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Any profession that has no control over the methods by which its members are evaluated is a profession destined for impotence. Sadly, at least in the United States, education is such a profession. Although students’ test performances increasingly serve as the chief criterion by which the nation’s teachers and administrators are judged, what most American educators know about educational assessment would fit, with room to spare, in a kindergarten child’s lunch pail.

It is understandable that educators who have never been formally trained regarding assessment would know little about it. Yet, given the significance of students’ test scores these days, teachers and administrators who choose to remain unaware of assessment’s key concepts are being dangerously na"ive.

This is because significant choices regarding the kinds of tests to be used in evaluating our schools are choices made by those who know at least something about educational assessment. Regrettably, school leaders who are not knowledgeable regarding assessment rarely will have a seat at the decision-making table when judgments are made about which tests to adopt or how those tests’ results should be used. After all, why invite people to any decision-making deliberation who know naught about what’s being considered?

What Is Assessment Literacy?

What, then, is assessment literacy—this commodity today’s educational leaders so desperately need? Well, here’s what most people mean when they refer to someone who is assessment literate:

An educator is assessment literate who understands the fundamental measurement concepts most relevant to the way we operate and evaluate our schools. Possession of assessment literacy does not signify that someone actually must be able to carry out the procedures associated with such concepts—only to understand those concepts.

In other words, an assessment-literate educator must be sufficiently familiar with the most significant measurement concepts so, at a meaningful level of understanding, that educator comprehends the essence of those concepts. For instance, if a school superintendent were asked by a member of the district’s school board to explain the nature of “assessment validity,” an assessment-literate superintendent would possess a sufficiently clear understanding of validity to accurately describe its chief features to the board member.

Similarly, suppose a reporter from a local newspaper asks a school principal to explain what’s meant when someone says, “This test is aligned with the state’s curricular aims it is intended to measure.” Clearly, the principal needs to understand the nature of curricular alignment well enough to supply a sensible explanation to the reporter.

Classroom teachers are not exempt from the need to be assessment literate. Suppose, at a back-to-school night, a parent poses the altogether reason-
Astonishingly, the annually administered standardized tests now routinely administered in all states.

When students’ scores on yearly accountability tests are employed to determine how successful a school’s educators have been, it is assumed that higher test scores by students reflect effective teaching, whereas lower test scores signify teaching that has been less than terrific. It is assumed, in short, that the accountability tests being used are capable of distinguishing between well-taught and badly taught students. In almost all of our 50 states, however, this assumption is definitely unwarranted. State accountability tests, with few exceptions, are not capable of distinguishing between effectively and ineffectively taught students. State accountability tests, with few exceptions, actually measure the composition of the student body in a given school—not the caliber of instruction those students have received. This is because state accountability tests, with few exceptions, are instructionally insensitive.

To look more carefully at this concept called instructional sensitivity, let’s start with a definition:

Instructional sensitivity is the degree to which students’ performances on a test accurately reflect the quality of instruction specifically provided to promote students’ mastery of what is being assessed.

As you can see, an accountability test would be instructionally sensitive if, after students have been taught well, they score high on the test—whereas, when students have not been taught well, they score low on the test. You might be thinking that such is currently the case. You might believe that state-level accountability tests are, in fact, capable of distinguishing between effectively and ineffectively taught students. If this is what you’re thinking, you would be categorically wrong. Here’s why.

Astonishingly, the annually administered standardized tests used as part of all states’ accountability systems are accompanied by no evidence—none at all—that these tests can tell the difference between students who have been taught well and students who haven’t. That’s right, there is no documentation to show that these remarkably influential accountability tests are instructionally sensi-
Many students in schools serving affluent youngsters get instructionally shortchanged because it is believed they are being taught better than is actually the case. In far too many schools serving high-SES students, many students fall far short of their potential because instructionally insensitive accountability tests are sending a flagrant false-positive message. Ineffective instructional practices will not be excised because those practices are never seen for what they are: wretched!

Reducing Instructional Insensitivity

All right, let's agree that—at least for purposes of evaluating educators’ success—instructionally insensitive tests are unhelpful. How can we be assured that the tests we use for evaluating our schools are as instructionally sensitive as we can make them? Well, we can employ the same two-pronged process that we've been using for the past few decades to reduce the number of biased items found on educational tests, namely, a judgmental item-identification procedure coupled with an empirical item-identification procedure.

In short, we simply lift the procedures we use in dealing with assessment bias and then lay them onto the task of reducing the instructional sensitivity of accountability tests. What we want to get rid of are instructionally insensitive items. If an accountability test contains few such insensitive items, the test itself is likely to be instructionally sensitive.

Judgmentally, when dealing with assessment bias, we assemble a bias-review committee of educators (and, possibly, noneducators) representing the student groups on whom assessment bias might be having a negative impact. For instance, we establish a bias-review committee consisting of males and females, African Americans, Hispanic Americans, and Native Americans, and then ask those committee members to consider each potential item on a high-stakes test in an effort to identify any item that might offend or unfairly penalize students because of those test-takers' personal characteristics. Empirically, we analyze actual test results to discern if there are disparities in the performances of various subgroups on particular items so that we can scrutinize such items more carefully for potential assessment bias and, if necessary, jettison any offending items.

Well, remember the degree to which a test is instructionally insensitive will be directly related to the number of items on the test that are instructionally insensitive. We can apply the same two-pronged procedure we use when trying to reduce assessment bias. More specifically, we can establish a review committee of educators whose members render a judgment for every single item on an accountability test by answering “yes” or “no” to a review question such as this one:

If a teacher has provided reasonably effective instruction related to the specific curricular aim the test's developers indicate is measured by this item, is it likely that a substantial majority of the teacher's students will respond correctly to the item?

As you can see, if a test is going to be instructionally sensitive, a review group should be coming up with very few items for which most reviewers answer “no” to such a review question. Items regarded as instructionally insensitive by a properly oriented and thoughtful committee of educators should be removed from any test whose function is to appraise instructional success.

But, as was true with assessment bias, a judgmental detection
strategy can be buttressed with an empirical approach. In order to identify test items that are potentially unable to discriminate between well-taught and poorly taught students, one approach would be to identify two groups of teachers, one group deemed particularly effective and one group regarded as less than stellar. All we need to do is to see if there are items for which students of the more stellar teachers do no better than students of the less stellar teachers. Such items would be regarded as instructionally insensitive. On the other hand, items that are answered correctly more often by students of highly competent teachers than by students taught by less effective teachers would be seen as instructionally sensitive items.

How would we go about identifying a set of stronger and weaker teachers? Well, one straightforward way of doing so could be used in any setting where students in adjacent grade levels complete tests measuring the same curricular aim, for instance, a content standard focused on students’ skill in detecting the main idea of a multiparagraph reading selection. Well, if students at one grade (let’s call it Year 1) fail to earn proficient scores on the state test measuring this skill but in the subsequent grade (Year 2) earn proficient scores, it seems that—at least for this particular skill—selected teachers in Year 2 (the teachers who bumped lots of kids from nonproficient to proficient) can be regarded as effective. Conversely, teachers who were unable to promote increased numbers of proficient students on a particular skill would be regarded—on that particular skill—as less effective.

Having identified our group of stronger and weaker teachers (all of this identifying can be accomplished by using extant state test-score data), we then can identify items on the state test that are unable to differentiate between students—on that specific skill—taught by stronger and weaker teachers. Such nondifferentiating items can be removed from any test whose mission is to help evaluate the quality of teachers’ instruction.

There are other ways of identifying stronger and weaker teachers, of course, but an approach to this task based on the analysis of students’ already collected test scores is appealing because it avoids any need to intrude on teachers’ ongoing instruction. What’s most important, however, is to recognize that, just as we saw with the isolation and elimination of items containing assessment bias, in the case of instructional insensitivity we can rely on both judgmental and empirical methods to spot insensitive items. Fewer instructionally insensitive items on high-stakes tests mean that we will be using tests more likely to accurately identify strong and weak instruction.

Back to Assessment Literacy

Okay, you’ve taken a quick tour regarding the highlights of instructional sensitivity and why it must be present when we use test scores to evaluate educators’ success. Clearly, school leaders who know nothing about instructional sensitivity are apt to find themselves behind a test-score eight ball but not know how they got there. But the instructional sensitivity of accountability tests is only one of several assessment concepts that can splash rain on a school leader’s parade. School leaders need to understand all the assessment constructs that, if misunderstood, can interfere with educationally sound decision making.

For example, during the past several decades, researchers have assembled a boatload of empirical evidence that the formative-assessment process, if used appropriately, will have a dramatically positive impact on kids’ learning. School leaders need to understand what formative assessment is, what it isn’t, and why it’s almost immoral that more teachers aren’t using it. Several recent books do a first-rate job in spelling out the nature and nurture of formative assessment, such as Heritage (2010) and Andrade and Cizek (2010). Other truly important assessment notions deal with the accuracy of educational tests; the use of affective assessment instruments; and the need for rigorously aligning curricular aims, assessment instruments, and the instructional experiences we provide for our students.

And how do school leaders become assessment literate, especially those individuals who are already credentialed and on the job? For openers, there are books to be read. It really does not take all that much time spent with books such as those listed below to get on top of what such volumes have to offer. Book study with colleagues, perhaps as part of a small study group or an extended-duration learning community, is another option. Of course, some colleges and universities offer courses in educational assessment. However, if you are shopping for such courses, make sure you don’t sign up for a measurement course steeped in traditional psychometrics. What today’s school leaders need is conversance with approaches to assessment more in tune with today’s instructional and evaluative needs. Same-old, same-old testing theory won’t help much. If the measurement courses being offered at a nearby institution, or online, aren’t dominated by modern, make-a-real-world-difference content, don’t waste your time with them.

In the final analysis, if you are a school leader, or you aspire to be one, you simply must become sufficiently assessment literate to fulfill your potential. Key assessment-related ideas exist that, if you do not understand them, will prevent you from doing a good job for your students. Please don’t let this happen.
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From the Director:
Why Not Use Research to Inform Leadership Certification and Program Approval?

Michelle D. Young

Within the last five years, researchers in the field of educational leadership have made tremendous progress in understanding the features of university-based leadership preparation programs that are associated with effective leadership practice (Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, Meyerson, Orr, & Cohen, 2007). Similarly, a growing body of empirical evidence demonstrates that the quality of leadership provided by school and district leaders is highly dependent on the quality of their preparation experiences (Browne-Ferrigno & Sho ho, 2004; Orr & Barber, 2007). In response, increasing numbers of educational leadership programs, particularly those in UCEA institutions, are engaged in revising their programs to reflect these new research findings and to make their programs more efficacious for the leaders they prepare.

All of this makes sense, of course; in order to have quality leaders we must have quality leadership preparation for current and future educational leaders. Interestingly, little of this research has found its way into state preparation program approval or leadership certification and licensure requirements. Indeed, most states have fairly ineffectual preparation program accreditation requirements, making it easy for weak programs to produce hundreds, and in some cases thousands, of underprepared candidates for school leadership positions. Furthermore, the last few months have been witness to the termination and/or suspension of educational leadership programs within universities—prominent programs known for the quality and impact of their preparation.

It also makes sense that programs would make thoughtful use of the growing body of research on the features of effective preparation, which are highlighted in the sidebar, within their own programs (Darling-Hammond et al., 2007). It also makes sense that state-level educational policymakers and leaders use this research to guide their program approval and certification work and that university leaders increase their awareness of and commitment to preserving high-quality leadership development programs.

There are over 460 university-based leadership preparation programs and countless alternative certification programs in the United States (Baker, Orr, & Young, 2007). Wide disparity exists in these programs along the following elements:

1. Quality—not all programs have incorporated all or most of the features associated with effective leadership practice.
2. Productivity (e.g., in 2008 one program in Texas had close to 2,700 candidates enrolled, while another enrolled only 39).
3. Postprogram placement of graduates into leadership positions (approximately 60% of graduates take some kind of leadership position, but less than 33% become principals). Placement rates vary by program, with some programs having larger placement rates than others over the long term (Fuller & Young, 2009).

Moreover, recent research by Fuller, Young, and Baker (in press) on the link between preparation and practice in Texas reveals that preparation delivered by programs housed in research and doctoral institutions prepare more effective principals than those programs housed at regional institutions. Specifically, principals prepared by programs housed at research and doctoral institutions are more effective in improving the overall qualifications of the team of teachers on a campus, suggesting a positive programmatic or resource effect of preparation programs housed by research and doctoral institutions.

Regardless of the positive link between the preparation provided in research and doctoral institutions and their graduates’ practice within schools, research institutions are playing a smaller role in such preparation (Baker et al., 2007), and leadership programs in research institutions continue to show up on university lists for potential closure. In some cases states are requiring that universities scrutinize programs according to measures like the number of students, number of graduates, and the average cost per student (Glenn & Schmidt, 2010), none of which is an accurate measure of quality.

Meanwhile at the state level, research isn’t being brought to bear in the areas of program approval or licensure. Most states require that program content aligns to the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards or a set of state standards for school leader practice. Programs are judged according to measures like the number of students who pass state certification exams. However, there is little evidence that states are using the research on program features or that significant attention is being paid to graduate placement rates into leadership preparation programs.

As is the case in other professional fields, state licensure or certification has been used in the field of education to ensure that all individuals taking positions as school or district leaders have a baseline competency level (Young, Crow, Murphy, & Ogawa, 2009). With few exceptions (e.g., Michigan, South Dakota), states within the U.S. require principals to be certified or to obtain a license to lead a school (Murphy, Moorman, & McCarthy, 2008). This continues to be
the trend, even in light of evidence that certification tests do not predict leadership practice. Pencil-and-paper tests continue to be measures of knowledge, rather than measures of one’s ability to effectively apply knowledge within a leadership position. The latter requires much more serious, resource-intensive performance assessments.

Another interesting development worth noting is the disentanglement of graduate work and teaching background from leadership licensure. Historically, obtaining such a license required teaching experience, the completion of graduate-level preparation in educational leadership, and formal licensure or certification testing. According to Roach, Smith, and Boutin (in press), the requirement for testing is still quite strong, with 35 states requiring assessment for the initial building leader license, including 11 states that require a portfolio assessment. However, over the last decade, state policymakers have begun to extricate licensure and certification from graduate-level coursework. According to Roach and Cohen (2002), these policy changes were spurred by the development of alternative-route certification programs within and by states and local education agencies. In fact, six states (AL, CA, MA, MS, OK, VA) provide alternative licensure for school administrators.

There are alternatives to current trends, alternatives that involve thoughtful investments in the future of educational leadership in states and the nation. For example, research could be used to inform decisions regarding educational leadership programming and state certification. In fact, it makes sense that states would work with educational leaders as well as university professors who are engaged in research on leadership evaluation and development to develop and implement a quality assurance system for the preparation of educational leaders. Ample resources could be tapped in such efforts, including the recently published Handbook of Research on the Education of School Leaders (Young et al., 2009), which provides a meta-analysis of research on leadership preparation and professional development, including separate chapters on curriculum, pedagogy, practical experiences, and so on.

Within such quality assurance systems, it would be important to consider both what happens in the program as well as what occurs as a result of the program. For example, requiring leadership preparation programs to incorporate research-based features that link quality preparation to quality practice would be important. This would help to ensure that programs not only had strong curricular content delivered by knowledgeable faculty, but also used field placements and powerful learning experiences to ensure that leaders could effectively apply knowledge and theory in their practice. Within such quality assurance systems, it also would be important to ensure that leadership preparation programs are participating in effective program evaluation efforts that can inform program improvement. The efforts of the National Center for the Evaluation of Educational Leadership Preparation and Practice (www.edleaderprep.org) should be considered an important resource in such systems. This center provides evaluation technical assistance and tools, such as surveys on program features and leadership practice from the perspective of leaders and teachers, and provides a comparative source of evidence on program outcomes. Finally, within such quality assurance systems, consideration should be given to more robust measures of program impact, such as leader performance assessments and graduate placement data.
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The Certification Wars
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Many might say that an ideological war is raging in and around the educational leadership preparation field, encompassing debates and even “battles” over what leaders should be prepared to do, who can lead, and who can best prepare them. The outcomes of these battles are being played out in district, state, and federal policies and, in some cases, shaped by private funders. Leadership preparation programs can either participate or react. Ignoring these battles, however, is not an option, as they are dramatically shifting the role of universities and their centrality in preparing school leaders.

Almost from our field’s inception, schools of education and their role in the leadership preparation field have been criticized, often by the field itself, over relevance, content, and effectiveness (Griffiths, Stout, & Forsyth, 1988; McCarthy, 1999; McCarthy & Forsyth, 2009; Murphy, 2002; Murphy & Forsyth, 1999). In recent years, however, critics from outside the field have advocated for new approaches and strongly questioned the capacity of schools of education to reform their own programs.

Our own research lies at the heart of these criticisms. We have argued and now demonstrated that quality and effectiveness of school leaders make a difference in school culture, teacher quality, and gain in student learning (see, e.g., Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004; Robinson, Lloyd, & Rowe, 2008; Sweetland & Hoy, 2000). More recently, we have shown that how leaders are prepared is related to the effectiveness of their leadership practices and school improvement work (Darling-Hammond, Meyerson, La Pointe, & Orr, 2009; Orr & Orphanos, in press; Tschannen-Moran & Gareis, 2005). Not surprising then, policymakers and funders have been quick to conclude—as many of our research implications have argued—that more widespread adoption of more effective preparation approaches can improve the quality of leaders and the effectiveness of schools. Conversely, such findings suggest (and some policymakers are quick to conclude) that the ineffectiveness of conventional leadership preparation programs contributes to schools’ poor progress. Thus, changing leadership preparation programs has become an important policy investment to improve schools (Frye, O’Neill, & Bottoms, 2006; Shelton, 2009).

Influences on the Content of Leadership Preparation

Initially, the leadership preparation debates were most intensively argued around the same issues that were central to leadership research: what is most essential among leaders’ skills and practices and how these should form the basis of preparation. Beginning in the mid-1990s, experts, researchers, and policymakers addressed this question and struggled over the form and content of national leadership standards and their adoption by states, districts, and accrediting institutions to influence university-based preparation. Yet, even after the Interstate School Leadership Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards were adopted in 1996, debates over the validity and use continued within the field, focusing on the standards’ sufficiency and assumptions about leadership (Anderson, 2001; English, 2006; Murphy, 2005; Young & Creighton, 2002). Nonetheless, these standards became a vehicle to recenter the preparation of leaders nationally around their educational role and away from a theory–practice content divide, which had focused more on principals’ managerial role and application of social science theories to optimize organizational effectiveness.

Out of the ISLLC standards work grew considerable state policy action, fueled by the work of the consortium members, particularly the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), which promoted the standards and reported on state adoption trends. By 2006, 43 states were using the national ISLLC standards or standards modeled on them (Toye, Blank, Sanders, & Williams, 2007). During the early 2000s, schools and districts were being held accountable for student performance, making effective leadership even more urgently needed. Consequently, national organizations and state policymakers took further steps to shift the field’s focus toward revisiting the principalship and ensuring that school leaders became and remained effective, with greater attention to accountability for improved student achievement.

States are encouraged to use a variety of policy levers to increase leader quality. The CCSSO, in collaboration with state education agencies, created a policy framework that defined the range of state policy options and how states could “realign and prioritize administrators’ roles and responsibilities to focus on improving teaching and learning” (Sanders & Simpson, 2006, p. i). Their framework’s five key state policy levers are (a) tiered certification for continuous improvement, (b) leadership standards and performance-based measures, (c) criteria for accrediting administrator preparation programs, (d) criteria for professional development, and (e) state accountability and reporting for administrator quality. State adoption of these policy strategies, in turn, shifts the leadership preparation debate from one over a national set of standards to multiple, state-based changes in how leaders are prepared, selected, and evaluated. Moreover, current calls for policy reform, strongly promoted in several states through Wallace Foundation grants for this purpose, stressed the coherent use of all these policy levers and alignment with national or state-defined standards. Taken together, these policies reinforced a more focused set of expectations for preparation program content—either directly in adhering to standards for program accreditation eligibility or indirectly through graduates’ licensure eligibility, state leadership assessments, and administrator evaluation.

The CCSSO, the Education Commission of the States, and the National Conference of State Legislatures track states’ new policies in these five areas, although no new comparative reports have been published since 2007. Nonetheless, by 2006, considerable change already had taken place, with direct implications for the content of leadership preparation: 31 states differentiated certification policies and standards by administrative role, and 33 states required state assessments for initial certification (with many having recently modified or updated their assessments), including 25 states that required the Educational Testing Service school leadership assessment (Toye et al., 2007). In addition, 17 states reported using assessment results to monitor preparation programs leading to certification, and a few used them for principal evaluation or induction programs.

Finally, some states have policies that directly address program content. This includes requiring completion of a leadership preparation program as a certification requirement (31 states) or a master’s degree (45 states). In addition, some states specify the
nature of preparation, particularly including requiring a supervised internship and defining the hours to be completed (27 states). The Southern Regional Education Board has encouraged 16 southern states to prescribe program content expectations, based on their critical success factors for leaders (Jacobson, O’Neill, Fry, Hill, & Bottoms, 2002). Most recently, some states, such as Alabama, Kentucky, and North Carolina, have become highly prescriptive about program content and features, requiring schools of education to close their existing programs and reapply for accreditation using detailed guidelines and regulations aimed at connecting preparation to leadership for improved student achievement.

Candidate Eligibility

A second debate centers on candidate eligibility and who is qualified to be a school leader. The overarching concern is that the leadership preparation field should not graduate (and recommend for leadership licensure or certification) individuals who are ill equipped to lead schools. Given the large numbers of leadership program graduate who never advance to leadership positions, the perceived overproduction of graduates, and the mediocre to poor performance of many schools, many critics complained that leadership preparation programs are not sufficiently discriminat- ing in their admissions practices and serve as “cash cows” for their institutions by having low admissions standards and high enrollments. Regardless of the veracity of these criticisms, three issues are inherent:

1. What initial candidate qualifications contribute to leadership readiness?
2. Should leadership preparation programs focus narrowly on training for specific leadership positions (i.e., assistant principal and principal) or on educational leadership more broadly?
3. How skilled (as school leaders) should candidates be when they have completed a graduate leadership program?

The role of public dollars in supporting the attainment of leadership preparation, proposing its elimination, or offering alternative pathways to leadership is a question of the relevance of education and educational leadership knowledge and skill development. The states that do not require a master’s degree in education or leadership preparation, propose its elimination, or offer alternative pathways to noneducators to be eligible for school and district leadership positions reflect this assumption. Their actions reinforce the idea of programs’ instrumentality as levers for districts and states to effect school change through production of leaders. This shift can be heard in the harsh criticisms that cite the number of certified individuals who never become school leaders and the disparaging remarks that dichotomize candidates as either being serious about becoming a school leader or simply completing the degree to gain a salary increase. By reframing programs as being only for those who are committed to school leader careers, critics purposefully tighten the connection between preparation and practice. But, they ignore the interests of educational benefits for a large percentage of program graduates who may pursue leadership degrees to become better teachers and teacher leaders or seek non-supervisory roles in school improvement, professional development, or curriculum and instruction. Finally, they suggest that leadership career commitment should exist before entering preparation, rather than being developed through preparation, as is more often the case.

Related to this debate are rising performance expectations of candidates as they become new leaders. Some critics, policymakers, and funders argue that graduates of leadership preparation programs should be able to quickly influence student learning once they became school leaders and call for evaluation results that track rapid career advancement to principal positions and student achievement gains after 1–2 years. In contrast, some recent state policy action acknowledges that leader readiness and effectiveness are developmental and grow as new leaders gain experience. Fortunately, some states recognize this developmental process and are shifting to professional licenses that must be renewed and are adding licensure tiers and qualification expectations to differentiate novice from experienced leaders with demonstrated skill and proficiency. Some states added continued professional learning as part of maintaining licensure.

Finally, cutting across the debates over who is most qualified to lead schools is a question of the relevance of education and educational leadership knowledge and skill development. The states that do not require a master’s degree in education or leadership preparation, propose its elimination, or offer alternative pathways to noneducators to be eligible for school and district leadership positions reflect this assumption. Their actions reinforce the idea
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that selection based on generic leadership qualities, rather than the quality of leadership preparation, matters most to leader effectiveness.

The Institutions That Prepare Leaders

The third major debate challenging our field is over what types of institutions can best prepare educational leaders, particularly given current demands for leadership to improve student learning. This debate encompasses questions on whether university-based programs should be responsible for leadership preparation, whether they can reform themselves to become more effective, and the types of programs that should be eligible to prepare school leaders. Some critics, policymakers, and funders, while agreeing that preparation makes a difference, argue that existing preparation programs have contributed to poor gains nationally in student achievement and lack the capacity to be part of the solution. They argue further that higher education institutions cannot make necessary changes to produce candidates who are ready to lead challenging schools. Some propose that alternative providers, new to the field, would be better positioned to design and deliver more efficacious programs, and national foundations such as Broad and Wallace have enabled their development.

Such arguments are part of a larger landscape to reform education by providing entrance for new providers and reframing the marketplace. Specifically, these arguments have been used similarly to advocate for charter schools and choice as alternatives for underperforming public schools. But research has shown that these alternatives primarily diversify the field, rather than bringing programmatic innovation (Lubienski, 2003). Their organizational innovations are supported by policy options that are not available to public K–12 schools.

Early experience with alternative providers in the leadership preparation field, like New Leaders for New Schools, shows similar patterns. Their access to external funding and district support enables them to offer paid, full-time internships and more competitive candidate selection (see www.nlns.org for a description of their program and candidate selection). Often, alternative providers like New Leaders for New Schools and the New York City Leadership Academy, another highly regarded alternative program, incorporate content and approaches drawn from exemplary university-based programs (e.g., the problem-based learning approach; Bridges & Hallinger, 1997). These providers rely on university partners, without public acknowledgement, for instructors and graduate credit validation to enable graduates to meet state licensure requirements. Like charter schools, alternative leadership preparation providers often are able to operate without policy constraints, such as accreditation requirements, that higher education institutions have.

Finally, a related issue centers on expectations for university preparation program eligibility. Some states use state requirements and national accreditation and evaluation processes for university-based programs to uphold standards for quality leadership preparation content and candidate outcomes. Yet, other states eschew such requirements and provide little oversight on candidate selection criteria, program content, faculty qualifications, or delivery methods. Consequently, such states are enabling some university-based programs to prepare large numbers of candidates with little attention to standards or program quality and are skewing the available candidate pool toward less well-prepared individuals, adding validity to criticisms of the field.

Escalation

These debates and state policy responses have escalated recently, with strong federal (and even foundation) incentives for several states to adopt policies to improve the quality and effectiveness of school leaders. Now, federal funding, particularly through the Race to the Top program, is stressing three policy levers to improve preparation quality: (a) holding programs publicly accountable (by creating state data systems that publish findings linking programs’ graduates to their career and school improvement outcomes), (b) encouraging competition through the inclusion of alternative providers, and (c) funding model approaches to prepare leaders for the lowest performing schools based on prior evidence of effectiveness. Most states are taking steps in one or more of these areas, despite little chance of winning the federal Race to the Top grant funds. Moreover, these strategies are being proposed as part of the federal reauthorization of the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (U.S. Department of Education, 2010), guaranteeing even swifter, more comprehensive changes to the leadership preparation landscape and the field as whole.

Threaded throughout these policy proposals is increased program accountability, tied to measures of graduates’ career and leadership outcomes and evaluation studies of program model effectiveness. Now, more than ever, the future of our individual programs and our field generally is dependent upon our capacity to demonstrate the effectiveness of our approaches to leadership preparation. Moreover, competition for candidates and program support is coming from new sectors and threatens to crowd us out by entities that are more nimble in garnering district support, marshalling public and private support, and publicizing claims of effectiveness (see www.nlns.org for their recent history and publicity as an example).

Implications

Such policy debates and escalating action call for strong response from university-based leadership preparation programs.

1. First, be responsive to these policy debates both locally and nationally and be ready to participate in them.

2. Be proactive—advocate, both individually and collectively (at the federal, state, and local levels) for policies and practices that strengthen university-based preparation programs’ capacity to produce leaders who can support local school improvement. This means that local programs should engage in proposing policies and requesting funds to improve program quality, particularly for paid internships and program accreditation requirements that ensure common standards for all programs.

3. Evaluate and publicize the results of our programs’ effectiveness in preparing candidates who advance to leadership positions and their impact on student learning, to demonstrate our quality while framing more realistic expectations for graduates’ career advancement and capacity to effect timely school change.

4. Take a systemic view to new and existing state and local policies for both preparation and principal evaluation. Use such a
perspective to understand their interrelatedness, engage with other stakeholder groups, and identify implications for better leadership preparation.

5. Educate state and federal policymakers about the features of quality leadership preparation and the development of leaders who can successfully improve student achievement, particularly for low-performing schools.

6. Finally, make research on the relationship between preparation and leadership practice a priority for us to continue to investigate how to improve program quality and the leadership efficacy of our graduates.

Working together, we can make our programs’ effectiveness more explicit and add our expertise to determining how policy investments in leadership preparation can yield improved student outcomes. The national network of university-based leadership preparation programs is a resource to be harnessed, not squandered through capricious or ill-informed policy action. It is our responsibility to take the lead, however, and not wait to respond to the consequences.
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**UCEA is now on Facebook**

www.facebook.com

Search for UCEA

Search for Barbara L. Jackson Scholars

Search for UCEA Convention, a Facebook Event
Innovative Programs:

Ed.D. in Urban Education Leadership at the University of Illinois at Chicago

Liz Hollingworth
University of Iowa

The College of Education at the University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC) offers an innovative doctoral program in Urban Education Leadership for talented teachers and school leaders who aspire to transform low-performing urban schools into effective learning environments for students and teachers. Led by the Educational Policy Studies Department with the support of faculty from Educational Psychology and Curriculum and Instruction, this 5-year cohort program prepares system and school leaders who are committed to a sustained immersion in the theory and practice of addressing the challenges of urban education. Performance outcomes, designed in collaboration with transformative principals from Chicago Public Schools (CPS), are achieved through an integration of doctoral coursework and at least 3 years of supervised leadership experiences, from internship to novice principalship. Candidates assume school or system leadership roles after a full year, receive paid administrative residency early in the program, and then receive coaching and mentoring support until the degree is completed.

Steve Tozer, Professor in Policy Studies in the College of Education at UIC, co-founded the program with his colleagues. He believes that the educational leadership profession is historically where the medical profession was between 1910 and 1920:

There were too many medical schools of poor quality. Abraham Flexner wrote the “Flexner Report,” arguing for higher selectivity in program admissions, extensive clinical experience supervised by practicing professionals, ongoing working relationships with hospitals and clinics, and new staffing patterns so that practicing professionals had a significant place in the preparation program.

Tozer described the UIC approach to a new school leadership preparation paradigm, where school districts need to be a part of the planning and we need to do it together—so the district is a partner, not just a consumer. Outstanding practitioners need to be part of the partnership staff so they have a role in implementing, creating curriculum, and assessing students.

Most importantly, the clinical faculty must be “outstanding principals who have turned around schools.”

From its initial design in 2002–2003, the partnership with CPS sought to achieve two things: (a) provide principals who dramatically improve student learning in high-need schools and (b) demonstrate that the substantial school leadership resources currently being used in higher education can be converted to a model that will reliably produce such principals. According to Tozer, “The critical idea is that transformative principals are not just born, but can be developed at scale, and higher education is the only place with the resources to make it happen.”

All aspects of the program (student and faculty selection, curriculum, course syllabi, practicum assignments, student assessments, and final dissertation) are aligned to the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium, National Association for Secondary School Principals, and CPS Principal Competencies.

The CPS and UIC school–university partnership is one in which preK–12 students, as much as the candidates for the leadership certificate, are the primary clientele to be served. The model is therefore (a) highly selective in admissions and in program completion, (b) clinically intensive, and (c) aggressive in employing the highest performing retiring principals in CPS to work as full-time coaches to prepare leaders for the highest need schools in the system.

Of the first 76 UIC candidates to complete their residency year in good standing, 95% obtained administrative positions in urban schools, and 68% obtained urban principalships in 3 years or less, both of which are unprecedented for colleges and universities in Illinois. (See the sidebar section, Evidence of UIC Program Success, for more statistics about the program’s success.)

Distinctive Features of the Program

Commitment to the simultaneous transformation of K–12 schools and higher education. To produce school leaders who have the knowledge, hands-on experience, and drive to transform failing urban schools into high-achieving learning communities, higher education must change how the business of leadership preparation is conducted. The program integrates both kinds of change.

A highly selective admissions process. UIC selects a diverse cohort from candidates who already hold a master’s degree, who have demonstrated records of outstanding classroom instruction as well as instructional leadership as teachers or administrators, and who are clearly committed to transforming schools where the leadership need is most evident.

A three-strand doctoral program structure. The program allows students to choose among concentrations leading to the Illinois Type 75 General Administrative Certification (preparation for the school principalship); the Illinois Superintendent Endorsement; or, for those already holding the Type 75, advanced leadership development tailored to school-building or system-level positions.

Coursework co-designed and co-taught by UIC academic faculty and by principals and system-level instructional officers who themselves have transformed urban schools. In addition to working directly with transformative school leaders, school districts, unions, and exemplary urban schools, students study with nationally recognized UIC faculty specialists in school organization and leadership, literacy and mathematics instruction, technology, special education, bilingual education, race and ethnicity, educational assessment, and other areas.

Three years of site-based coaching and mentoring aimed at producing candidates who have proven their ability as change agents in schools. This coaching is provided by former high-performing principals in addition to mentoring by principals who are successfully confronting the needs of urban schools. From Day 1 of the first semester of the full-year paid residency, candidates assume roles as change agents who lead collaborative school improvement initiatives. The coaching therefore supports actual school improvement projects aligned with improvement plans at
the candidates’ schools. Candidates who become principals after their 1st year in the program are coached through at least the next 2 years to help them reach transformational goals in their new schools. Candidates who enter the program as principals receive similar support for at least 3 years.

Regular assessment of candidate performance throughout the program. Candidates are assessed each semester by a team of academic and clinical faculty. Assessments are used for developmental purposes as well as program continuation decisions.

Capstone case study research that focuses on genuine problems of leadership practice. Candidates conduct research at the school or system level that employs methods of inquiry authentic to the inquiry, data collection and analysis, and decision-making tasks of school leaders.

Sustainability and Dissemination of the Program

Changes within the host university have been made in support of the UIC program. These include budget lines for the experienced coach-principals who call regularly on principal candidates and new principals; sharing of course syllabi and other regular communication among clinical and academic faculty; and use of coaches as course instructors, co-instructors, and guest instructors.

The program has just completed a full year of collaborative program redesign as part of their commitment to continuous improvement. Future plans include influencing state and national policy on school leader preparation. Program members also will present, participate, and lead in state task forces and national conferences in the coming months. A program dissemination manual and workshop are also planned.

For further information about the Ed.D. in Urban Education Leadership, contact Professor Steve Tozer, Program Founder and Coordinator at the Office of Student Services, UIC College of Education 1040 W. Harrison St. (M/C 147) Chicago, IL 60607 [stozer@uic.edu] http://education.uic.edu/
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Evidence of UIC Program Success

**UIC-led elementary schools** are improving standardized achievement results (ISAT) in three different subsets of schools:

- In 10 of the 11 UIC-led schools that are 90% low income and African American or 90% Latino, UIC-led schools are outperforming district gains.
- Among all five large, UIC-led schools with large percentages of both Latino and African American students, four are outperforming district gains. In the three elementary schools in which UIC principals entered non-high-poverty schools, all posted greater gains than comparable schools in 2009.

**. . . in high-need elementary schools**

- 80% of UIC-led schools have free or reduced-price lunch rates at or above 80%.
- 72% have African American + Hispanic enrollments greater than 80%.
- While ISAT reading scores in CPS elementary schools lag well behind state averages, 59% of UIC principals enter elementary schools that lag even behind CPS averages in these scores.

**. . . while making significant gains in student attendance**

- In Academic Year (AY) 2009, UIC elementary schools posted higher annual attendance levels on average than non-UIC elementary schools.
- In all cases, UIC elementary schools in AY 2009 exceeded the attendance levels of relevant comparable schools.
- While attendance dropped in CPS 90/90 African American schools from 2004–2009, attendance increased substantially across the 10 UIC 90/90 African American schools, all nonselective neighborhood schools.

**UIC-led high schools** are also improving standardized achievement results:

- Of the UIC-led high schools with state PSAE data (includes the ACT; five UIC schools did not yet have junior classes last year), 4 of 5 outperformed district comparison groups, large and small schools alike.
- Of the three UIC large, nonselective, comprehensive high schools, two substantially outperformed district norms; one scored in the top 10% of CPS comparison schools on four primary comparative measures, including reducing students in the bottom quartile.
- Both of the two UIC-led small, nonselective high schools ranked 1, 2, or 3 on all of the four primary achievement measures reduced the number of students in the bottom quartile.

**. . . in high-need high schools**

- Nine of 10 serve schools with combined minority student populations (African American + Hispanic) greater than 90%.
- All 10 entered high schools with average composite ninth-grade EXPLORE scores below 15 (behind the pace for college readiness by Grade 12).

**. . . while making significant gains in student attendance**

- In AY 2009, UIC high schools posted higher annual schoolwide attendance levels on average than non-UIC elementary schools (a difference of over 4% from nonselective CPS comparison schools).
- In all cases, UIC high schools in AY 2009 exceeded the attendance levels of relevant comparable schools both school wide and particularly among ninth graders.
• The difference between UIC high schools and nonselective CPS comparison schools in Grade 9 attendance was statistically significant (85.7% vs. 80% non-UIC, t = 2.06, p < .03, one-tailed test).

• In 2008, the only two nonselective CPS high schools to rank in the top 12 in attendance (out of 120 schools) were UIC led.

. . . improving CPS Freshman-on-Track (FOT) results
• Six of 7 UIC high schools with FOT data increased their FOT levels significantly between 2008 and 2009—increases of 6.5% to over 28%—and reached 3-year highs in FOT (charter schools do not report FOT data).

• In AY 2009, UIC high schools posted higher annual FOT levels on average than non-UIC, nonselective high schools (a difference of over 6% from nonselective CPS comparison schools).

• On average, UIC high schools in AY 2009 exceeded the FOT levels of relevant comparable schools.

• In general, data show that UIC high school principals drive instructional rigor early in their tenures and put pressure on prior FOT levels. Second- and 3rd-year UIC principals raise FOT levels through (a) rigorous monitoring of failure rates at the individual student level across departments, (b) defining clearer faculty standards for grade assignment, and (c) developing stronger academic support and credit recovery processes school wide.

. . . and reducing dropout rates
• In AY 2009, UIC high schools posted lower 1-year dropout levels on average than non-UIC, nonselective high schools (a statistically significant difference of over 3.3% from nonselective CPS comparison schools).

• On average, UIC high schools in AY 2009 posted lower 1-year dropout levels than relevant comparable schools.

• Four out of 5 UIC high school principals with 2–3 years in their new positions decreased 1-year dropout levels by 0.5% or more from 2008 to 2009.

New Program Center: National Center for the Evaluation of Educational Leadership Preparation and Practice

The latest UCEA program center is the National Center for the Evaluation of Educational Leadership Preparation and Practice at the University of Utah. Although significant attention has been directed to research-based innovation and best practices in university-based leadership preparation programs, few of the 500 or more graduate leadership preparation programs have developed the capacity to ascertain program effectiveness and impact on the 16,000 master’s degree graduates they produce annually. In large measure this is due to the limited access to valid, reliable methodology and infrastructure for technical assistance, data sharing, and guidance in collecting, interpreting, and using evaluation data for program improvement and enhanced leadership preparation.

The purpose of the center is to make available valid and reliable evaluation research tools, methods, and training materials and strategies for leadership preparation programs to allow:

• the collection and analysis of survey evaluation research data for program benchmarking and in-depth multiprogram analysis of program features and graduate career and leadership practices outcomes;

• the creation of a systematic process for collecting and analyzing state data on degrees and certification by institution and data on career advancement and school progress by graduates and institutions;

• the provision of evaluation training, technical assistance, and support for leadership preparation programs, as well as establishment of regional train-the-trainer opportunities to increase evaluation technical assistance capacity locally; and

• the creation of a sustainable system for ongoing evaluation research to support continuous evaluation and improvement of leadership preparation programs.

Center directors are Andrea Rorrer, University of Utah; Margaret Terry Orr, Bank Street College; and Michelle D. Young, UCEA and The University of Texas-Austin.

http://www.edleaderprep.org
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A Conversation With
Ann Weaver Hart,
Temple University President

Maricla A. Rodríguez
Interview Section Co-Editor

Ann Weaver Hart is the president of Temple University. She is the first woman to serve in that role in the 125-year history of the university. A former educational administration faculty member at the University of Utah, Dr. Hart has published several articles related to teacher leadership and is the author of *Principal Succession: Establishing Leadership in Schools*. UCEA honored her with the Jack A. Culbertson Award in 1992.

**MR:** Dr. Hart, thank you for accepting my invitation to be interviewed for the upcoming edition of the *UCEA Review*. Let’s begin by having you give us a recap of your professional experience.

**AWH:** I think I have had as varied a career as humanly possible without completely switching professions. I began my career as a public school teacher. I taught in junior high and high school. Then I was a junior high school principal before joining the faculty at the University of Utah, where I was a professor of educational administration. I then became associate dean of the College of Education and dean of the Graduate School at the University of Utah. From there I had the great opportunity of a few years in private higher education as the provost of Claremont Graduate University in Claremont, California. From Claremont, I became the president of the University of New Hampshire. And I am now the president at Temple University in Philadelphia. I even did a stint as a full-time mom in the middle of all of that.

**MR:** I understand what you mean by a varied career that has given you experiences in a variety of educational settings.

**AWH:** It has indeed. It’s turned out to be a real strength.

**MR:** It has been over 15 years since the publication of your seminal book, *Principal Succession: Establishing Leadership in Schools*. If you had the opportunity to write an updated edition of the book, what are some key points you would add? Why?

**AWH:** I would want a deeper analysis of the incredible pressure that young professionals face when they really want to make a change in institutions that are long standing and firmly established. I think the pressure to get along is intense, but the whole work-based socialization process often overwhelms the professional knowledge that they acquire in their studies to become a principal or a leader. It’s very intense, and I think that they would deserve considerable insight, and this would be a good thing for us to pay attention to. We talk a lot about school reform now, and certainly President Obama has brought the subject of improving education to the forefront of the national dialogue—building on the No Child Left Behind [Act], but really with Arnie Duncan, talking a lot about student outcomes. We train young professionals to become leaders in schools and organizations that are deeply mired in their own customs and past. I think we owe it to them to examine what they will face when they go into their profession and try to be effective in making change.

**MR:** And the consideration being with change as the impetus for everything in schools it would seem how much change can one leader really do.

**AWH:** I think that’s true and to what end. One of the things that we have to be careful about is to measure the outcomes we seek with students. And I know there is always a lot of talk about student outcomes, but you have to be attentive to the present, to the here and now, and what you’re doing as a leader, working with teachers in order to have an impact on student outcomes. And focusing on actions that lead to the outcomes we want is something that we always have to keep in mind.

**MR:** A book that could help principal preparation students understand what it is they’re facing and which actions would be most effective would be helpful.

**AWH:** Indeed. And every school is different. I emphasized the similarities in schools as organizations, but they also are social systems with human beings. To be a successful leader I think one needs to be prepared to be flexible, to pay attention to the actual human environment in which you are seeking to have an impact.

**MR:** You published an article titled “The Professional Education of School Administrators” in *Educational Administration Quarterly* (1991). In this article you described how principals were affected by reform pressure and demands. To what degree do you believe current federal and state accountability mandates for student achievement have impacted principals in schools today?

**AWH:** Absolutely, I think it is more intense than it was in 1991. Here in Philadelphia the mayor has made career and school success a major issue for him as a leader in our city. He has enlisted those of us who are in higher education to try and be more active in effecting change that will make the Philadelphia public school system more successful. It is not one of the gems of American public education right now and I think everybody would agree about that, but the insecurity and threat school leaders and teachers feel from this pressure in the state, federal, and local environment is intense. It is interesting to watch. I was reading in our local newspaper, the *Philadelphia Inquirer*, that a number of principals and teachers in the schools that have been identified by our superintendent as areas of focus are actually very intimidated and insecure about conversations about changes in their schools, even though they know they are not being successful in securing the student outcomes they want. It is a very intense environment. When we talk about preparing young professionals to be school principals, preparing them for the political and personal pressure they will be under, we need to address the resilience that they will need to be successful. It’s every bit as important as being able to prepare a budget and stick to it.

**MR:** As faculty members in educational administration we need to understand what these pressures might be for principal candidates and focus on those within our programs.

**AWH:** A real social intelligence is needed to do it. Years and years ago, Karl Weick wrote about the importance of complexity in leaders, of having a repertoire of behaviors and knowledge. I think that the need for complexity and knowledge is even greater now in
In 1994 you published an article in Educational Administration Quarterly titled “Creating Teacher Leadership Roles.” In this article you discussed how the attention and contribution of principals significantly impacted how teachers viewed their leadership roles. How can principals help build teacher capacity?

AWH: One of the members of my board of trustees is Dr. Bill Cosby, Jr. who has been outspoken in his advocacy for young children and young adults in poverty who are not succeeding in schools. It's a very important issue for him, and one of the things that he always tells our teacher education students when he meets with them is how important it is not to assume that they know what the lives of their pupils are like. All of us grow up in a different situation, and being able to diagnose the problem at hand is more important than thinking you already know what it is.

MR: In 1994 you published an article in Educational Administration Quarterly titled “Creating Teacher Leadership Roles.” In this article you discussed how the attention and contribution of principals significantly impacted how teachers viewed their leadership roles. How can principals help build teacher capacity?

AWH: It starts with believing that the people you're working with are smart. That they are able to learn and that they want to succeed. That they deserve to have increased trust and authority as they demonstrate that capacity. So it's very much a leadership issue, but it also requires a principal to attend to the importance of teachers having an impact. Teachers are people who are always learning and growing. It's not a question of what the secret is of a teacher's success, it's a question about how you can help a teacher learn here and now how to be more successful. So it's a constant and growing process.

MR: Why should principals help build teacher capacity?

AWH: Everyone benefits. It strikes me as déjà vu all over again to think about this from a 1994 perspective and now a 2010 perspective, because the press and dialogue about teacher careers are very much the same as they were at the time that this article was published. We haven't come very far when we're talking about how important it is for teachers to have more leadership opportunities in their schools, helping each other build capacity and be more successful. It requires that we continually think about it that way, and that we not let old ways of doing things prevent us from reaching out and succeeding. It's the “put me in, coach, I'm ready to play today. Don't limit my ability to have an impact beyond my own classroom, but let me develop the ability to have an impact in our organization at large.”

MR: It's important to give teachers these opportunities in schools to be able to do what you recommended. As educational administration faculty we need to communicate to our students that principals can share leadership with teachers.

AWH: Absolutely, and as I said, we have a structure that suppresses that from the beginning, because of the old ways of doing things. We don't reward extraordinary success, and we don't sanction failure.

MR: In which ways can schools of education help build the capacity of preservice teachers in teacher preparation programs?

AWH: We continue to recognize that we need to have more experience in preservice with the children and young adults who we want to teach. That level of engagement between the preservice teachers and the teaching profession itself is hard to achieve, but I continue to believe that a focus on the developing professional who doesn't just walk into a classroom for the first time at the end of a teacher preparation program is really important. I see now, as a university president, the colleges of education struggling to make that happen. This perspective has reinforced my belief that, like every profession, the student of education needs gradual and increasing opportunities to practice the profession before they jump in.

MR: I agree that it's a constant challenge for schools of education given locations of school and the demographic make-up of schools.

AWH: It is a difficulty, and students do need expertise and degrees in their discipline as well. I think that it's important for them to know what they're trying to teach. We mustn't let them fall into the trap of believing that learning to teach takes precedent over what you're teaching. They need a balance.

MR: What connection do you see between teacher preparation programs and principal preparation programs?

AWH: I think that teacher preparation will get you ready to be the soldier on the frontlines. The teachers are preparing to act directly with young people to help them learn. Principals need to know what makes teachers successful, and hopefully they will have been successful teachers themselves, but they are preparing to de-
develop strategy and facilitate the success of others. What teachers do to be successful is still the subject, and principals need to learn how to help marshal those talents and efforts on behalf of the children and young adults. A principal is supposed to help teachers be more successful. To create an environment in which their success is facilitated.

MR: What recommendations do you have for preservice teachers and practicing teachers and principals regarding building student capacity?

AWH: Outcomes, outcomes, outcomes. It’s so easy to fall into measuring the process and the inputs. Students’ capacity grows little by little. So it’s “what’s preventing me from learning here and now? And what can I do to get off that square, and start learning here and now?” Not for the future, but right now.

MR: We tend to consider principal capacity and teacher capacity. But, in essence, I think our work daily impacts student capacity building.

AWH: It’s easy to want the perfect student to be sitting in front of you, because then success is a lot of fun, but we are given the students we are given, and helping them overcome what’s preventing them from learning right now is what’s going to build their capacity.

MR: What are some concluding thoughts you would like to offer our readers?

AWH: I think to remember how critically important what we do is and to just love it. Some of it is so challenging and so hard that you have to have a passion for the importance of what you do. And a passion to continually learn the same way we’re asking our students to learn. I would ask the same questions of ourselves: “What’s preventing us from learning here and now to be more successful in this setting? Not for the future, but what am I going to do in the future, but right now?”

MR: Thank you for taking the time to share your thoughts during this interview for the UCEA Review. It was a privilege to be able to meet you over the phone.

AWH: You’re welcome. Thank you for asking me.
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UCEA Welcomes New Member: Nipissing University

UCEA welcomes new affiliate member Nipissing University, North Bay, Ontario, Canada. Nipissing University is a small liberal arts university that was established in 1967 as an affiliate of Laurentian University and received its charter as an independent university in 1992.

The Schulich School of Education builds on Nipissing’s strong reputation for teacher education, while allowing for strategic investment and growth in four new areas: (a) development of teacher preparation rich in the areas of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics; (b) approaches to enhance family and Aboriginal literacies; (c) establishment of a Schulich Chair in Aboriginal Education; and (d) improving achievement through continuous improvement of teaching and enhanced educational technology. Nipissing students have achieved positions in national and international venues as educators in a range of locations. In addition, the school is home to the International Centre for Educational Leadership and the Nipissing Centre for Literacy Education.

The M.Ed. program offers a full- or part-time plan, with courses available through online delivery, mixed delivery (onsite and online) and onsite-only delivery. In-service education courses for teachers include Additional Qualification (AQ) courses, Additional Basic Qualification (ABQ) courses, Principal’s Qualification (PQP) courses, and more. Nipissing’s teacher education programs have been in existence since 1909 and have an excellent reputation.

Programs for Aboriginal students who wish to become teachers are well respected and focus on developing intercultural understanding. The Aboriginal Teacher Certificate Program has been designed to prepare people of Native ancestry for teaching positions in Ontario. The program meets the academic requirements of Nipissing’s teacher education program, and graduates are recommended to the Ontario College of Teachers for a Certificate of Qualification in the Primary/Junior Division (Junior Kindergarten to Grade 6). The goal is to train Native teachers to provide the Ontario elementary school curriculum combined with traditional values and culture.

Nipissing continues its tradition of creating and extending a learning environment that fosters a professional community. Such a community takes learning beyond schools and directs students to become actively involved in the world as participants whose knowledge and skills are valued. In short, the Schulich School of Education takes seriously the notion that if one wishes to learn how to be in the world, one should participate in it.

http://www.nipissingu.ca/education/

We are also pleased to announce that Bowling Green University is now a full member of UCEA.

If you would like information about full, provisional, or associate membership in UCEA, please contact the UCEA headquarters at UCEA@austin.utexas.edu or UCEA, The University of Texas, College of Education, 1 University Station D5400, Austin, TX 78712
UCEA’s International Center for the Study of Leadership and Ethics

Effective October 3, 2009, the newly established Center for the Study of Leadership and Ethics (CSLE) housed in the Faculty of Education at Nipissing University (Ontario, Canada) was officially designated the headquarters of a consortium of seven international research centers. This resolution was among several passed by the center’s Board of Trustees at a business meeting held at Pennsylvania State University during the 14th Annual Values and Leadership Conference. The UCEA CSLE is now officially a multi-institution and international organization.

Paul Begley, now Professor of Educational Leadership at Nipissing University in North Bay, Ontario, Canada, was appointed Executive Director of the reconstituted UCEA program center organization for a term of 3 years. Reconstituting the center as a multi-institution and international organization will generate several positive outcomes for the UCEA membership. These include an expanded international profile for UCEA, access for faculty and students to a large network of scholars in seven or more countries, a new quarterly refereed journal in addition to the existing Values and Ethics in Educational Administration (VEEA) journal, the opportunity for students and faculty to become involved in the design and delivery of an annual international conference, formal connections with multiple universities that currently operate doctoral programs, facilitated access to multiple universities in support of study leaves, visiting scholar appointments, and research data collection in other countries. As part of this process, Nipissing University has become an affiliate member of the UCEA.

What Is CSLE?

The original CSLE was established as a UCEA program center in June 1996. The center is devoted to the support, promotion and dissemination of theory and research on values and leadership. As of July 2009, the center has been housed in the Faculty of Education at Nipissing University.

Paul Begley has been a director of the center since its establishment in 1996 at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) at the University of Toronto in partnership with the University of Virginia. During the first 5 years of operation, Paul Begley and Margaret Grogan (now dean at Claremont Graduate School) co-directed the center. In 2003 the center was relocated to Penn State, and the University of Virginia ceased its formal involvement in center affairs. In early 2009 a proposal was tabled to the board of trustees to reorganize the governance structure of the center in anticipation of Paul Begley’s return to Canada and appointment to the faculty of Nipissing University. The new governance structure ensures the continuation of the center’s work, reconfirms Paul Begley as Executive Director for 3 years, and formally incorporates within the center organization seven research centers located at universities in five countries: Canada, the United States, Sweden, Australia, and Hong Kong. The universities currently represented by these centers are Nipissing University, Penn State University, Temple University, Umea University, the Australian Catholic University, and the Hong Kong Institute of Education. Further information about each of the seven affiliated centers is accessible from the center website: http://www.ucea.org/leadership-ethics/

The current Board of Trustees for the CSLE is composed of the directors of the seven affiliated centers plus one designate appointed by each center organization. Directors are as follows:

- Paul T. Begley, CSLE, Nipissing University, Canada
- Michael Bezzina, Center for Creative and Authentic Leadership, Australian Catholic University, Australia
- Steven Gross, New DEEL Center, Temple University, U.S.
- Olof Johansson, Center for Principal Development, Umea University, Sweden
- Jacqueline Stefkovich, Willower Center for the Study of Leadership and Ethics, Penn State University, U.S.
- Nancy Tuana, Rock Ethics Institute, Penn State University
- Allan D. Walker, Hong Kong Institute of Education, Hong Kong

The Annual Values and Leadership Conference

An annual conference is held each October. The most recent conference took place at Penn State in October 2009. Typical attendance is 100-125 scholars and practitioners from five or more countries. In other years the conference has taken place in Victoria, BC (2006 and 2008), Barbados (2000 and 2004), OISE, Penn State, and the University of Virginia. The 2010 conference will take place in mid-September 2010 at Umea University in Umea, Sweden. The 2011 conference will take place in Victoria, BC, Canada, once again. See the conference website for details:

http://www.nipissingu.ca/csle/Conference10/index.htm

Other Center Projects

The center website is a rich source of downloadable resources, including archived issues of the VEEA journal, various annotated resource lists, and most recently several video and audio recordings on moral literacy and ethics. A new quarterly refereed journal was also launched in January 2010: The Journal of Authentic Leadership in Education (JALE). Single articles will be published quarterly. The first two issues of Volume 1 are currently viewable. This journal is published in hard copy form as well as online.

A number of signature events are also being sponsored by the associated center organizations. These include (a) a proposed 3rd Annual Moral Literacy Colloquium sponsored by the Rock Ethics Institute and the Willower Center at Penn State University during February 2010, (b) the annual New DEEL Conference scheduled for March 2010 at Temple University in Philadelphia, (c) the CASEA–CSSE Conference scheduled for June 2010 in Montreal, and (d) the 15th Annual Values and Leadership Conference scheduled for mid-September in Umea, Sweden. The Nipissing leadership center is also collaborating with Mr. Jan Olsson in the design and delivery of the annual National Character Education Conference to be held in Huntsville, Ontario, Canada, in November 2010:

http://www.ncec.ca/

http://www.ucea.org/leadership-ethics/
The International Study of Principal Preparation
Charles F. Webber & Shelleyann Scott
University of Calgary

The International Study of Principal Preparation (ISPP) compares and contrasts principal preparation experiences and approaches in the following countries: Australia, Canada, England, Germany, Jamaica, Mexico, New Zealand, Scotland, South Africa, Tanzania, Turkey, the United States, and China. The ISPP is focused on the question: How useful are principal preparation programs to novice principals? This study seeks to gather information that will guide those who help to prepare principals for their first appointments.

The ISPP was conceptualized initially as a three-stage study. Stage 1 mapped the existing principal preparation processes and programs in participant countries. The mapping structure described the preparation programs’ intended audience, content, structure, deliverers, and delivery modes. Stage 2 encompassed a set of case studies conducted in each cultural setting that captured qualitative insights from early-career principals. Stage 3 is ongoing and involves the use of data gathered during the initial two stages to create a common survey instrument currently being administered. Survey data will be analyzed for the purpose of improving principal preparation within and across cultural contexts.

Interesting findings have emerged from Stages 1 and 2. For example, a paper by Scott and Webber (2008) summarized some key findings:

There is a need for principals in Australia to be better prepared to deal with the complexity of the role and with the tensions and dilemmas associated with their decision making (Clarke et al., 2007). In Mexico, three problems that were particularly prominent for new principals included a lack of confidence in the selection process, concerns with funding of schools and maintenance, and insufficient time for educational leadership due, for example, to the needs of two shifts of students each day (Slater et al., 2006). Additionally, principals in Mexico described their lack of preparation to deal with teachers exhibiting poor professional practice. In Canada, Webber and Sherman (2008) explored the implications for leadership preparation programs by asking how school boards can facilitate the growth of principals’ abilities to enhance development of social and human capacity without input from outsiders. Additionally, they queried how educational organizations can avoid reinforcing already established institutional cultures. In their cross-cultural analysis of the needs of new principals in England, Scotland, and Turkey, researchers Cowie et al. (2006) identified that new principals experienced difficulties conceptualizing and dealing with the demands of their roles. They also articulated the importance of establishing positive professional networks that build confidence and resilience. In South Africa, Mentz and van der Walt (2007) highlighted educators’ perceived lack of preparation to deal with the challenges of racially and ethnically diverse schools, discrimination and prejudice, and inculcation of appreciation for difference. (p. 763)

The ISPP is a unique project in the field of educational leadership as it is rare to encounter collaborations among mainstream Western scholars and their colleagues in more diverse international settings. The study presents opportunities for cross-cultural insights and enriched experiences by prospective principals. The lessons learned from the ISPP have greater capacity to inform practitioners, researchers, and decision makers because of the nature of this “boundary-breaking” research (Robertson & Webber, 2002).

More information about the ISPP can be obtained by contacting Charles Webber or other members of the research team listed at http://people.ucalgary.ca/~cwebber/ISPP/members.htm.
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Check out the UCEA Interview Series

The UCEA Interview Series is a new online resource focused on recent research relevant to leadership practice and preparation. Visit http://www.blogtalkradio.com/UCEA and check out the current offerings, including interviews with Karen Seashore, Ken Leithwood, Terry Orr, Mike Knapp, David Mayrowitz, and Scott McLeod. Listen to interviews live, listen online, or download them to your mp3 player.
Developments in International Collaboration

Bruce Barnett
The University of Texas at San Antonio

The Executive Committee (EC) recently approved several initiatives to support UCEA's efforts to encourage international research and development. During the Board Meeting in New Orleans in March, the EC approved (a) research dissemination strategies and (b) Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) with several international professional associations.

Research Dissemination

To provide mechanisms for colleagues to share international research initiatives, the EC agreed to:

- provide competitive travel stipends for graduate students for the UCEA Convention;
- create a permanent section of the UCEA Review focused on cross-national research studies;
- incorporate a session during the 2010 Convention devoted to cross-national research and trends in international preparation, development, and practice;
- dedicate a special issue of the Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership to international issues, cross-national issues, preparation, and context; and
- recommend to the editors of JRLE and EAQ to consider dedicating a special issue on these topics.

MOUs

The EC also authorized MOUs with three organizations: (a) Australian Council for Educational Leaders (ACEL), (b) British Educational Leadership and Management Administration Society (BELMAS), and (c) New Zealand Educational Administration and Leadership Society (NZEALS). Negotiations are currently underway with the Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration and Management (CCEAM) to establish a similar agreement. The MOUs are intended to develop stronger relationships through cooperative programs in areas of agreed priority between UCEA and these organizations. Areas of collaboration outlined in the agreements include:

- promoting information about one another's organizations to their membership, using websites, brochures, newsletters, and other pertinent information;
- co-developing activities, including conferences, visiting scholar programs, joint submissions and proposals, collaborative research, and publications;
- collaborating on conference events, such as joint receptions for council/board members, reciprocal symposia, and reduced registration fees for UCEA members;
- providing member rates for publications for UCEA members;
- encouraging submission of articles for journals and newsletters; and
- supporting opportunities for collaborative research projects.

Brief summaries of immediate ways in which colleagues can participate in activities with these professional organizations are listed below.

ACEL

www.acel.com.au

The ACEL is a major professional association for educational leaders and draws its membership from all sectors of education in Australia, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, and the rest of the world. Participating in the organization can include the following:

1. Attend the annual conference (in September). Participants from Australia and countries around the world attend sessions with experts on leadership, learning organizations, teaching, and personal growth. The goal of the conference is to expand participants’ horizons and refresh their commitment to students.

2. Publish in journals. Leading and Managing is a refereed academic journal dealing with the complementary phases of leading and managing in educational administration, targeted at personnel working at all organizational levels and in all educational sectors and systems. The Australian Educational Leader, a research-based journal, is a practical vehicle for the exchange of current educational research, trends, and innovations.

BELMAS

www.belmas.org.uk

BELMAS seeks to advance the practice, teaching and study of educational management, administration, and leadership in the United Kingdom and to contribute to international developments in these areas. Ways to engage with the organization include the following:

1. Attend the annual conference (in July) where practitioners, academics, and policymakers come together to debate and discuss issues of importance in educational leadership and management. Each conference has a different theme, with a mixture of keynote speakers, discussion panels, and papers given by people from around the world. This year, UCEA President-Elect Autumn Tooms will be one of the featured keynote presenters.

2. Publish in Educational Management and Leadership. The journal provides a forum for original research and analysis on all aspects of leadership, management, administration, and policy in education. The international advisory editorial board ensures a broad examination of the field, encouraging contributions from people with a wide range of perspectives and experiences.

NZEALS

www.nzeals.org.nz

NZEALS represents the entire New Zealand educational spectrum, from early childhood to tertiary level, as well as agencies such as the Education Review Office and the Ministry of Education. Members are from New Zealand, Australia, Malaysia, and other countries. Individuals can be involved in this organization in the
1. Attend the conference held every even year in April. Opportunities are provided for researchers, practitioners, and policymakers to engage in mutual learning. Presentations must include an interactive component (e.g., questions and answers, discussion groups).

2. Publish in the *Journal of Educational Leadership, Policy and Practice*. The journal publishes the work of established and new scholars and practitioners aimed at new knowledge and important ideas from New Zealand and elsewhere in the world. The journal welcomes studies that further international debates in the field of educational leadership.

3. Apply to be a visiting scholar. Each year a highly recognized person who contributes significantly to education is selected to present his or her work throughout New Zealand. Recent scholars have been from Wollongong University (Australia), Nottingham University (United Kingdom), University of Hawaii (U.S.), Victoria University of Wellington (New Zealand), and Pen Green Centre for Children and Families (United Kingdom).

---

**Welcome to the BELMAS Conference**

**July 9–11, 2010**

**Reading, England**

UCEA Colleagues:

As Chair of the British Educational Leadership, Management and Administration Society (BELMAS), I am delighted to welcome you to our 2010 conference being held in Reading, England, July 9–11. BELMAS and UCEA are committed to collaborating with each other over the next few years in order to advance our field. Our conference is small (around 150–200 academics and practitioners from around the world) but big in terms of its welcome to new researchers and teachers. The conference attracts some of the leading names in educational administration. Past keynote presenters include Jim Spillane, Ken Leithwood, Karen Seashore Louis, Bruce Barnett, and this year, Autumn Tooms. Full details of the conference can be found at www.kc-jones.co.uk/belmas

I look forward to meeting you and other UCEA colleagues at our conference.

Megan Crawford

BELMAS Chair

---

**In Memory of Zandile Kunene**

I regret to announce the death of Zandile Kunene, President of the Commonwealth Council of Educational Administration and Management (CCEAM), at the early age of 45. She had been suffering from cancer for some time.

I met Zandile in August 2003, just before she took up her post as the founding executive director of the Matthew Goniwe School of Leadership and Governance (MGSLG). Subsequently, she became a close friend to my wife, Chabala, and to me. We were delighted that she was able to attend our wedding in 2004, and we always enjoyed her company.

MGSLG is a specialist body whose mission is to develop school principals, other leaders, and governors in the South African province of Gauteng. In her 6 years as executive director, she and her colleagues achieved great success, setting up and operating a suite of programmes for leaders at all levels and also contributing to knowledge generation through funding research on several aspects of school leadership.

In 2004, Zandile was elected president of the Education Management Association of South Africa, the country’s affiliate to CCEAM. In 2008, in Durban, she was elected as the first Black president of CCEAM. In July 2009, she gave an impressive keynote presentation to the British Educational Leadership, Management, and Administration Society (BELMAS) International Conference in Sheffield, England. In September, she was taken ill in London and spent three months in a London hospital. For much of this time, she was in intensive care but, as she improved, Cha and I were able to visit her. In December 2009, Zandile was able to return to South Africa and we were both hopeful that she would make a full recovery. However, this was not to be, and she died in Johannesburg in February.

Zandile achieved so much, despite growing up in the Apartheid era, in what is now the Kwazulu-Natal province of South Africa, and overcoming all the indignities of this iniquitous regime. She has been taken from us much too soon, but she leaves behind a strong legacy and powerful evidence that talent and determination can triumph over adversity. She will be sorely missed.

Tony Bush, Professor
University of Warwick
Editor, *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*

---

**Shop the new UCEA Amazon Bookstore:**

http://astore.amazon.com/u0b4-20
Point/Counterpoint:
State Certification Policies as Levers for Programmatic Change

Mónica Byrne-Jiménez
Hofstra University

In recent years, state education policymakers have turned their attention to leadership standards, preparation, and certification. This increasing role in certification has encouraged—or some would say, forced—universities to redesign their programs to meet changing requirements. Add to this the growing acceptance of non-university-based programs and alternate certification routes, and it is clear that pressure on universities is mounting. Whether leadership preparation programs can respond creatively and effectively may be the determining factor in the continued success of university-based programs.

The following essays reflect two programs’ responses to changes in state policies. Tricia Browne-Ferrigno, Associate Professor in Educational Leadership Studies at the University of Kentucky, shares her experiences in response to a pending statewide moratorium on admissions to address issues of “overproduction.” Subsequently, aspiring leaders will have to meet more stringent admission requirements. This prompted the University of Kentucky to conduct a thorough analysis of program graduates to identify areas of need for future potential applicants. Cynthia Reed, Director of the Truman Pierce Institute and Professor of Educational Leadership Studies at Auburn University, offers her experiences redesigning the program to address increased emphasis on district partnerships. The relationships that developed at both the state and local levels proved invaluable to their redesign efforts. Drs. Browne-Ferrigno and Reed highlight conceptual flexibility and responsiveness as necessary elements that need to be developed—and strengthened—as programs divest themselves of old structures and create new ones.

These essays demonstrate how two universities embraced the changes in state policies and how each developed something new and unique. They encourage us to look beyond actual mandates and focus on preparing leaders that our schools and children deserve. By focusing on their instructional goals and visions of effective leadership, these programs used the state policy changes as motivation for continued improvement. It is clear that we can learn from their experiences and improve our programs, regardless of externally imposed mandates.

Redesigning for Future Admissions

Tricia Browne-Ferrigno
University of Kentucky

Improving principal candidate pools through careful recruitment and selective admissions to preparation programs is a long-standing and shared recommendation of professional and university-based associations (American Association of School Administrators, 1960; Griffiths, Stout, & Forsyth, 1988; Milstein, 1992; Murphy 1992, 1993; Stout, 1973). Prior to 1998, admission to preparation programs in Kentucky was limited to educators holding a graduate degree and having at least three years of full-time teaching experience (Browne-Ferrigno & Fusarelli, 2005). Open admissions, however, became common practice after the 1998 adoption of the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium Standards for School Leaders (Council of Chief State School Officers, 1996) because the policy officially adopting the standards also allowed the master’s degree in school administration. The state’s educator certification agency had to change admission requirements to align with policy, which thus allowed novice teachers to enter programs years before they were ready to assume a principalship—if ever.

To ascertain impacts of these policy changes, in 2001 professors at Kentucky’s UCEA-member universities designed and administered surveys to nine discrete groups of educational practitioners. Data indicated that 1,285 educators were qualified to hold administrator certification but were not practicing as principals or seeking positions (Björk, 2002). Superintendents, however, perceived the statewide candidate pool to contain the names of only 630 qualified candidates for school leadership in their districts (Björk, Keedy, Rinehart, & Winter, 2002).

Shortly thereafter, the certification agency began tracking the number of program graduates statewide against its active candidate pool. By 2004 Kentucky’s 11 preparation programs had produced over 3,000 teachers qualified to hold provisional certification, but who were not seeking placement as principals. Four years later the number had doubled to 6,000. Rather than changing admission requirements, agency officials agitated for total redesign of programs to stem overproduction of administrator-trained teachers. Kentucky policymakers responded quickly by passing legislation with major implications for colleges and universities (Professional Certificate for Instructional Leadership, 2008).

All currently accredited preparation programs will no longer be allowed to admit students after December 31, 2011. Institutions wishing to prepare principals must submit their redesigned program proposals for review no later than December 31, 2012. The new state policy stipulates that candidates admitted to these approved redesigned programs must

- hold a master’s degree;
- present evidence of 3 years of documented teaching experience in a public school or a nonpublic school that meets state performance standards;
- present a written statement documenting their skills and understanding in three areas: (a) ability to improve student achievement; (b) leadership; and (c) advanced knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment; and
- present an agreement signed by a superintendent pledging support for the candidate to participate in a high-quality practicum experience (i.e., opportunities for candidate to observe school and district leadership, participate in school and district leadership activities, and access aggregated school and district data).

These changes have been supported by University of Kentucky professors who participated actively in various statewide redesign-planning efforts over the years. However, clarification of the phrase “school that meets state performance standards” appearing in the second bulleted item has not yet been fully explored.
To inform University of Kentucky program redesign, a comprehensive review of student files was conducted during the spring of 2010 to ascertain program-completer outcomes. The initial step was creating a list of names for candidates enrolled in the program between 2000 and 2010. An Excel spreadsheet was then developed that displays each candidate's name, program entry and exit dates, degree-seeking status, current position and work site, and e-mail address.

From the 151-member database, a smaller one was generated that contains only those who were admitted to the program between 2002 and 2006 and who completed coursework requirements by May 2008, which would have given them time to assume a principalship by this writing. Among these 85 program completers, 54 (65%) have passed both state-required examinations (i.e., School Leaders Licensure Assessment, Kentucky Specialty Test of Instructional and Administrative Practices) and currently hold principal certification. The Table displays candidates' program status, prior leadership experience (determined by candidates' résumés and admission essays in department files), and current work position.

Further analyses conducted on this 85-member database indicate that 60% of those completing the University of Kentucky preparation program held at least a master's degree and had accrued an average of 10.25 years of teaching experience (range 1–30, median 8, mode 7) prior to formally preparing for the principalship. In other words, two thirds of those completing the University of Kentucky program since 2002 meet admissions requirements for the redesigned programs. However, the professional development needs of the other 40% of those participating in the program have not been well addressed because the program intentionally focuses on preparing principals.

To remedy this problem, University of Kentucky faculty developed a new teacher leadership program that will be launched in Fall 2010. The goals of the 30-credit, degree-granting (M.Ed., Ed.S.) program are to expand teachers' understanding of schools as learning organizations and to develop their skills in working more effectively as learning leaders with their principals and fellow teachers. The 12-credit core includes an introductory course on learner-centered leadership; a two-course series on participant action research; and a practicum that engages candidates in distributed responsibilities for monitoring curriculum, instruction, and assessment. The new University of Kentucky program will meet the professional needs of teacher leaders and provide opportunities for them to explore firsthand principal responsibilities in order to help them make informed career decisions—and assure that those wanting to become principals have acquired the requisite pre-admission experiences in the redesigned programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Program Completers Admission Statistics and Current Work Assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prior leadership experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Admissions classification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>classification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEd&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; (n = 34)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EdS&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; (n = 33) &amp; CERT&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt; (n = 18)</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>MEd = Candidates seeking first graduate degree (Master of Education).
<sup>b</sup>EdS = Candidates seeking additional graduate degree (Specialist in Education).
<sup>c</sup>CERT = Non-degree-seeking candidates holding master's degree upon entry to program.
<sup>d</sup>TOSA = Teacher on special assignment outside classroom (e.g., curriculum coach, dean of students, program coordinator, resource teacher for specific content area).
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Auburn University’s Story
Cynthia Reed
Auburn University

Auburn University’s College of Education has been preparing educational leaders since 1915. Our graduates are in leadership positions throughout the state and beyond. We believed we were preparing highly competent leaders who had a strong grounding in both theory and practice. In hindsight after engaging in our redesign work and after implementing our new program, we still believe that our graduates prepared through our former program are strong educational leaders. But, we also realize that we were comfortable using the structures, processes, and curriculum that had been in place since we restructured our programs nearly a decade ago (Murphy, 2002).

Alabama, along with many other states and educational organizations, called for substantive changes in the ways principals are prepared (Grogan & Andrews, 2002; Southern Regional Education Board, 2006, 2007). The Governor’s Congress on School Leadership, convened by Governor Bob Riley and Alabama State Superintendent Joe Morton in 2004, created five task forces to address issues related to school leadership in Alabama schools, including the redesign of principal preparation programs. The governor appointed over 200 individuals to serve on this commission. These individuals represented schools, colleges, universities, businesses, and the community at large. The governor’s charge to the Congress was to develop a plan to improve the quality of educational leadership in Alabama’s public schools. Outcomes from this work included recommendations for a code of ethics, standards and requirements to implement a university preparation program redesign process, revised requirements and processes for the certification of instructional leaders, the creation of a professional development process to support instructional leaders, and the establishment of incentives to attract and retain quality principals in every school. These recommendations were developed into a report that was submitted to the governor and the State Board of Education (Cox, 2007; Kochan, in press).

In response to these recommendations, Alabama adopted legislation in 2005, authorizing principal preparation program redesign initiatives. The State Department of Education issued a request for proposals in 2006 soliciting volunteer programs that would halt new admissions and engage in a comprehensive redesign process. The mandated parameters of the redesign process required school districts to become partners with universities in the preparation of school leaders and placed stronger emphasis on developing competencies for improving schools and increasing student achievement. The central objective of the redesign directive was that principals in our state must be prepared in ways that ensure “every child learns, is successful in school, and is prepared to lead a productive life beyond high school through collaborative work with school leaders” (Southern Regional Education Board, 2006, 2007).

Auburn University was selected as a pilot redesign site after submitting a competitive proposal to address four key areas: (a) partnerships, (b) admissions, (c) curriculum including internship experiences, and (d) evaluation. As one of four pilot sites in the state, we began a collaborative redesign process for how we prepare principals in partnership with seven school districts (the current Educational Leadership program has expanded to include 11 school districts as partners). Our pilot principal preparation program redesign work took over two years from proposal submission to reaccreditation. During this timeframe we did not admit any new students, a state requirement for the redesign. This created numerous challenges for our faculty, potential candidates who were ready to begin leadership preparation work, and area school districts with leadership positions to fill (Kochan, in press). Our redesign efforts involved negotiating state requirements, faculty needs and research interests, school district needs and interests, best practices, and common sense (Reed & Llanes, in press).

As a faculty, we were determined to design a program reflective of the needs of our district-based partners; research-based best practices; and adherence to socially just, democratic principles (Brown, 2004; Gale & Densmore, 2003; Kochan & Reed, 2005; Theoharis, 2007). Our Educational Leadership Preparation Redeign Plan focused on four areas: (a) establishing an advisory council comprised of representatives from multiple stakeholder groups, (b) redesigning the admissions process so that it was rigorous and admissions decisions are collaboratively determined by our faculty and representatives from partner school districts, (c) redesigning the curriculum and system of delivering the curriculum including the internship experiences, and (d) designing and implementing an ongoing evaluation process to measure both program effectiveness and graduate preparedness.

Although we did not realize it while engaged in the process, in many ways our redesign work was consistent with Orr’s (2006) recommended innovations in leadership education. Specifically, we (a) reinterpreted “leadership as pivotal for improving teaching and learning”; (b) incorporated new insights about the integration of program content, pedagogy, and field-based learning experiences into a powerful plan for preparing leaders; (c) utilized partnerships for “richer, more extensive program design opportunities”; and (d) made a collaborative commitment to continuous improvement (Orr, 2006, pp. 492–493).

In December 2007, Auburn University’s redesigned Instructional Leadership Program received formal approval from the Alabama Board of Education to reopen its program as one of three approved new programs in the state. In May 2008, the first master’s cohort began their journey through the new four-semester program. Our first Instructional Leadership Program cohort graduated in August 2009. Our second cohort will graduate in August 2010.

I believe the state is making a concerted effort to identify and implement policies, standards, and processes that maximize human capital, organizational capacity, and student achievement (Rand, 2009). New standards have been developed and approved by the State Board of Education that now hold principal preparation programs, professional development programs, and teacher education programs to more rigorous and collaborative standards. These standards are aligned with new protocols for evaluating teachers, and a new protocol for evaluating instructional leaders will be piloted in the near future. It is difficult to argue with the logic behind many of the changes being made.

Throughout our work we demonstrated a willingness to risk...
(Bussey & O’Neill, in press) and to change the “ways we do business” (Reed & Llanes, in press). I believe we earned the respect of state policymakers and senior-level personnel at the Alabama State Department of Education. We embraced the challenges inherent in the redesign process, while using the new state standards as a beginning point for our work rather than as a prescription for programming. The redesign work was grueling at times, especially when teaching classes for the remaining students who had to finish before the former program was sundowned. Although we had the full support of the dean, and she served as an active member of our redesign team (Kochan, in press), there were still heavy expectations for faculty to produce research, engage in outreach scholarship, and provide service.

Throughout the redesign process we developed or enhanced strong working relationships and partnerships. As we worked together, we learned more about each other’s worlds, and our levels of respect and trust grew tremendously. During our reaccreditation process, we received many commendations, but the one we were most proud of was recognition for the depth of collaboration and level of trust among our partnerships. We now have a “seat at the table” when new state commissions are formed to discuss changes in other types of programs, policies, or processes. For example, in the past few years I have served on a variety of committees or commissions focused on professional development, teacher leadership, and dropout prevention, as well as regional groups created by the governor’s office and focused on collaborative approaches to improving student learning conditions and practices. We make ourselves accessible to state leaders, and they, in turn, make themselves available as a resource to us.

Not all of our redesign process was smooth sailing. There were many tensions about who was in charge and of what, how much influence the state should have on our degree programs in addition to the certification requirements, and the degree of partnership work we should expect from our district partners. Our work forced us to reconsider all aspects of our programs, our workloads, and our professional relationships (Wallace Foundation, 2006). The state applied pressure from the top but also provided supports to facilitate success (Rand, 2009). State-sponsored summits and workshops were held for pilot redesign sites and other university-based preparation programs throughout the process. We had regular contact from state department officials throughout the process to see how we were doing and to offer support.

Rather than offering a one-size-fits-all preparation program, which some state certification programs suggest, I believe we need to be willing to take a risk and move outside our comfort zones in order to meet the educational needs of tomorrow’s students. Issues ranging from generational learning differences; expanded learning economies; any-time, any-place learning capabilities; and changing trends related to family and community diversity will necessitate drastic changes in how we educate young people and consequently how we prepare principals.

Our experience at Auburn University was overwhelmingly a positive one. We built stronger personal and professional relationships with leaders and others in our partner school districts and with state leaders and policymakers. We engaged in inclusive practices throughout the process (and still do) that challenged our thinking about what school systems need in their leaders. As a result, our newly redesigned program integrates field-based experiences in a seamless manner throughout our course of study. There are opportunities for district personnel, our students, and our faculty to engage in professional development together. Our students research district problems and offer potential solutions using a “think tank” approach, and our program is more cohesive and purposefully organized than it was previously. There were many challenges throughout the redesign work and in the ongoing implementation of that work. However, I believe the opportunities the redesign process created far outweigh the negatives that we encountered.
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Mark Gooden Joins the UCEA Executive Committee

Earlier this year, Dr. Mark Gooden, Associate Professor at The University of Texas at Austin Principalship Program (UTAPP) in the Educational Administration Department. He also serves as an associate professor in that department. His research interests include the principalship, issues in urban educational leadership, and legal issues in education. His research has appeared in Brigham Young University Education and Law Journal, Education and Urban Society, The Journal of Negro Education, Educational Administration Quarterly, The Sage Handbook of African-American Education, and The Principal's Legal Handbook.

Distinguished Service Award

Dr. Diana G. Pounder received the Distinguished Service Award at the 2009 UCEA Convention to recognize her tenure as editor of the Educational Administration Quarterly (EAQ) and service to UCEA. Diana Pounder is College of Education Dean at the University of Central Arkansas and former Professor and Chair of the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy at the University of Utah–Salt Lake City. She earned her Ph.D. in Educational Administration from the University of Wisconsin–Madison. She has worked as a university professor and researcher for over 25 years, after working in public schools for 10 years as a high school math teacher, a secondary guidance counselor, and a middle school principal.

Dr. Pounder has been active and assumed leadership roles in national professional organizations, including past EAQ Editor; President of the UCEA; Secretary of Division A of the American Educational Research Association (AERA); and Co-Chair of the Joint UCEA, AERA-Division A, TEA-SIG Task Force on Leadership Preparation Effectiveness. She participates actively in a variety of state and national education and policy initiatives, the most recent of which have focused largely on improving and assessing school teacher and leader preparation.

Associate Director of Graduate Student Development

Dr. Cristóbal Rodríguez is the new Associate Director of Graduate Student Development at UCEA. Cristóbal Rodríguez is Assistant Professor in the College of Education at New Mexico State University. Cristóbal contributed to the UCEA Graduate Student Development programs as a graduate research assistant at UCEA headquarters. He was selected in 2009 for the David L. Clark National Graduate Student Research Seminar in Educational Administration and Policy.

As a developing scholar at The University of Texas at Austin and at New Mexico State University, Cristóbal has been trained in education research, evaluation, and policy analysis with a K–12 focus and has experienced various secondary and postsecondary education roles serving and preparing diverse students for academic success. As a doctoral student at The University of Texas at Austin, Cristóbal worked on numerous education policy research experiences that prepared him for a career in P–20 education pipeline policy research focused on access and performance of students from diverse backgrounds and settings. Cristóbal's mixed-methods dissertation focused on access and success of Borderland students at Texas flagship and Borderland universities amid the Top 10% Admissions Plan. He has held graduate research assistantships and been involved with research centers and organizations, including the Texas Center for Education Policy, under Dr. Angela Valenzuela; The University of Texas–Austin Education Research Center, under Dr. Pedro Reyes; and UCEA headquarters, under Executive Director Dr. Michelle Young.

Recently, Cristóbal has been recognized by the American Association for Hispanics in Higher Education (AAHHE) as a 2010 Faculty Fellow, which provides mentorship nationally recognized faculty and the opportunity to mentor developing scholars in the AAHHE Graduate Student Fellows Program. Returning to Las Cruces, New Mexico, in 2009 also meant that numerous community-oriented programs would seek Cristóbal’s continued participation. As an example of his community involvement, Cristóbal serves as president of La Academia Dolores Huerta Public Charter Middle School Governing Council, a dual-language school with an emphasis on multicultural education. Cristóbal is prepared and ready to serve as Associate Director of UCEA Graduate Student Development, while continuing to proudly serve the students and surrounding communities at New Mexico State University as Assistant Professor.

Podcasts:
UCEA Convention 2009 Keynote Speeches
www.ucea.org/keynote-speakers2009/
Contributing to the UCEA Review

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

Additionally, Andrea Rorrer, University of Utah, has reached the end of her term as UCEA Review Features Editor. We thank her for her invaluable contribution to the Review and the UCEA community. If you have an interest in serving as a UCEA Review Features Editor, please contact Michelle Young at UCEA Headquarters. The Editorial Team (see back page of the Review) meets twice a year. One to two features appear in each issue of the Review, which is published three times a year.

General Editors:
Michelle D. Young: michelleyoung@austin.utexas.edu
Gerardo Lopez: lopezg@indiana.edu

IES Research Grant Competition

The Institute of Education Sciences (IES) is gearing up for its research grant competitions for Fiscal Year 2010. Within IES, the National Center for Education Research anticipates conducting one research competition (84.305A Education Research) that encompasses two topic areas that may be of interest to UCEA members:

Education Leadership:
http://ies.ed.gov/funding/ncer_rfas/edleadership.asp?page=all

Education Policy, Finance, and Systems:
http://ies.ed.gov/funding/ncer_rfas/edpolicy.asp?page=all

Program announcements are available at the above links. The FY 2010 Request for Applications may not have been released by the publication date of this newsletter. However, information on the anticipated application deadlines is located at http://ies.ed.gov/funding/futureComp.asp.

If you are interested in applying to an upcoming IES research competition, please check http://ies.ed.gov/funding/ regularly for new Request for Applications or sign up for the IES Newsflash (http://ies.ed.gov/newsflash/) for e-mail notification of the release of the new RFAs.

For information on the Education Leadership research topic:
Katina R. Stapleton, Education Research Analyst
Institute of Education Sciences
555 New Jersey Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20208
202-219-2154, Katina.Stapleton@ed.gov

For information on the Education Policy, Finance, and Systems research topic:
Karen Ross, Associate Research Scientist
Institute of Education Sciences
555 New Jersey Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20208
202-219-2154, Karen.Ross@ed.gov

UES also invites applications for research projects that will contribute to its new research program on the Evaluation of State and Local Education Programs and Policies (84.305E). For more information contact Dr. Allen Ruby at (202) 219-1591 or Allen.Ruby@ed.gov For information on training opportunities, see http://ies.ed.gov/whatsnew/conferences.

UCEA Members-Only Site

Membership in UCEA is a significant marker of program quality, but the benefits of membership extend beyond being apart of a scholarly community. UCEA member faculty have long enjoyed discounted prices on hard copies of the Educational Administration Quarterly (EAQ). Each year faculty and graduate students are provided with special forms for ordering EAQ at a steep discount off individual subscription rates. Additionally, for the last 8 years, UCEA members have enjoyed free access to the Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership (JCEL) and the UCEA Review. UCEA member faculty continue to enjoy these benefits, though they have been enhanced. JCEL has been included, along with EAQ, in the Sage online education collection. UCEA member faculty can access the entire bundle though the UCEA Members-Only site. The bundle includes all of Sage’s education journals and allows cross-journal searches.

Unfortunately, UCEA can only offer this access to UCEA member faculty. Individuals who are not UCEA member faculty will no longer have free access to JCEL, unless they or their institutions subscribe to the journal/bundle through Sage. Please visit www.ucea.org! UCEA Plenary Session Representatives were provided information on accessing the Members-Only Site.

Place a UCEA Member Seal on Your Department or College Website

UCEA’s members now can showcase their membership for their local community. UCEA has designed a seal exclusively for members to download and place on their department and/or college web page. No tech savvy is required. All you need to do is go to http://www.ucea.org/logo-request/ and fill out the form. The seal will link to UCEA’s Mission Statement on the UCEA home page.
Call for proposals to host the

Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership

Deadline: October 15, 2010

Guidelines for Submitting Proposals

When submitting a proposal to host JCEL, please address the key questions identified below. The UCEA Executive Committee must have a clear understanding of the resources available within your institution to support the editorial offices of JCEL.

Proposals for this editorship must include the following materials:

• A letter of interest
• A current curriculum vitae of each editorial team member
• A prospective editorial strategy
• A statement from an administrator of the applicant’s institution or organization describing support for the appointment

Key Questions

• What is your vision for JCEL and how will you fulfill it?
• Who are the proposed editor and the associate editors? What is your proposed editorial strategy?
• What qualities make your institution a strong candidate to host JCEL?
• What type(s) of institutional support will be provided?

Contributions Requested of Host Institution

• Editor who will manage the flow and review of manuscripts, edit all copy (Sage does copy editing), and oversee the management and well-being of the publication
• Support of editing function by providing necessary equipment and materials (e.g., computer, printer, fax, photocopying, postage, and other pertinent materials)
• Support to send the Editor to the annual meetings of the JCEL Editorial Board, traditionally held at the UCEA convention.

Estimated Annual Costs for Hosting JCEL

• Release time for Editor
• Support personnel to fulfill Managing Editor responsibilities (approximately 20 hours per week)
• Travel support to JCEL Editorial Board meeting at the UCEA annual convention
• Limited expenses associated with copying and other supplies.

The Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership publishes, in electronic format, peer-reviewed cases appropriate for use in programs that prepare educational leaders. Building on a long tradition, the University Council for Education Administration sponsors this journal in an ongoing effort to improve administrative preparation. The journal’s editorial staff seeks a wide range of cases that embody relevant and timely presentations of issues germane to the preparation of educational leaders.

www.ucea.org
Excellence in Educational Leadership Awards

The Excellence in Educational Leadership Award is for practicing school administrators who have made significant contributions to the improvement of administrator preparation. Each year, the UCEA Executive Committee invites member university faculties to select a distinguished school administrator who has an exemplary record of supporting school administrator preparation efforts. This is an unusual award in that it affords national recognition, but individual universities select the recipients. It provides a unique mechanism for UCEA universities to build good will and recognize the contributions of practitioners to the preparation of junior professionals.

Phyllis L. Amick is the interim superintendent in East Washington Schools, a position she accepted in order to build the capacity in school governance that would permit this district to hire a permanent superintendent. Phyllis is known statewide as a superb educator with a very high degree of interpersonal skills; informed judgment about leadership; and an unwavering commitment to the ideals of equity, social justice, and democratic schools. She has served as principal, superintendent in four districts, and adjunct university instructor. Phyllis was the first female in Indiana to serve as the president of the State Superintendent’s Association. Phyllis served as a consultant for the Urban Principals Program at Indiana University. During a school term, while leading her school district from the superintendent position, Phyllis serves professional organizations, teaches graduate classes, mentors both students and peers, speaks at conferences, and writes articles for publication.

William M. Barr has served Georgia education as a teacher, principal, assistant superintendent and superintendent. He has taught graduate classes in educational leadership at Georgia State University and at Atlanta University. Dr. Barr has greatly influenced education in Georgia, serving as executive director of the Georgia School Superintendent’s Association for 8 years. In conjunction with the Georgia Department of Education, Dr. Barr initiated a 2-year professional development program to provide support and preparation for aspiring superintendents. Dr. Barr has made a tremendous impact on education in Georgia with a career that has encompassed leadership positions spanning K–12 and higher education.

Lydia M. Begley has served as superintendent of schools for the Wantagh UFSD since July 2009. She is most proud of the district’s accomplishments in student achievement and professional development. The district is a regional showcase for effective inclusion models in the service of special education students. Dr. Begley served the district as assistant superintendent for instruction 1999–2009. Previously, Dr. Begley served as elementary principal in the New Hyde Park-Garden City Park School District. Other leadership positions included elementary assistant principal in the Harborfields Central School District and elementary teacher. Dr. Begley has received recognition as a Doctoral Fellow for Hofstra University from 1996–2002, the UCEA David L. Clark Grant, and the Pathways to Leadership Scholarship from the NYSCSS. Her professional affiliations are many, including the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development; she is president of the Hofstra Chapter of Phi Delta Kappa and president-elect of the Nassau Association of District Curriculum Officials. Dr. Begley holds a Doctorate of Education from Hofstra University, an MS in Reading from Hofstra University, and a BA in English and Psychology from C.W. Post College.

Marianne Castellon earned an Ed.D. in 2007, a master’s in Special Education in 1981, and a BA in 1978 from the University of Arizona. She served as an elementary education teacher at an American School in Central America, returning to teaching in the United States in 1979 to work 21 years as an elementary special education teacher. In 2001, she became inclusion facilitator for Marana Unified School District in Tucson, Arizona. Dr. Castellon spearheaded program development for students with autism, mental retardation, and various disabilities. She serves as director of educational services for Marana Unified School District. Dr. Castellon is also an adjunct professor for the University of Arizona, where she teaches Education Law to future administrators. She has been instrumental in the development and delivery of online and face-to-face law courses. Dr. Castellon also works for the Arizona Department of Education as a Solutions Team Member, evaluating schools in need of school improvement. Additionally, she has worked for the Department of Education on college certification review committees. Dr. Castellon has received grants to support school program development, including Assistive Technology Grant, Arizona Game and Fish Department grant, School to Work grant and a Marana Foundation grant.

Kent A. Davis became an associate superintendent in the Deer Valley Unified School District in 2000. He has been a faculty associate at Arizona State University since 2004. Since 2007, Dr. Davis has been a McREL Professional Development consultant. Prior to his roles in district administration, Dr. Davis joined the Deer Valley Unified School District as an assistant principal in 1985, moving into a principalship 2 years later. He began his career in education as a schoolteacher in Tucson, Arizona. He has taught primary and middle school children. Dr. Davis has a doctorate, granted from Arizona State University, in Educational Administration and Supervision. His BA and M.Ed. degrees are in Elementary Education from the University of Arizona.

Mary Delagardelle is the executive director of the Iowa School Boards Foundation and the deputy executive director of the Iowa Association of School Boards. She helps prepare future superintendents by teaching a course for Iowa State University in school board–superintendent governance. She is a national leader on school board leadership and student achievement and has collaborated with Dr. Tom Alsbury of North Carolina State in forthcoming books and book chapters. Her dissertation on school board leadership won an award from the Graduate College of Iowa State University and the Jordan Larson Award from the educational administration faculty. Since 1973, she has served as an elementary and special education teacher, an elementary school principal, district curriculum director, and a school board member. She is active in building school partnerships across Iowa, including working with Dr. Richard Elmore of Harvard to facilitate a superintendent network focused on student achievement.
John Dilworth, superintendent of the East Baton Rouge Parish School System since July 2009, knows the importance of a good education. His father was a working man who never learned to read, and his mother had only a third-grade education. Yet they gave him a solid foundation of integrity in life. As a child, he overcame poverty, a stutter, and a segregated school system in Pine Bluff, Arkansas, to become the first college graduate in his family. Mr. Dilworth went on to have a successful career as a professional football player in the mid ’70s and an educator. Because of his experiences, Dilworth’s calling is to help young people understand that education can break the cycle of poverty. Mr. Dilworth has bachelor’s and master’s degrees in Education from Northwestern State University in Natchitoches, LA, where he also served as vice president of University Affairs. Mr. Dilworth served the Caddo Parish Public School District in Shreveport, LA, for more than 26 years as chief operating officer, high school principal, assistant principal, teacher, and coach. Mr. Dilworth was school superintendent in Montgomery, AL, 2007–2009. Winner of the Northwestern University Hall of Distinguished Educators 2008 and the Northwestern Athletic Hall of Fame awards and a graduate of the Broad Urban Superintendents Academy, Mr. Dilworth served on the Montgomery Chamber of Commerce’s Board Committee and was a member of the Montgomery Area YMCA Board, among others. Now, Mr. Dilworth is on the boards of directors for Volunteers In Public Schools, the Louisiana Resource Center for Educators, and Tyrus Thomas, Inc.

Renee Gargano exemplifies “Excellence in Educational Leadership” for her broad and deep commitment to leadership preparation quality for the Westchester and Putnam counties of New York. In the late 1990s, she worked with Teachers College to create a partnership preparation program to support districts’ leadership needs in the region. This program, later redesigned as a partnership with Bank Street College as the Future School Leaders Academy, has graduated over 100 candidates, most school and district leaders in the region. As doctoral programs closed down or curtailed enrollment options in the region, she and her staff worked closely with Manhattanville College to create a cohort doctoral program in educational leadership. With requests from her region’s superintendents, she developed a series of certificate and degree programs with local universities to address leadership development needs and priorities, including Teachers College, Bank Street College, Cornell University, and Pace University. Ms. Gargano has been instrumental in connecting districts to national models in leadership development, through affiliation with the National Institute for School Leadership, Instructional Rounds (for district leaders), and executive coaching.

Colt Gill is superintendent of schools in Bethel School District in Eugene, OR. An outstanding instructional leader, Gill works with district staff to use data-based decision making and research-based best practices. He was an early adopter of computer use in individualizing instruction and has worked with research faculty in the College of Education on literacy strategies. Under his leadership, the Bethel School District has made significant gains in closing the achievement gap at the elementary level. Throughout his administrative career at elementary and district levels, Gill has been a mentor for aspiring and novice administrators. Over the years, he has served as a teacher in the University of Oregon’s Initial Ad-

David J. Gundlach is the director of curriculum and instruction in the Menasha Joint School District. He is recognized statewide for his leadership in the development of a vision for 21st-century learning. He has tremendous internal and external credibility as a leader with a heart for service to his district, his colleagues, and the greater community. Dave has successfully led major adaptive organizational change that has resulted in significant advancements in student learning.

Christina Hernandez, principal at Gonzalez Elementary in McAllen, TX, opened the school in 1991. She has served as the school’s principal for 19 years, providing a vision of success for the school and community. The school consistently has been rated by the Texas Education Agency as a recognized and exemplary school. The Texas Business and Education Coalition has identified the school for students performance. This is not a small feat, especially since she has one of the most diverse learning communities in McAllen. Her latest accomplishment for the school and community, includes transforming the school into a Primary Years Program school and receiving full certification. Mrs. Hernandez has been a very dedicated, committed, and high-energy principal in her zeal to meet the student needs of Gonzalez Elementary, serving on numerous community service boards. She received a BS in Elementary Education, M.Ed. in Guidance and Counseling, and Principal Certification from The University of Texas Pan American.

UCEA Research Utilization Briefs

UCEA has developed with the Wallace Foundation a publication series that shares pertinent information regarding leadership preparation with the individuals who are in positions (at the program, institutional, and state levels) to make use of the information and make positive change. The series provides short, high-impact explanations and examples of how the preparation-focused research can be used to improve leadership preparation programs. These publications are based on new, current, and forthcoming research products from the Wallace Foundation and its funded projects.  

March 2009: Selecting Leadership for Tomorrow’s Schools
June 2009: Assessing Leadership Effectiveness
Sept. 2009: Investing in Staff Resources for Learning Improvement
Dec. 2009: University-District Partnerships
May 2010: The Importance of Program Purpose & Coherence

The views expressed in these policy briefs are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of UCEA or member institutions. These documents are available on the UCEA website: www.ucea.org/research-utilization-briefs
Jim L. Hinson has played a critical role in the preparation and continuing professional development of Missouri’s future and current school leaders through his leadership in a variety of venues. He has served tirelessly as a leader on numerous state and national associations. He continues to be a critical friend of the University of Missouri’s College of Education, the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis, and the Hook Center for Educational Leadership and District Renewal, helping to ensure that leadership preparation programs and activities are rigorous, relevant, and effective.

Rachel A. Holler has been a principal in a challenging urban school environment in Norristown, PA, for 10 years. She has been an agent for change, seeking innovative ways to propel her school to greater achievement while coping with the uncertainty of district reorganization and financial constraint. Still early in her career, she has demonstrated remarkable leadership at both the middle and high school levels, fostering a collaborative environment focused on high-quality instruction and building deep relationships with her students. Dr. Holler also has been instrumental in the redesign of the Principal Certification program in the Educational Leadership program at Lehigh University, has rewritten the Principalship course, and has taught this course for 3 years. She has provided a visitation site for students to learn about urban education. Dr. Holler has served as a mentor to principal certification students and has taught a course on Organizational Leadership. Dr. Holler gained her Ed.D. from Lehigh University in 2006. Since then, she has published an article based on her dissertation, Section 504 and Public Schools.

Ronald Ikin served as a senior administrator in Victoria and New South Wales for 40 years. He is an experienced educator and administrator, a Fulbright recipient, Principal Inspector, and a consultant to Commonwealth Schools Commission. Dr. Ikin has facilitated the Michigan State University (MSU) College of Education study abroad program in Australia the past 7 years. Each year he has taken two sets of students to sites across the country, including universities where students were able to engage with Aussie peers. In addition, Ron secured home-stays for MSU students that allowed them to study and work in Sydney schools. He co-taught a course on leadership to MSU students at the undergraduate level. He’s facilitated visits with Aboriginals and other historic sites in the country. In short, Dr. Ikin is a critical part of the success of MSU’s study abroad in Australia.

Linda S. Irwin joined the Niswonger Foundation as assistant director in charge of school projects in 2004. Previously, Ms. Irwin served Maryville City Schools for 33 years as a teacher, coach, school counselor, and (for 12 years) school administrator. As a principal, Ms. Irwin’s school led the state in annual gains in academic performance and was recognized as one of the top elementary schools in the state. She is past president of the Tennessee Principals Association and chairman of the Tennessee State Board of Education Teacher Preparation and Certification Advisory Committee. For 15 years, she served as chairman of the Blount County American Red Cross Safety Services Committee and has received recognition as a 35-year Red Cross volunteer. She chaired the Tennessee American Red Cross Safety Service Committee for 8 years and later served the state as the Volunteer Field Service Director. Ms. Irwin has participated in many other community involvement activities: Relay for Life Board of Directors, Foothills Fall Festival Board or Directors, Maryville Housing Authority Advisory Board, and the United Way of Blount County. Ms. Irwin holds a bachelor’s degree from East Tennessee State University and a master’s degree from Tusculum College.

Barry J. Kamrath has been the principal at Bloomer Middle School in Bloomer, WI, since 2000. Dr. Kamrath is also the district technology coordinator. In 2008, his school received the Wisconsin Middle School of Excellence Award (small school division) from the Association of Wisconsin School Administrators and the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. He received his Doctorate in Education from the University of Minnesota in 2007. His dissertation, High Superintendent Turnover: A Multicase Study of Small, Rural School Districts, received second place honors for the American Educational Research Association’s Rural Education SIG’s 2008 Dissertation of the Year Award. In 2009, Dr. Kamrath began as an adjunct instructor for the Educational Leadership Department at Viterbo University in La Crosse, WI. Additionally, he is a new adjunct instructor in the Principal Leadership Program at the University of Wisconsin–River Falls. Prior to being a middle school principal, Dr. Kamrath was an instrumental music instructor for 10 years in the Eau Claire Area School District in Wisconsin.

Jean M. Lane has been an instructional and curricular leader throughout her 36 years in education. As superintendent of Richland School District in Washington, she promotes ongoing instructional and curricular improvement through her modeling of leadership that links data-based decision making to actual decisions to improve learning. She has been instrumental in the implementation and development of professional learning communities to support professional practice and team learning for teachers to collaborate and solve problems in classroom practices to improve student learning. Dr. Lane has provided a valuable context within her district for Washington State University students to complete their internships. Her dedication to mentoring, improving student learning, and using data to ask questions to guide school improvement and benchmark gains as well as her work with professional learning communities demonstrate her dedication to excellence in educational leadership. The other part of her dedication is role modeling strong instructional and curricular leadership with clear expectation for her principals to do similarly.

Linda M Paul is the executive director of the New Mexico Leadership Institute (NMLI). The NMLI began in November 2009 to create a statewide system of preservice and in-service leadership development. Dr. Paul previously served as superintendent of the Aztec Municipal School District for 8 years. She was an elementary school teacher and principal, taught at college and graduate levels, and served as assistant superintendent for Aztec Schools and the Central Consolidated School District, which covers the northeastern portion of the Navajo Nation. Dr. Paul holds a bachelor's degree in Elementary Education from the University of Arizona and master's and doctoral degrees in Educational Administration from Teachers College at Columbia University. She is passionate about student success and holds high expectations for school reform in New Mexico.
J. Roderick Rice earned his baccalaureate and master's degrees at Bowling Green State University and a specialist's degree in Educational Administration from Ohio State University. Mr. Rice has a long career as an educator, serving as a science and mathematics teacher, principal, and superintendent. Mr. Rice also served as president and executive director of the Buckeye Association of School Administrators (BASA). Mr. Rice was the recipient of the BASA President’s Award and the Exemplary Educational Leadership Award from the superintendents of Ohio schools. During his 14-year tenure as BASA executive director, he counseled and mentored hundreds of school leaders in Ohio, quietly influencing local school matters and Ohio’s education policy. In 2001, Mr. Rice was recognized as a Pioneer in Education by the Ohio Department of Education. The J. Roderick Rice Lecture Series in Educational Administration and Supervision was established by the BASA at Bowling Green State University to honor Mr. Rice upon his retirement as BASA executive director and to provide an annual professional development activity for school administrators. Mr. Rice continues to champion the cause of public education and make significant contributions to administrator preparation in Ohio as a philanthropist, clinical professor, mentor, and role model to school administrators across the state.

Robert J. Rodosky, executive director of the Department of Accountability, Research, and Planning for Jefferson County Public Schools (JCPS), has led efforts to develop meaningful, high-quality capstone projects in a spirit of cooperation and professional integrity. His expertise in data analysis and program evaluation has deepened doctoral students' interests in accountability and extended their understanding of all aspects of research in a real-time, real-policy context. Dr. Rodosky guides, challenges, and inspires graduate students as an Ed.D. capstone partner. Dr. Rodosky has proven a unique and irreplaceable partner in terms of his professionalism, expertise, and scholarship. He has assumed a central, pivotal role in collaboration with Peabody College faculty and doctoral students to produce highly regarded Ed.D. capstone projects that enable JCPS (and other urban school districts) to move forward with data-driven policy recommendations designed to improve professional practice and student outcomes.

Michael H. Savage began his career in public education in 1960 as a teacher of mathematics and science at Litchfield Jr-Sr High School. He served as athletic director, junior high school principal, and senior high school principal. Mike was secretary and member of the board of directors of the Connecticut Association of Schools (CAS). He has been an active member of the Connecticut Interscholastic Athletic Conference (CIAC), serving as chairman of the CIAC Officials Committee, vice chairman of the CIAC Board of Control, member of the CIAC By-Laws Revision Committee, and representative to the National Association of Secondary School Principals National Honor Society Council. In 1980, Mike was awarded a CAS Citation, the association’s highest honor, and appointed assistant executive director of CAS-CIAC. In 1988, Mike was named executive director of CAS-CIAC. Mike was inducted into the Litchfield Athletic Hall of Fame in 2001 and the Thomaston Hall of Fame in 2007. In 1995, Mike was honored by the Connecticut State Board of Education for his contributions; in 1997, Mike received a citation from the Connecticut General Assembly in recognition of his service to Connecticut high school athletics. In 2010, Mike will receive the prestigious Great American Award from the National Football Foundation. Mike Savage’s service to public education and to high school athletics spans nearly 50 years. His career stands as a monument to intrepid leadership, personal humility, and professional will.

Lucia V. Sebastian is York County’s chief academic officer, responsible for the entire instructional program, pre-K–12 and adult education. Dr. Sebastian also serves as assistant adjunct professor at the College of William & Mary. Dr. Sebastian has served Virginia schools as principal, teacher, and administrator. Her past positions include director of curriculum and student achievement for York County, principal of James River Elementary School in Williamsburg, and assistant principal for Bethel Manor Elementary School and Dare Elementary School in York County. Dr. Sebastian received her undergraduate degree from East Carolina University. She earned her master’s in 1986 and her doctorate of Educational Administration in 1996, both from the College of William & Mary. She has received numerous accolades throughout her career, including National Distinguished Principal of the Year in 2002.

Franny Jo Serenka is superintendent of the Sto-Rox School District. She is celebrating 29 years in education committed to comprehensive school reform and education advocacy. Dr. Serenka is a graduate of Steel Valley High School and attended Duquesne University for all her other degrees: BA in Psychology and Political Science, graduate work in Political Science and Education, MS in Education Administration, and doctoral coursework in Educational Leadership. Dr. Serenka's dissertation research was an analysis of student perceptions related to resiliency. She was an Education Policy and Leadership Center Fellow in 2001, a Temple University Fellow for Comprehensive Reform from 2000–2003, the Henderson Award winner for Educational Leadership at Duquesne University in 2004, nominated to the Western Pennsylvania Forum for Superintendents in 2008, and awarded the Junior Achievement Educational Leadership Award in 2009. Dr. Serenka sits on the Executive Board of the Pennsylvania Leadership Development Council and has developed a program of study dealing with leadership as advocacy for the 21st century. Dr. Serenka is also active with various educators’ groups and is a member of the Purple Heart Auxiliary.

Princess Shareef is the principal of Cleveland High School in Seattle, WA. Her educational leadership includes experience as an instructional assistant, language arts teacher, and middle school counselor. She was the co-developer of a tuition-free summer-school program for historically underserved youth before Seattle Public Schools implemented their own summer-school model. She has served as assistant principal at Washington Middle School and principal of Meany Middle School. Her current focus is the collaborative and equitable conversion of Cleveland High School to a Science Technology Engineering Mathematics (STEM) School in Fall 2010. Ms. Shareef has been an educator for 29 years.

James J. Shaw is superintendent of schools in the Racine Unified School District, an urban district of about 21,000 students. Before coming to Racine in 2007, Jim was clinical professor and director of the Wisconsin Idea Executive Ph.D. Program in the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis at the University of Wisconsin–Madison. His major interest, besides...
teaching educational leadership, was creating partnerships in K–16 education to promote the integration of theory, research, and practice to improve public schools. His research interest is social learning and social development theory and its relationship to school leadership and leadership development. He and Carolyn Kelley recently authored *Learning First: A School Leader's Guide to Closing Achievement Gaps*. Before going to the University of Wisconsin, Jim was a highly acclaimed educator and administrator in K–12 public education, serving for 10 years as the superintendent of schools in Menomonee Falls, WI. He is a former Wisconsin Superintendent of the Year. Jim has received distinguished service and leadership awards from the Wisconsin Association of School District Administrators, the University of Wisconsin–Madison, the Wisconsin Education Association Council, and The Public Policy Forum of metropolitan Milwaukee.

**Stu Silberman** has led two school districts to prominence in the state of Kentucky and three times has been named the state Superintendent of the Year. Most recently, he was among the four finalists for AASAs 2009 National Superintendent of the Year Award. Well-known for his mantra “It's About Kids,” Dr. Silberman was hired in 2004 to be the fifth superintendent in 3 years for the Fayette County Public Schools. He has engaged and rebuilt faith with the community, and student achievement has skyrocketed. Under his leadership 1995–2004, the Daviess County district became a national model, including an appearance on NBC's Today show as one of America's best places to educate children. President Clinton visited the district to observe how students living in poverty could achieve at high levels. Dr. Silberman has taught in the state’s new superintendent training program for several years. Six members of his cabinets have gone on to become successful superintendents, and he is the only superintendent in Kentucky to have served as a mentor in the state's minority superintendent intern program in each of its 3 years. He received the AASA Leadership for Learning Award, the Tech Savvy Superintendent Award from E-School News, and the Kentucky School Boards Association Kids First Award. His districts have received the NSBA Magna Award, the National What Parents Want Award, the Kentucky PEAK award, and a Gold Medallion from NSPRA. He holds bachelor's and master's degrees from the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga, did doctoral work at the University of Alabama, and received an honorary doctorate from Kentucky Wesleyan College.

**Keith Allen Stewart** is Superintendent of Bullock County School District, AL, an official partner with Auburn University. He leads by example, with vision and willingness to try new ways to improve the quality of education and quality of life for students in his high-poverty, high-minority district. He expects administrators and teachers to provide a rigorous and relevant curriculum and promote positive relationships with students. In the past 7 years, student achievement has increased steadily and communication within and among schools has improved greatly. Every school in the district has state-of-the-art technology. Last year Mr. Stewart was a champion for a small rural school in his district that was in danger of being closed due to economic hardships, working with the community and the school board. Prior to his appointment as superintendent, over 9 years in the Tallassee City School District Stewart served as an elementary teacher, high school coach, business education teacher, career/technical education director, technology coordinator, assistant principal, and elementary and high school principal. Mr. Stewart served in the U.S. Air Force for 10 years. He received a BS from Troy University, master's in Educational Leadership from Auburn University, and attended the Superintendents’ Academy at the University of Alabama.

**Ronald P. Walker** serves as superintendent for USD 475 Geary County Schools. In 2003, Mr. Walker was selected to serve on the Kansas Governor’s Fort Riley Area Task Force and continues to co-chair the educational task force. He is a regional director for the National Association of Federally Impacted Schools (NAFIS), which champions military-connected students and schools. He belongs to the United Schools Administrators of Kansas, American Association of School Administrators, Rotary International and the Greater Junction City Chamber of Commerce, Geary Community Hospital Foundation Board, Seven Rivers Coalition, National Committee on the Relevancy on Impact Aid, and the Military Impacted Schools Association. He is a board member for the Kauffman Foundation Kansas/Missouri Superintendents Forum. In 2008, Mr. Walker was appointed to the National Board to administer the Interstate Compact on the Military Child. Since beginning his work in Kansas, he has received numerous commendations and awards for his work as an educational leader. He received the You Make A Difference Award from NAFIS, received the Kansas Partners in Education Award, was a nominee for the 2007 Kansas Superintendent of the Year, and is an active member of Leadership Kansas. Mr. Walker was recognized at the 33rd Annual Governor's Conference for the Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect with the prestigious Heather Child. An Oklahoma native, Mr. Walker received his bachelor’s degree from Langston University, a historically Black college. He received his master's degree from University of Central Oklahoma and is a doctoral student at Kansas State University.

---

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

Dedicated supporters of the UCEA 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 already have included UCEA in your will or estate plans, please contact us so we can update you as a UCEA Partner for the Future.
Shirley She-Lai Wong has been a seasoned administrator and leader in the education community in Hong Kong for a long time. She has served in several important decision-making bodies in the education sector in Hong Kong. From 2006–2008, she served in the capacity of chairperson for the Hong Kong Subsidized Secondary Schools Council. Since 2003, Ms. Wong has been one of the chief initiators of the preparation for the principalship program and professional development program for newly appointed principals in Hong Kong and has been a strong supporter of the Hong Kong Centre for the Development of Educational Leadership at the Chinese University of Hong Kong.

Brian T. Woods is the deputy superintendent for administration in the Northside Independent School District (NISD) in San Antonio, TX, one of the fastest growing districts in the state. He received his master’s degree and superintendent certification from The University of Texas at San Antonio (UTSA) and is completing his doctoral degree. Mr. Woods has been a campus high school principal and assistant superintendent for secondary administration in NISD. He has been instrumental in coordinating ATLAS, a leadership development program for assistant principals aimed at developing future campus leaders. A staff program in NISD is AIM, a 1-year program devoted to working with teachers to learn the various operations of the district as well as to assist them in developing and implementing a school improvement project on their home campuses. Mr. Woods has assisted the Educational Leadership faculty at UTSA in developing collaborative ventures for NISD teachers and administrators, creating an accelerated, blended-delivery (some online) master’s degree program with 25 NISD teachers; gaining board approval for NISD to become a UCEA Affiliate School District Member; writing grants; and hosting information sessions for recruiting students.

Edward J. Zero is district superintendent and executive officer for Eastern Suffolk Boards of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES) as well as interim district superintendent at Western Suffolk BOCES. His career in education spans over 37 years. He received his BA in Biology with a minor in Marine Sciences and Secondary Education from Long Island University, Southampton College, and his MS in Applied Science from Stony Brook University, College of Engineering. Mr. Zero also attended New York University, where he obtained his School District Administrator’s certification. He spent his early career working in environmental education. Programs he administered earned national and state awards, most notably the National Search for Excellence in Science Education award from the National Science Teachers and Supervisors Associations. Mr. Zero served as chairman of the Governor’s Environmental Education Task Force during the Cuomo administration. While serving as the regional manager of the Effective Schools Consortium Network for the Metro Region and as the executive director of the Long Island Regional Support Center, he built a reputation as a staunch supporter of school reform initiatives and innovative programs to address the needs of low-performing, high-poverty school districts. Mr. Zero is regional representative of the Commissioner of Education and the State Education Department. He is a member of the District Superintendents’ Planning Council and is chair of the District Superintendents’ Curriculum, Assessment, and Instruction Committee.
UCEA Employment Resource Center

UCEA Job Search Handbook

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

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

UCEA Job Posting Service

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

Job Search Resources

www.EdLeadershipJobs.org

Subscribe to the feed to get new job postings in your e-mail inbox or RSS reader. Search by date, state, or type of position. The site aggregates in one place all of the jobs posted at

- HigherEdJobs: http://www.higheredjobs.com/faculty/search.cfm?JobCat=64
- The Chronicle: http://chronicle.com/jobs/100/300/3000/

UCEA Job Search Handbook: www.ucea.org/uceajobsearch/jobsearch

Stage-by-stage assistance for graduate students new to the academic job search process. The site includes a plethora of helpful tips and strategies and has been highly acclaimed by past job seekers. Please publicize these resources to your graduate students. Thank you.

A service of UCEA (http://www.ucea.org) and UCEA CASTLE (http://www.schooltechleadership.org)

UCEA Convention 2010: Opportunities for Graduate Students

UCEA Graduate Student Travel Grants

In order to encourage graduate students, especially those traveling from outside North America, to participate in the UCEA Convention, the Executive Committee has authorized competitive travel stipends for the 2010 meeting in New Orleans. Preference will be given to students who will be presenting at the conference. Interested students should send the following information to Bruce Barnett at Bruce.Barnett@utsa.edu by August 15, 2010:

- A short description of the rationale for requesting the funds
- List of the session(s) they will be presenting at during the convention
- Funds being provided by their university

Recipients will be notified of their awards by September 15, 2010. Any questions about these stipends should be directed to Bruce Barnett, UCEA Associate Director: Bruce.Barnett@utsa.edu.

UCEA Convention Volunteers

Graduate students have an exclusive UCEA convention opportunity. Because UCEA's central organization is small, we depend upon the help of graduate students during each year's convention. If you volunteer just 2 hours, UCEA will waive your entire registration fee. You can choose to work at the registration table, or you may work with the vendors in the designated exhibit area. E-mail UCEAgreadrconnex@gmail.com
# Building Bridges: Politics, Partnerships, and the Purpose of Schooling

**UCEA Convention 2010**
October 28-31, 2010
Sheraton New Orleans
New Orleans, Louisiana

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Early (before Aug. 1)</th>
<th>Regular (Aug. 1 - Oct. 8)</th>
<th>Late (Oct. 8 - 30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UCEA University Faculty</td>
<td>$125</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-UCEA Faculty</td>
<td>$160</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicing Administrator</td>
<td>$160</td>
<td>$175</td>
<td>$190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCEA Graduate Student</td>
<td>$45</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td>$70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-UCEA Graduate Student</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REGISTER STARTING JUNE 1 AT:**
http://www.regonline.org/ucea2010

**EVENTS INCLUDE**
- Keynote Speakers Carol D. Lee, Joel Spring, Alan R. Shoho, and Mike Tidwell
- Annual Plenum Session, Wednesday, October 27, 11:00 a.m. - 6:00 p.m., and Thursday, October 28, 7:00 - 11:30 a.m.
- UCEA Awards Luncheon, Thursday, October 28, 12:30 - 2:00 p.m.
- Opening Convention Reception in honor of UCEA Past Presidents, Thursday, October 28, 7:15 - 9:15 p.m.
- UCEA Annual Banquet with Keynote Speaker Beverly Tatum, Friday, October 29, 6:30 - 10:00 p.m.

For More Information, Visit www.ucea.org
Dr. Beverly Daniel Tatum, 9th President of Spelman College, will deliver the Brock Prize Lecture. Dr. Tatum is a clinical psychologist whose areas of research interest include Black families in White communities, racial identity in teens, and the role of race in the classroom. In her critically acclaimed 1997 book, Why Are All the Black Kids Sitting Together in the Cafeteria? and Other Conversations About Race, she applied her expertise on race to argue that straight talk about racial identity is essential to the nation. Going beyond the usual Black–White paradigm, the book uses real-life examples and the latest research not only to dispel race as taboo, but also to give readers a new lens for understanding the emergence of racial identity as a developmental process experienced by everyone. Dr. Tatum is also the author of Assimilation Blues: Black Families in White Community (1987).

Dr. Carol D. Lee is Professor of Education and Social Policy in the Learning Sciences Program at Northwestern University. She is the current president of the American Educational Research Association (AERA), a member of the National Academy of Education, and past president and fellow of the National Conference of Research on Language and Literacy. Dr. Lee is the author of three books, including Culture, Literacy and Learning: Taking Bloom in the Midst of the Whirlwind, and co-editor of Vygotskian Perspectives on Literacy Research, along with other publications. Her research focuses on ecological influences on learning and development, including the cultural modeling framework for the design of instruction that scaffolds knowledge from youth’s everyday experiences to support discipline-specific learning. She is a co-founder of four schools in Chicago spanning a 37-year history and serves as chairman of the board of directors of Betty Shabazz International Charter Schools.

Dr. Joel Spring, Professor at Queens College, City University of New York, has published over 20 books on American and global educational policy, including Political Agendas for Education: From Change We Can Believe in to Putting America First (2010); Globalization of Education: An Introduction (2009); A New Paradigm for Global School Systems: Education for a Long and Happy Life (2007); Wheels in the Head: Educational Philosophies of Authority, Freedom, and Culture from Confucianism to Human Rights (3rd. ed., 2008); Deculturalization and the Struggle for Equality: A Brief History of the Education of Dominated Cultures in the United States (6th ed., 2010); and American Education (14th ed., 2010). Dr. Spring is an enrolled member of the Choctaw Nation. His great-great-grandfather was the first Principal Chief of the Choctaw Nation in Indian Territory, and his grandfather, Joel S. Spring, was a district chief at the time Indian Territory became Oklahoma.

Dr. Alan R. Shoho is Professor of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at The University of Texas at San Antonio, where he has been for 16 years. His research focuses on aspiring principals and assistant principals, high school social processes, and organizational cultures. Dr. Shoho is currently leading a research team of doctoral students to examine social processes in high schools. Dr. Shoho has published in the Educational Administration Quarterly, ERS Spectrum, Journal of School Leadership, Journal of Educational Administration, The High School Journal, Research in Schools, Theory and Research in Educational Administration, Journal of Special Education Leadership, and the International Journal of Educational Management. Recently, Dr. Shoho co-authored with Bruce Barnett and Mike Copland a book chapter in the Handbook of Research on Leadership Education on the use of internship in preparing principals. Dr. Shoho co-authored another piece on admissions to university-based preparation programs in the NCPEA Yearbook and a chapter in the Handbook of Educational Leadership entitled, “Social Justice: Seeking a Common Language.” Dr. Shoho is a member of the editorial boards of Leadership and Policy in Schools and Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership.

Mike Tidwell predicted in vivid detail the Katrina hurricane disaster in his 2003 book, Bayou Farewell: The Rich Life and Tragic Death of Louisiana’s Cajun Coast. He has written five books centered on the themes of travel and nature. These include Amazon Stranger (detailing efforts to save the Ecuadorian rain forest) and In the Mountains of Heaven (travels to exotic lands across the globe). Tidwell has won four Lowell Thomas awards, the highest prize in American travel journalism, and is a former grantee of the National Endowment for the Arts. His articles have appeared in many national publications. Tidwell is also founder and director of the U.S. Climate Emergency Council, based in Takoma Park, Maryland.
The best reason to meet in New Orleans may be because it’s, well, New Orleans. Unlike any other North American city, New Orleans inspires and intrigues. The birthplace of jazz, home to some of the greatest restaurants (and service) in the world, an oasis of history and charm on the Mississippi River, New Orleans is all that and more... and that is why more associations and corporations set attendance records here in the Crescent City than any other place.

This year, UCEA invites you to the Sheraton New Orleans, in the heart of the city, bordering the French Quarter and steps away from the Mississippi River. Each Guest Room reflects a contemporary, warm style and classic New Orleans charm. Located on Floors 9-41 and richly appointed with a “residential” feel, many rooms offer views of the Mississippi River and French Quarter. While many of the world’s finest restaurants are located just outside the doors, you are guaranteed an extraordinary meal without having to leave the hotel at the own Roux Bistro. You can unwind and embrace the ambience of New Orleans in the Pelican Bar or enjoy a Starbucks Coffee®.

The entire city is easily accessible from the Sheraton New Orleans Hotel. Located on historic Canal Street, you are just steps from the Aquarium of Americas and the IMAX Theatre; the National D-Day Museum; Harrah’s New Orleans Casino; and such popular shopping destinations as Canal Place, Riverwalk Marketplace and JAX Brewery. The convention center is minutes away, and the hotel is located on the New Orleans Streetcar line, so you can catch a breezy, relaxing ride up Canal Street to City Park and the New Orleans Museum of Art. Within walking distance you’ll find enough to keep you busy and entertained for as long as you plan on staying.

Exit the hotel’s front doors, cross historic Canal Street, and you’re in the French Quarter, home to famous restaurants and nightclubs, live music, fantastic shopping, museums and historic sites, unique architecture, and a one-of-a-kind, spirited atmosphere. Many visitors are content to spend their entire stay in the French Quarter. But if you do venture out, great things await you.

New Orleans Visitor Information: http://www.neworleanscvb.com/
Sheraton New Orleans: http://www.sheratonneworleans.com
UCEA: http://www.ucea.org

Top Photo: French Quarter Architecture, Photographer: Richard Nowitz/Top and Bottom Photos Courtesy of New Orleans Convention and Visitors Bureau/Middle Photo courtesy of the Sheraton New Orleans
UCEA Call for Convention 2010 Volunteers

If you are interested in serving as a Session Chair or a Session Discussant for the UCEA Convention 2010 in New Orleans, 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:
___ Session Chair for UCEA Convention 2010.
___ Session Discussant for UCEA Convention 2010.

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

Deadline is June 12, 2010.

SPECIAL INTEREST GROUP MEETINGS AT UCEA

If you provide leadership for a special interest group that has met or would like to meet at UCEA’s Convention 2010, please contact Christopher Ruggeri at cruggeri@austin.utexas.edu before August 1.

UCEA will be providing a limited number of slots to SIGs on a first-come basis.
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 Editors:
Michelle D. Young..............................................Executive Director
Bruce Barnett.............................................Associate Dir.of International Initiatives
Gerardo Lopez...........................................Associate Dir. of Publications
Julian Vasquez Heilig..........................Associate Dir. of Program Centers
Scott McLeod............................................Associate Dir. of Communication
Cristobal Rodriguez..........................Associate Dir. of Grad. Student Development
Edwin Sharpe................................................Senior Advisor
Christopher A. Ruggeri..........................Events Manager
Graham Schmidt........................................Administrative Assistant
Lisa Wright, CPA.................................Financial Manager
Bradley Carpenter.................................Graduate Assistant
Pei-Ling Lee...........................................Graduate Assistant
Marilyn Springel........................................Graduate Assistant

Feature Editors:
Samantha M Parades Scribner (IUPUI)
smpscrib@iupui.edu
Andrea Rorrer (University of Utah)
andrea.rorrer@ed.utah.edu

Interview Editors:
Laura McNeal (Michigan State University)
mncneall@msu.edu
Mariela Rodríguez (University of Texas at San Antonio)
Mariela.Rodriguez@utsa.edu

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

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

Managing Editor:
Jennifer E. Cook (UCEA)
jennifercook@mail.utexas.edu

2010–2011 Calendar

June 2010  Deadline, UCEA 2010 Session Chair/Discussant, June 12
July 2010  BELMAS Meeting, Reading, England, July 9-11
           Urban Leadership Development Meeting, Buffalo, July 17-19
August 2010 Deadline, Grad. Student Convention Travel Grants, Aug. 15
           NCPEA national conference, Washington, DC, Aug. 3–6
September 2010 UCEA Convention Program available online
October 2010 Deadline, Proposals to Host JCEL, Oct. 15
           UCEA Convention, New Orleans, Oct. 28-31
November 2010 2010 David L Clark Nominations due, UCEA HQ
March 2011  Deadline, Excellence in Ed. Leadership Award nominations
April 2011  AERA annual meeting, New Orleans, April 8–12
           Jackson Scholars Workshop, New Orleans
           David L. Clark Seminar, New Orleans