many ways, it’s one of the newest in Central Florida, with a recent multi-million renovation that put the resort on the cutting edge of event technology. Meeting groups, such as ours, can appreciate everything from the 90,000 square feet of flexible conference facilities to the pampering pleasures of a European-style spa to the extraordinary cuisine to the magnificent sunset views. You can also enjoy the allure of the Walt Disney World® Resort, the excitement of championship golf, and the luxury of a cold spritz from the pool concierge. The Buena Vista Palace is the place to be in Orlando!

You’ll find every comfort inside the hotel. Their guest rooms are beautifully detailed—with thoughtful touches like pillowtop mattresses, Golden Door® toiletries, and private balconies. Business is a pleasure in a room that performs. We’ve thought of everything—wired and wireless high-speed Internet access, ergonomic work chairs, large well-lighted work areas, in-room safes, and cordless two-line phones with voicemail and extra long cord. Most rooms offer a private patio or balcony for enjoying the fabulous Florida sunshine. The Buena Vista Palace also accommodates non-smoking, special needs, and environmentally sensitive guests who appreciate individual filtering systems, non-dyed linens, and non-allergenic bedding.

Dining options at the Buena Vista Palace are wonderfully diverse. Guests can enjoy Outback Restaurant featuring a “Down Under” setting with Florida’s finest seafood and hearty steaks prepared on an open-hearth grill. The Mediterranean-style Watercress Café offers not only casual dining by the lake, but also the fun of meeting favorite Disney friends at the Disney Character Breakfast Buffet every Sunday. For a simple meal or quick snack, the Watercress Pastry Shop & Mini Market provides fresh baked goods and gourmet coffees. And for refreshing tropical drinks or convenient poolside snack, the Shipwrecked Pool Bar and Castaway Grill are favorite choices. The Lobby Lounge is an ideal place to gather for cocktails with live piano music. The Top of the Palace Lounge lights up each night to sensational sunsets and birds-eye view of the area’s dazzling fireworks displays.

With an exclusive address inside the Walt Disney World Resort, the Buena Vista Palace offers an enticing variety of opportunities and attractions. Soaring 27 stories above the world’s greatest destination, the Buena Vista Palace is located in the heart of the shops and restaurants, exhilarating nighttime fun and dazzling entertainment options of the Downtown Disney® Marketplace, Pleasure Island, and West Side. Four Disney Theme Parks and two water parks are a quick, complimentary shuttle away.

The Buena Vista Palace makes every event as magical as the kingdom where wishes come true. For more hotel information, please visit http://www.buenavistapalace.com
UCEA Call for Convention 2008 Volunteers

If you are interested in serving as a Proposal Reviewer, a Session Chair, or a Session Discussant for the UCEA Convention 2008, please complete the following form and return it to UCEA. The UCEA Convention Planning Committee will use these forms to identify potential reviewers, chairs, and discussants. Only university faculty may serve in the above capacities. Please print legibly.

Return this form to UCEA by mailing or fax:
Christopher Ruggeri, UCEA, University of Texas at Austin, 1 University Station-D5400, Austin, TX 78712, Fax: 512-471-5975

Name ____________________________________________________________

Academic Title ____________________________________________________

Department/Program ______________________________________________

Institution ________________________________________________________

Address __________________________________________________________

City/State/ZIP _____________________________________________________

E-mail _____________________________________________________________ Tel. __________________

I am interested in serving as:
___ Proposal Reviewer for UCEA Convention 2008. Please note all proposals for the Convention will be submitted and reviewed electronically.
___ Session Chair for UCEA Convention 2008
___ Session Discussant for UCEA Convention 2008

Have you served UCEA in one of the above capacities in previous years? ___yes ___no

Deadline for consideration as a Proposal Reviewer is May 5th.
Deadline for consideration as a Session Chair or Session Discussant is June 1st.
Contributing to the UCEA Review

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

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

Feature Editor:
Rose 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
Laura McNeal (Georgia State University)
lmcneal@gsu.edu

Point-Counterpoint Editor:
Jeffrey S. Brooks (Florida State University)
jbrooks@coe.fsu.edu

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

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

2008 Calendar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 28-29, 2008</td>
<td>David L. Clark Graduate Research Seminar New York, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May/June 2008</td>
<td>National Policy Board in Educational Administration Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 30 - July 1, 2008</td>
<td>ECS National Policy Forum Austin, TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 26-29, 2008</td>
<td>National Council for Professors of Educational Administration Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October, 2008</td>
<td>2008 UCEA Center for Leadership and Ethics Conference Victoria, BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 28-30, 2008</td>
<td>UCEA Governance Meetings Orlando, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 30- November 2, 2008</td>
<td>UCEA Convention 2008 Orlando, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 30- November 2, 2008</td>
<td>UCEA Graduate Student Symposium Orlando, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 10, 2008</td>
<td>Nominations due for the David L. Clark Graduate Student Research Seminar UCEA, HQ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UCEA Review

The UCEA Review is published three times a year (winter, summer, fall) and distributed as a membership benefit by the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA). Address changes and other corrections should be sent to UCEA at the above address.

Michelle D. Young.................................Executive Director
Bruce Barnett......................................Associate Director of International Initiatives
Catherine Lugg...............Associate Director of Publications
Scott McLeod...........Associate Director of Communications
Linda Tillman.....................................Associate Director of Graduate Student Development
Julian Vasquez Heilig...............Associate Director of Program Centers
Edwin Sharpe.........................Senior Advisor
Christopher A. Ruggeri...............Events Manager
Lisa Wright, CPA................Financial Manager
Bradley Carpenter...............Graduate Assistant
Pei-Ling Lee.................................Graduate Assistant
Katherine Mansfield...............Graduate Assistant