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Gracias for that introduction, Noelle! My parents taught me that it’s always important to enter a new space with thanks. So, I want to start with a few thanks so that my mother doesn’t give me the side-eye when she sees the recording. First, to the Executive Committee and Michelle, who brought their best selves to every meeting, discussion, decision, and have been with me on every step of this journey—and it is a journey. Second, for all those who contacted me to offer support and advice, who asked for help, who pushed and questioned and inspired me to be better, do better. Third, to all those who work behind the scenes to make this look effortless, the UCEA headquarters staff—who I don’t think have slept in a month—and to all the hotel staff who have welcomed us and demonstrated the best that Detroit has to offer. Fourth, to the land and its protectors—here and everywhere—who nourish our minds and bodies. Lastly, to my parents and all my ancestors—both personal and professional. Though I stand here alone, they give me strength, courage and purpose. And thank you to all of you. As I stand here I can feel your support—like waves—and it humbles me.

I hope you have enjoyed your days here at the Convention and in Detroit! Let’s give our new president, April Peters-Hawkins, and her fabulous planning team a heartfelt thanks for creating this wonderful space for us to come together.

My original title was “leading in dangerous times.” We are now living in more dangerous times. And to be clear, despite growing evidence across the country,

Black Lives Matter
Native Lives Matter
Muslim Lives Matter
Undocumented Lives Matter
LGBTQ Lives Matter
Differently Abled Lives Matter

And lastly, for our sake here today,
Leadership Matters

Our work matters, our teaching, our research, our advocacy. And just as important, if not more so, our silence matters. Elliot Eisner warns us, our students are watching. They learn leadership as much from us, what we do in...
and out of our classrooms, as they do from our curriculum. What kind of leaders will we be?

In a strange quirk of fate, I saw “Hamilton: An American Musical” last week. The last song is called, “Who Lives, Who Dies, Who Tells Your Story,” sung by Eliza Hamilton. Eliza questions who will tell Hamilton’s story and for what purpose. Hamilton’s story was polished to a high burnish until the myth obscured the man. Lin Manuel Miranda reclaims Hamilton’s story focusing on his immigrant experience, racial ambiguity, poverty, and the challenges he faced because of his roots. A story that is true—more true?—today. So how will the story of our world post—November 9 be told? Who will tell it? For what purpose? What is our responsibility, individually and collectively, in telling the many stories that need to be told, remembered, and reclaimed? What kind of storytellers will we be?

On November 9—really it was November 10—I threw out my original speech. That speech showcased my academic voice and years of scholarly training and was well substantiated by theorists and philosophers—it would have made my professors proud. It was the speech I thought I ought to give. But the voice that needed to speak came from my heart. And I realized that I needed to use that voice here today—to give the speech I wanted to give.

In this kind of forum it is difficult to speak from the heart—as if that somehow undermines my intellect. In this space of privilege—let’s not forget that this is a space of privilege—it is difficult to share my thoughts while I am keenly aware that for many of us, scholars of color in particular, this space isn’t particularly safe, no matter how “far we’ve come.” Last night, Terrance Green reminded all of our Jackson Scholars, “You belong here.” These are words that even we as faculty of color need to hear. So I recognize my role in this space and enter with both trepidation and a deep sense of responsibility. As I do when I’m uncertain, I reached out to my hermanas, two of whom have been mentors of many years. Sylvia Mendez-Morse and Malu Gonzalez—they, unfortunately, couldn’t be here today—both urged me to speak from the corazón and reminded me that leadership is personal. An expression of personal beliefs, values, and experiences. And of deep care for the people and communities we lead. So with their consig, I choose to speak from my heart, to reclaim it as an active and important part of my leadership. I was recently reminded, too, that it’s NOT about me.

Those of us who study Latino leadership know that it’s never about “us”—it’s about our community, those who opened the way for us, and those for whom we open the way.

As I was watching the election results come in, in what seems like a lifetime ago, I felt the Earth’s axis shift, thinking of those for whom we open the way. Van Jones from MSNBC expressed so eloquently the fear of so many parents of breakfast the following morning. “Tomorrow” terrified me, and there was no one sitting at my breakfast table. And though I have no children of my own, I have nieces and nephews on both sides of the border, children I have taught in the past, their children, and of course the children of everyone here in this room.

In these academic circles, we often forget our children. They are the why of our work, the reason we do what we do. The reason we believe in education. If you’ll let me, I would like to share your children today, for the next few minutes.
As I was rethinking what I would talk about here today with our changed world that honored my heart, I turned to my more creative nature. I realized that even as I was struggling with how to share my thoughts with all of you, there was someone I could talk to. … I found I could talk to my “daughter.” I could focus on her and think about what I would tell her—for children, there is no distinction between heart and brain, between emotions and the rationale. Adults are whole human beings to them.

And here I want also to express my appreciation to Irene Yoon, who said to me just the other day when we bumped into each other, “I trust your vision for your talk.” She reminded me to trust my vision, too. Gracias, Irene!

Back to my daughter … so I decided to write her a letter. This letter would let me think about what she needed rather than what I needed. This letter would let me use my heart and my head.

Her name would be Isabel, named after my paternal grandmother. My grandmother was an orphan raised in a convent in Lima, Peru. She became a teacher and then finally the principal of the same convent school where she was a student. She was proud. She never, ever, ever bent. She fought every day of her life, against loneliness and low expectations, against her fears. The thing she wanted above anything else was to feel safe. She and I were creatures from different worlds, and she never quite knew what to do with me, but she loved me all the same. It wasn't until I became a teacher myself that we connected. My Isabel would be proud, she would learn to bend and be a fighter, she would be unafraid, and she probably wouldn't know what to do with me either.

With your indulgence, I offer you my letter to my daughter …

Mi querida Isabel, te amo (because she would be bilingual),

I know you are wondering what's happened while you were safely tucked in bed and why I'm so upset. Knowing you, you're probably mad at me, too, and how I let this happen. And you're scared about what this means for the future and where our family, our community goes from here. … So am I.

In this letter, I'll say things that you might not be ready to hear, but you need to know them, down to your bones. One day you will be ready and you will know—on that day, I may die a little, but on that day, I will be there to pick you up, give you the tools you will need to use your anger for justice, to turn your anger into love. It's complicated and I'll fumble it a bit, so be patient.

And FYI, I’m sharing this letter with a couple hundred of my best friends as we meet in Detroit for our convention. You're used to me sharing our lives with them and you are certainly used to hearing about them. Don’t worry, they will carry you gently, today and always.

You've asked me before why we have so many lotuses around the house. I believe what Thich Nhat Hanh writes, that suffering is transitory and that we can transform suffering into happiness, for ourselves and for others. And that suffering and happiness are connected, like a lotus's roots under the water. The most important thing is to not let ourselves to be overwhelmed by the despair. He writes, “No mud, no lotus.” In order to embrace the beautiful, we must also embrace the ugly. He said that suffering is a kind of mud that we need to generate happiness and joy. The lotuses remind me of that.

Back to your questions. … I won't deny there are reasons to be afraid. You have seen that in schools already, where young people feel emboldened to spew hate. Children who mimic what they see from the adults around them—that they absorb through their skin. The chants to “build that wall,” calls to “go back where you came from,” obstructing access to classrooms for students of color, renewed calls for book banning, young women questioning whether or not to wear their hijabs, assaults on LGBTQ young people, mockery of the differently abled, swastikas appearing on walls … in 2016. You probably even saw some adults threatening their students and their families with deportation or the Muslim teachers threatened by their own students. The Southern Poverty Law Center set up a website, #ReportHate, so that we can witness
how our country is turning on itself. By now there are over 200 incidents [update: as of December 1, 900 incidents had been reported] around the country in schools and universities. Victory can be a heady drug, but victory without kindness is hatred, never forget that.

And the silence … the silence of “good” adults who are supposed to create safe spaces in classrooms, hallways, and schools. Edmund Burke said, “All that is necessary for the triumph of evil is for good people to do nothing.” There are a whole lot of people out there thinking that doing nothing is a good strategy. Where are those “good” teachers and “good” principals to put a stop to the cruelty and unmask underlying White supremacist ideologies? How can children learn when they are afraid to be who they are? How can you turn to the grown-ups if they are blind to that hatred or if they can’t even keep eachother safe? Schools are being uncovered as sites of violence on anyone who is different or seen as “other,” as not belonging. My friends would argue that schools have always been sites of violence on Black and Brown youth, simmering underneath a veneer of “multiculturalism.” Now that the veneer has worn off, so many, so many are left vulnerable and afraid in our schools and other educational spaces. Even the ones where I work.

I can tell you, “We’ll be all right,” and I want you to believe that, and it’s mostly true. In our little world we are pretty “safe.” We have a pretty strong bubble around us. But I can’t tell you the same for some of your friends, or for some of the kids at your school, or for others we’ve never even met. Even among my students there are new undercurrents of uncertainty. And remember how I always tell you that we are all connected? You hear me say all the time, “In lak ech,” Mayan for “Tu eres mi otro yo/You are my other me.” We are all connected in the good and the bad. So where one person feels fear or pain, we all do too. And if we don’t, we have a problem.

Our communities will survive, because we always have and because we don’t know any other way. We need to remember and honor my compadres’ journey to this country as undocumented immigrants. One of millions of families that came here in search of hope. If you’ve learned nothing from their stories, remember this: There is nothing we can’t resist, overcome, accomplish if we work and dream together and build eachother up instead of tearing each other down. This is one more step in a familiar journey paved with the worst that fear offers, but also the best that love has to give.

I can imagine your face and you’re thinking, but how can people do that? That’s a good question. There are lots of reasons, all of them make sense and each answers a part of that question. And if I’m honest, I don’t understand all of the reasons or how they work together to create this tangled web. Some have to do with racism and how it has become so like the air we breathe that many don’t even notice. So prevalent that we don’t see how bigger systems like economies, education, politics, justice were built on and against the backs of our people. Until we pull THOSE walls down, physical walls don’t matter.

Others have to do with racists who, because of what they’ve seen people in power do, feel that they are allowed to step on other people. And then there are those that don’t want to see the difference or don’t want to see how their own privilege keeps them blind, either on purpose or because they don’t know they don’t know. Either way, those people work hard to keep their access to opportunities, education, wealth, power safe and sealed off from others.

Other reasons have to do with some people thinking that they know more about what it means to be Black or Brown—or know what we need—that those very people … and that’s true for Native people, LGBTQ, and immigrants. Or they start “fixing” us without stopping to understand who we are. But we know that these people don’t really know and are afraid to listen. And sometimes when they do get up the nerve to ask, we are too weary or too angry to answer.

Me, one thing I have spent a lot of time thinking about is that some of us stopped loving each other and how some of us, I realized, never loved the other part of us at all. And I don’t mean the mushy love that you see in the movies or read about and isn’t really real. I’m talking about the kind of love where we see each other, I mean really see each other, gifts, flaws, fears, everything. Where we witness eachother's pain and recognize that we contributed to it in the past, that we contribute to it even now, and that unless we do something very different we will contribute to it in the future. That kind of love requires honest and hard work. It means that we acknowledge our separate and intertwined histories and our common future. And that makes us realize that we move forward together or we don’t move at all. This is a courageous love, a love that requires strength.

Martin Luther King talked about a love that is both tough-minded and tender-hearted. He said that they were both important to making the change we want to see in the world. The tough mind can be clear, insightful, and logical but both important to making the change we want to see in the world. The tough mind can be clear, insightful, and logical but without heart can be dismissive and cruel. The tender-heart can be warm and welcoming, but alone can be indecisive and petty. It takes both to create justice.

Now, you are asking, but don’t YOU teach those “good” people that work in schools? Shouldn't you be teaching them better? Yes, Isabel, yes I do and, you know what, yes I should. The people I’m meeting with, the people who prepare the teachers and principals for school buildings all over the place, they are good-good people. In their own ways they try to grapple with the problems that you live every day. Sometimes we get in our own ways and overthink things—then again, sometimes we underthink things, too—and forget what it means to be a child in school, or a child of color, or a child living in poverty going to a place that reminds them over and
over again that they are not important.

We know what’s at stake. Our brains know about the gaps in achievement or other academic outcomes. Our brains know that leadership in schools matters. But somehow we keep forgetting to think about you, your questions, your dreams, your pain. And it’s easy to lose your faces when we talk about you as “data.” But when they do remember, and when they think about kids like your friends, many of them will fight until they can’t fight anymore to make schools smarter, kinder, more joyful places. That’s our job after all.

Most of want to listen to our better angels, most of us want to leave this world a better place than we found it. Some of us don’t know how, and some of us are afraid to let go of our histories—personal and collective—to make room for others. It’s a constant struggle for each of us and for us as an organization. But we are an organization of people, after all, and in the days ahead we have to recommit ourselves to each of our children. We have to recommit ourselves to the fight for justice. We have to recommit ourselves to love—this is not about us, it’s about our communities. We may not be able to move our dreams forward over the next few years, but we damn well better hold the line. They’ve hit us before with water cannons, rubber bullets, dogs, tear gas, and our ancestors held the line. Our elders and young people, even now in Standing Rock and across the country, are holding the line. We have to hold the line.

And if that means putting our documented, overeducated, privileged bodies out front, then I’ll be there. And if it means that our field, my field, has to think less and do more, then I’ll be there. And if it means that I have to teach you to be a Toltec Warrior Queen, then I will be there!!

Never, ever forget, what the Mexicanos say: “They tried to bury us. They didn’t know we were seeds.”

And it means, mi querida Isabel, that all of us have to be vigilant—every single day—for slip ups and slip backs, vigilant against the comfort of complaisance. Many of us feel like Sisyphus rolling that rock up that mountain and feeling squashed when it rolls back down, even a little. We each make decisions to be Sisyphus, the rock or the mountain. Which will you be?

Your Abuelita, my mother, used to call me “La Revoltosa”—the revolutionary or the rebellious one—it loses in the translation. I would get so angry, I couldn’t speak. But that anger is never enough, the anger leaves you empty. Courage comes from a place that weds anger and love. And real courage comes from a place of anger and love in the service of others. I love you, I love the work that I do, I love my familia, and I love the people who are part of my comunidad, this community.

My one, biggest hope, my biggest fear, is that in the face all of this, I made you proud.

Con todo corazón,
Tu Mamá

I’m not sure what Isabel would do with my letter. I don’t know if it would make her feel better or if she would shove it to the back of her sock drawer. I don’t know if it would help her understand where we go from here. And I don’t know the conversations you have had with your children or students.

But it does help me think about what happens here, from this moment on, and what we need to keep our eyes on. Justice is not a theoretical construct that we pick and put down as needed or as convenient, or to get our paper accepted to a conference. Justice is the difference between life and death for children, youth, and communities across the country. It is real.

I am proud of the work that we have accomplished this year as an organization. We have begun several projects designed to improve the field, but also to build and strengthen our community of scholars and areas of inquiry, everything from the Professional Development Network to the Plenum common reading. We have taken a stand on a number of important social issues and have become more responsive and nimble at doing that. We will, I think, be proud of that in the future. We have done all that from the heart and have become better every time. And with every misstep we know better and we commit to being better, doing better.

As leaders, we need to repurpose our work and stay focused on the issues that matter and the what lays ahead. And we don’t stop … ever.

We need to use love. We need to embrace each other. We need to be kind and joyful, because our children are watching.

And to everyone, con todo corazón, thank you all very, very much for the honor of being your president!! Muchas, muchas gracias.
From the Director:
The UCEA Consortium’s Focus on Quality Leadership Preparation Yields Significant Results

Michelle D. Young
UCEA Executive Director

Providing High Quality Research-Based Preparation is a major priority of the University Council for Educational Administration. Since 2000, UCEA has taken a keen interest in developing a research-based understanding of quality leadership preparation. Several initiatives have been particularly influential in the field. First, UCEA, working with partner organizations the American Educational Research Association Division A and the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration, kicked off a Joint Research Taskforce focused on conducting a series of meta-analyses of the research literature focused on various elements of the research literature (Young, 2004). The goals of this effort included both charting what was known and stimulating more and better research on the preparation of leaders. That effort led to the development of two research handbooks (Lumby, Walker, Bryant, Bush, & Bjork, 2009; Young, Crow, Murphy, & Ogawa, 2009) and the Journal of Research on Leadership Education, which have provided important resources for scholars, policymakers, and leadership preparation faculty. The Journal of Research on Leadership Education is particularly significant given that it was the first journal in the field to focus specifically on leadership preparation (Murphy & Vriesenga, 2004). At the end of 2016, UCEA published the second edition of the Handbook of Research on the Education of School Leaders, highlighting the work of a robust and growing community of preparation-focused researchers (Young & Crow, 2016).

Of equal significance is the program evaluation work supported by UCEA and its partner organization the Learning and Teaching in Educational Leadership (LTEL) Special Interest Group of the American Educational Research Association. Together, UCEA and LTEL developed an evaluation research taskforce, which worked with a national network of programs to develop a valid and reliable survey instrument to chart the features of preparation programs as well as graduates’ perceptions of program quality. The survey designed by the taskforce was adopted by UCEA in 2008 and revised to create the School Leadership Preparation and Practice Program Survey and the School Leadership Preparation and Practice Graduate Survey. Today, after years of testing and improvement, UCEA offers a suite of program evaluation surveys, the Initiative for Systematic Program Improvement Through Research in Educational Leadership (INSPIRE), that capture program features, graduate perspectives, and graduate impact once graduates become educational leaders. The primary goal of the INSPIRE Suite is to provide a source of data for program faculty to take a critical and evaluative examination of their program in order to engage in productive and effective program changes for improvement, accreditation, and stakeholder support. The surveys are used by a growing number of leadership programs and consortia to examine relationships between program features, graduate perspectives, and graduate impact once candidates become educational leaders; to identify program strengths and weaknesses; and to use survey results to foster program planning and improvement.

Working with New Leaders and with support from The Wallace Foundation, UCEA applied its expertise in reviewing and evaluating leadership preparation to the development of a toolkit for state agencies: the State Evaluation of Principal Preparation Programs (SEP) Toolkit (Ikemoto, Keleman, Tucker, & Young, 2016). Based on an understanding that growing numbers of states were either required or interested in developing statewide systems for evaluating leadership preparation but lacked models of how to enact this role effectively and fairly, UCEA and New Leaders developed a state guidance document, a program evaluation model, and a set of tools designed to provide state education agencies with detailed guidance on fair and reasonable data sources and processes such agencies might use to evaluate preparation programs. The model reflects the research-based logic model developed by the UCEA-LTEL research evaluation taskforce on how leadership preparation impacts leader practice and includes five categories of indicators that reflect program inputs, program processes, program outputs, graduate outcomes, and student outcomes. The tools include a state self-assessment of readiness, goals, and resources; an annual evaluation report that includes state-gathered data sources; and an in-depth review process modeled on the review process used by UCEA with its own membership. Furthermore, the SEP Toolkit recommends the use of the INSPIRE program evaluation surveys.

UCEA has contributed significantly to efforts focused on understanding the nature and impact of educational leadership preparation. The above accomplishments represent only a slice of the UCEA consortium’s work in supporting this work. Significantly, the universities that have chosen to affiliate with UCEA and accepted for membership have a culture and ethos of continuous improvement, and their interest in gathering and using program data to engage in program planning, improvement, and/or redesign is a sign of intentionality and ongoing commitment to high-quality leadership preparation programming (Winn et al., 2017).

http://twitter.com/UCEA
UCEA is thrilled to share with you a set of resources and tools designed to help states improve principal preparation by reforming their current approach to evaluating educational administration programs. Created in partnership with the New Leaders, the State Evaluation of Principal Preparation Programs Toolkit—or SEP³ Toolkit—provides essential guidance on implementing a more in-depth and rigorous principal preparation evaluation process, thereby enabling states to accurately assess quality, promote improvement, and intervene in the case of performance that raises concerns. Download these materials: www.sepkit.org
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The Initiative for Systemic Program Improvement through Research in Educational Leadership (INSPIRE) Surveys include a suite of evaluation resources made available by the UCEA Center for the Evaluation of Educational Leadership Preparation and Practice. These surveys are available for leadership preparation programs to produce evidence helpful in improving programs, meeting accreditation requirements, and making the case for support among various constituencies. INSPIRE is aligned with national educational leadership standards and the UCEA Institutional and Program Quality Criteria and provides a source of evidence on program outcomes.

www.ucea.org/resource/inspire-leadership-survey-suite/
NEW: Second Edition of the
Handbook of Research on the Education of School Leaders
Michelle D. Young & Gary M. Crow, Editors

“A landmark book. The highest quality and most comprehensive resource on the education of school leaders available.”
- Joseph Murphy, Frank W. Mayborn Chair of Education and Associate Dean, Peabody College, Vanderbilt University

“The Handbook of Research on the Education of School Leaders 2nd edition is the source book to use for designing a leadership curriculum for the future. As K-12 schools face increased pressure to improve student outcomes, the educational leadership skill set is changing to meet the demands of an instructionally focused curriculum. This book is a must have for understanding how best to train school leaders to lead instructionally focused schools based upon ‘the most up-to-date research on the field.’
- James E. Berry, Professor of Educational Administration, Eastern Michigan University and Executive Director, National Council of Professors of Educational Administration

Available for pre-order at Amazon

The Handbook of Research on the Education of School Leaders (2nd ed.) brings together empirical research on leadership preparation and development to provide a comprehensive overview and synthesis of what we know about preparing school leaders today. With contributions from the field’s foremost scholars, this new edition investigates the methodological foundations of leadership preparation research, reviews the pedagogical and curricular features of preparation programs, and presents valuable insights into the demographic, economic, and political factors affecting school leaders. This volume both mirrors the first edition's macro-level approach to leadership preparation and presents the most up-to-date research in the field. Updates to this edition cover recent state and federal government efforts to improve leadership in education, new challenges for the field, and significant gaps and critical questions for framing, researching, evaluating, and improving the education of school leaders. Sponsored by UCEA, this handbook is an essential resource for students and scholars of educational leadership, as well as practitioners, policymakers, and other educators interested in professional leadership.
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Welcome New UCEA Member
Purdue University

The Educational Leadership and Policy Studies program at Purdue's College of Education prepares people who are committed to teaching and departmental leadership, administrative, or professional positions. Our graduates assume positions as building-level administrators, superintendents, central office administrators, educational leadership researchers, and educational policymakers. The program provides a strong emphasis on student learning environments, community collaboration and development, educational policy, and managing of organizations from an educational and business perspective. The core curriculum also explores contemporary educational issues and how they relate to the work of school leadership.

The program offers three degree programs: (a) master’s degree or Educational Specialist in Educational Leadership with Indiana building-level licensure, (b) PhD in Educational Leadership (cohort doctoral program) with Indiana superintendent licensure, and (c) full-time PhD program in Educational Leadership and Policy Studies.

Faculty are involved in a number of local, state, and national initiatives. For example, one faculty member serves as the executive director of the National Rural Education Association and is involved in the Purdue Educational Leadership Initiative for Small and Rural Schools and the Woodrow Wilson Fellowship program. Another faculty member is involved in research with practicing administrators in New Jersey, Indiana, and Missouri, engaged in inquiry around the intersections of equity, contexts, and leadership. All faculty work with both master's and doctoral students and are committed to developing practitioners with a solid understanding of state and national standards for leadership.

Purdue’s College of Education meets the challenges of educating 21st century learners by discovering what works in education. The college prepares highly qualified educators and conducts research that informs how teachers teach and students learn. With a focus on integrated P-12 STEM education and a commitment to social justice and diversity, graduates are prepared to be leaders in education, business and society.

Purdue University, a top public research institution, offers higher education at its highest proven value. Committed to affordability, the university has frozen tuition and most fees at 2012-13 levels. Committed to student success, Purdue is changing the student experience with greater focus on faculty–student interaction and creative use of technology. Committed to pursuing scientific discoveries and engineered solutions, Purdue has streamlined pathways for faculty and student innovators who have a vision for moving the world forward.
Professor Donald (Don) H. Layton seemed born to capture the love and admiration of all those who knew him. In his own quiet and unassuming way, he was truly one of the icons of our field. And he leaves us with a legacy of kindness, acceptance, ingenuity, mentorship, and especially, a subtle sense of humor that could catch you when you least expected it.

Don, 81, died on Saturday, October 22 of a long-standing illness in Exeter, New Hampshire, where he resided at the Riverwoods Retirement Community, an independent retirement community for seniors.

Don loved people and loved watching how they reacted to situations and what they did. Thus, while this memorial includes the traditional biographical information, it focuses mainly on how many of those friends he watched felt about him, as a professional but, more importantly, as a loving human being.

He was born in a small Ohio town, Russellville, on April 23, 1935. He left Russellville after high school graduation for Northwestern University where he completed an undergraduate degree (BA) in 1956 from one of the premier Political Science Departments in our nation. A few years later in 1959 he completed his second undergraduate degree (BS in education) at The Ohio State University, and he continued to pursue his preferred field outside education, political science.

After a secondary teaching stint in the Columbus, Ohio, and suburban Chicago schools, he was selected to a teaching fellowship at Harvard University, where he completed a master’s degree. He then returned to Chicago, and the University of Chicago, as a Laverne Noyes Fellow and earned a PhD from a program that produced professors in educational administration throughout the nation.

It was my privilege to have met him when we attended American Educational Research Association (AERA) and American Educational Administration Association meetings and where our two graduate institutions, Stanford University and the University of Chicago, enjoyed close ties. Later in 1968, I recruited Don to the University of California at Los Angeles and the Urban Educational Policy and Planning Program, where he taught 5 1/2 years. This was an interdisciplinary program that valued his political science background and interest in national and state educational politics and policy. Don was very popular among his fellow faculty members and his students.

In the late 1960s, along with his mentor, Roald Campbell, and fellow student, Gerald Sroufe, Don conducted a seminal study examining the different organizational plans for administering education at the state level. This study launched Don’s career in higher education, and he went on to complete his dissertation, which was a historical study of the early development of the Commission on the States. Strengthening state departments of education, especially as agencies of political leadership that help link educational professionals, the public, and political leaders, served as an early focus of his academic research.

Gerry Sroufe, now an AERA senior advisor, recently proposed an AERA session commemorating Don, emphasizing Don’s interest in intergovernmental relations. In so doing, he stated, “Certainly, the topic of federal–state relations merits additional attention in terms of contemporary political events.” In addition, Gerry shared these personal accolades:

Always thoughtful, Don was an exquisite writer and an excellent editor. Following our Chicago days, Don was always our first visitor when career moves took us to new locations. Our young children always welcomed him because he tolerated their climbing all over him. They referred to Don as their “funny man.”

Unequivocally, his most significant and lasting contribution to our field, however, was his longtime dedication and commitment to an area in our profession he helped initiate in the late 1960s, the Politics of Education. He was always proud to say he was one of the organizing members of the Politics of Education Association (PEA) at the 1969 AERA Conference in Los Angeles. While he was active in a number of professional organizations and editor of several academic publications, the PEA would be his prized affiliation. He served not only as a president of PEA, but also as the historiographer of this organization throughout his career. In 1994, PEA awarded him the first Distinguished Service Award and in 2007, the David L. Colton Award for devoted service to the development and history of the PEA. This award is given infrequently and is a special honor for the Awards Committee to bestow. Bruce S. Cooper, Fordham University professor emeritus and former PEA president, recently wrote, “So sorry and sad about the passing of wonderful, kind, and brilliant Don Layton. PEA will always remember and revere Don. And I shall always remember and revere Don as a friend, colleague, and inspiration.”

Don and I had the pleasure of working together on several projects. Two, in particular, focused on this new politics
of education field to which he dedicated his scholarly interests. In 1989, we co-edited a monograph for the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA), which included a historical chapter Don wrote on the “Politics of Education in the Curriculum of Educational Administration.” This chapter delineates how politics and policy became the underpinning and rationale for the reorganization of the curriculum in educational administration. Our other collaboration was the 1994 commemorative yearbook of the PEA (1969–1994) we co-edited in 1995. This book surveyed major trends in politics of education over the preceding quarter century of PEA’s existence.

His publications, conference papers, teaching assignments, and related professional activities always reflected his single-minded commitment to the politics of education field. As Betty Malen, Distinguished Scholar Teacher, University of Maryland, indicates, Don will be remembered for his dedication and kindness. Betty recalls,

I remember Don’s investment in the Politics of Education Association and his warm welcome to all who came to our SIG meetings. He was so committed to the development and continuation of a community of scholars! He wanted us to all enjoy one another’s company and benefit from our collegial exchanges. He taught me a lot about what it means to be a steward of the field.

For the past few years, Don endured several health issues, which undoubtedly was why he asked me a year ago last fall if I could do something with the several boxes of historical PEA documents, letters, minutes, and the like he had collected over four decades. I said I would but had no idea what I would do with this massive data trove at the time. Shortly, thereafter, he had all his boxes mailed to me at my home in Dallas, Texas.

It occurred to me, we needed active members of the field to help us. Thus, I contacted five young professors whom both Don and I either mentored or were aware of their interest in our field. Enrique Aleman and Curtis Brewer from the University of Texas at San Antonio, Samantha Scribner and Brendan Maxey from Indiana University in Indianapolis, and Gerardo López from the University of Utah were invited to Dallas to determine what to do with this cache of materials with which Don had entrusted us. Aleman, Brewer, López, and Scribner met in Dallas, and together we opened the boxes for the first time. An initial inventory was completed, preliminary discussions of content were undertaken, and two decisions were made: First, the boxes would be sent to Indiana University for archiving; and second, a meeting was scheduled during the summer in Maine.

The files are currently in the care of Samantha Paredes Scribner at the Center of Multicultural Education at Indiana University School of Education at IUPUI. The team has been cataloguing these documents, drawing on their contents to inform an analysis of the field and the professoriate as it relates to contemporary political actions within and among marginalized communities.

The upshot of all this was our profound appreciation for how much Don cared for and meticulously chronicled the history of PEA. Curtis remarked, “I remember that he was a meticulous record keeper. He approached the task artfully and it is clear [his mission] was to document the creation of an important organization.” Samantha recalled,

My first memories of Don are as a kind, gentle and loyal friend of my parents. Delving into his notes, though, and apart from awe for his meticulous record keeping, my favorite revelations are his notes in the margins of an agenda from a meeting in the early 90s, when he (amusingly) wrote a “note to self” about the backlash he got after recommending a woman (Catherine Marshall) lead PEA.

Martha McCarthy also underscores Don’s advocacy for gender equity, asserting that he was one of the first people who befriended and encouraged me when I was a new, very green assistant professor. I will always be indebted to Don for his warm welcome and kindness in making me feel that I belonged in what was then a very male-dominated field!

On their way to Maine, Curtis and Enrique stopped to spend time with Don 2 months before he passed. And Enrique’s subsequent comments provide a wonderful summary to this entire undertaking:

I feel fortunate that I had the opportunity to sit and visit with Don this past summer on our trip to Maine. Yes, I have used his work—both in teaching the Politics of Education and thinking about my own research—but it was the first time I was able to sit across from the man who helped organize, sustain, archive, and grow the field of the politics of education. Although he wasn’t feeling well, he was engaging—asking questions about my training, work and scholarship. . . . Most of all, I appreciated receiving an email from him when I returned. He was very gracious, thanked me and Curtis for taking time to visit, and wished us well.

Indeed, Don was a friend to us all, a unique individual whose attentions, concerns, and curiosities ranged far and wide beyond his professional interests. He took great pleasure in sharing his excitement about the trips he had taken, the museums he visited, or the concerts he attended. He traveled to most of the continents throughout the world and served as a lecturer at institutions of higher education in Australia, Canada, and Great Britain. When I asked his former classmate what he remembered about Don, Jim Cibulka, former president of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education and founding president of the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation, responded,

Don welcomed me to the University of Chicago doctoral program in 1966. From the start he took an interest in my personal and professional well-being. Thus began a 50-year friendship centered on shared ideas and interests, which included not only our academic discipline in the politics of education but also literature, music, art, religion, and public affairs. He was one of the most well-read and educated persons I have had the privilege to know. Don represented civility, tolerance, good manners, and generosity. He was both a scholar and a gentleman.

Likewise, his Canadian friend, Richard Townsend, wrote, “Barbara and I see Donald as a caring gentleman, intellectually hopeful and helpful to others in achieving excellence!”

People close to Don will always remember his humanity, his compassion, friendliness, and generosity. As I said at the outset, while this memorial mentions some of his most significant profes-
sional contributions, it mainly focuses on how his friends felt about him as a person. And in so doing, I thought what the former dean of the college where he spent most of his career had to say about him would be a fitting conclusion to this “Remembering a Friend” article. Jim Fleming, professor and Dean Emeritus, School of Education, University at Albany (SUNY), remembers him as follows:

From the beginning I knew Don as very bright, well credentialed, with exceptional expertise in the educational policy and politics field he cared about deeply. All of this was obvious to his students who consistently found his classes to be the best. Moreover, they really liked him, for they knew he genuinely cared about them.

On a somewhat more personal note, Don could be one of the most self-effacing faculty members—sometimes modest to a fault. But always with a sense of humor, and sharp as a tack: About one of his colleagues with a highly inflated ego, Don could tell you how soon after his publication that individual’s books had been remaindered for almost nothing.

As far as I know, Don never owned a car. I doubt he knew how to drive. He lived in a modest house near the campus. He was consistently frugal. Don didn’t stay in the conference hotels, finding less expensive accommodations nearby. This I had vivid evidence of when I encountered him staying at YMCA at the AERA Conference in Toronto.

Despite having long-time health problems, Don remained cheerful and stalwart in the work he loved the most: his research and writing; the service to his department; and, most insistently, his teaching.

Don had a legion of students out there who knew what they had.

Finally, on a personal note, Don was always more than a personal friend to my family. He, Alicia, and I shared many wonderful times together over the 50-plus years we knew each other. He followed our children’s adventures and accomplishments with interest and affection, always acting like the adopted uncle he was to the Scribner siblings. And he will be missed.
Innovative Programs:
Graduate Certificate in School Technology Leadership at the University of Kentucky

Jayson W. Richardson
San Diego State University

Sara C. Heintzelman
University of Kentucky

Department of Educational Leadership Studies

The Department of Educational Leadership Studies at the University of Kentucky offers opportunities for graduate students to pursue an MEd, EdS, or an EdD degree. The department also offers an undergraduate certificate in leadership studies. Additionally, a PhD degree in Educational Sciences is available at the college level with an Educational Leadership strand. The department provides programs and specializations in teacher leadership; principalship; superintendency; and most recently, school technology leadership. Traditionally, the department has offered its programs in a hybrid format where students meet face to face at the University of Kentucky 6–10 times per semester. The remaining learning activities occur online through a learning management system. The department has been transitioning to Canvas over the past 5 years. As of Fall 2016, all courses in the department are housed in Canvas.

School Technology Leadership Program Structure

The field of School Technology Leadership began to get its footing at the University of Minnesota with the guidance of Scott McLeod and Joan Hughes. Through a U.S. Department of Education Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education grant, they co-created the nation’s first graduate program designed to prepare technology-savvy school leaders. The School Technology Leadership Initiative was the first academic program based on the National Educational Technology Standards for Administrators (International Society for Technology in Education [ISTE], 2002). The UCEA Center for the Advanced Study of Technology Leadership in Education (CASTLE) developed out of this innovative program. Four cohorts successfully completed the program at the University of Minnesota. In 2011-2012, the program was redesigned, updated, and implemented at the University of Kentucky.

McLeod, Bathon, and Richardson (2011) discussed that the intersection of technology and school leadership often falls into three domains: (a) using digital technology to teach traditional educational leadership content, (b) training school leaders to use digital technologies, and (c) preparing school leaders to be better technology leaders. In response to this reality and to address these three domains, the Department of Educational Leadership Studies at the University of Kentucky began to offer courses in the fully online School Technology Leadership graduate certificate in Fall 2012. The School Technology Leadership graduate certificate is comprised of five fully online courses. These five courses are structured around the ISTE (2016b) Standards for Administrators (formerly the National Educational Technology Standards for Administrators). ISTE (2016a) noted how the standards work together to support educators, students and leaders with clear guidelines for the skills and knowledge necessary to move away from the factory model. These are not the typical boxes educators need to check. They provide a framework for rethinking education, adapting to a constantly changing technological landscape and preparing students to enter an increasingly global economy. (para. 1)

Thus, the courses were developed broadly around the topics of visionary leadership, digital-age learning culture, excellence in professional practice, systematic improvement, and digital citizenship. The Department of Educational Leadership Studies offers two School Technology Leadership courses per semester. Students can complete the graduate certificate in one calendar year, including taking one course during the summer session. The graduate certificate was not intended to be cohort based. However, most students tend to complete the courses in a cohort.

The School Technology Leadership graduate certificate courses include synchronous meetings to supplement the fully online content, hosted in Canvas. Using a video conferencing platform called Zoom, students meet 6–10 times per course per semester. Zoom is a cloud-based application that allows all participants to stream their video and audio feeds live. A Zoom meeting feels like a traditional face-to-face class where all participants can see each other and interact in real time. Both Canvas and Zoom work well on mobile devices as well as desktop and laptop computers. To avoid confusion with online courses that have no synchronous components, the faculty in the Department of Educational Leadership Studies often describe how all of their online courses have “Internet-facilitated face-to-face class sessions.” In Zoom, the audio and video streams are instant, which makes the interactions feel natural. Zoom allows for participants to share their screen, chat, and collaborate on a whiteboard, all in real time. In addition, Zoom allows the instructor to create breakout rooms where groups of students can work collaboratively. The instructor can easily pop into these rooms to facilitate small-group instruction.

Using Canvas and Zoom together, students report that the program feels like a traditional, face-to-face, on-campus course. However, students note that there are more robust opportunities to engage with peers from around the world over a sustained period of time in this online environment. Because of the technology, students report that the School Technology Leadership courses have more faculty and student interactions than in traditional brick-and-mortar courses.

Coupled With Existing Programs

Completing the University of Kentucky School Technology Leadership graduate certificate has become an attractive way for students to complete all of the coursework for an MEd or EdD fully online. In the EdD program, students have used the School Technology Leadership courses to fulfill their elective requirements. The online graduate certificate in School Technology Leadership...
has allowed some students to even design a PhD program that is fully online.

The University of Kentucky has a standing tradition of offering its distance learning (i.e., hybrid or online) courses at in-state tuition rates. Thus, the program is quite affordable for students. In 2015, the PhD in Educational Sciences with a Specialization in School Technology Leadership was ranked the fourth most affordable online doctorate in the country (Online PhD, 2015). Although the coursework is online, the Educational Leadership doctoral program offers an annual optional doctoral symposium that is hosted on the University of Kentucky campus in Lexington. Designed by students and implemented by faculty and past participants, students from around the world participate in sessions focused on dissertation writing, academic publishing, and mastering tools needed to effectively collaborate online. The summer symposium is a way that online students can engage in the university culture and meet faculty and peers in a face to face environment.

International Attraction
The School Technology Leadership online graduate certificate program in the Department of Educational Leadership Studies has gained the attraction of international school educators. Students from countries including Vietnam, India, Hong Kong, Thailand, Austria, Canada, and Singapore have completed the graduate certificate. Most of the students, however, remain based in the United States.

Recognized Success
Students in the School Technology Leadership graduate certificate program have careers that range across the field of education. Graduates of the School Technology Leadership graduate certificate are frequently viewed as leaders and innovators. Thus, while most students enter the graduate certificate program with a distinct focus and direction, it is common for students to shift their interests and even get promoted into new roles. Often, these career changes are a result of participation in the School Technology Leadership program. For example, recognized for their technology-leaning reputation and leadership experiences in their previous roles as school leaders, both Curt and Stephanie were hired as school administrators of larger school districts. Ryan, a high school assistant principal, was reassigned to another school within his district because of his successful implementation of change. Robert and Dana work at international schools in Hong Kong and Vietnam, respectively, and lead the technology integration efforts of their K-12 schools. Propelled by their success in the School Technology Leadership program, both are also highly sought after innovation and technology consultants. Tyler, a student who recently returned to the United States from Vietnam, works as director of the Center for Teaching Excellence at a higher education institution. Another student, Todd, recently acquired the role of Director of Education and Workforce at a state university. These are just a few of the success stories of this innovative program.

Details on the University of Kentucky’s School Technology Leadership graduate certificate can be found here:
https://education.uky.edu/edl/school-technology-leadership
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Call for Nominations

2017 Exemplary Educational Leadership Preparation Award

Intent to Apply due May 1, 2017 (Monday)
Deadline to Submit Materials: June 29, 2017 (Thursday)

The Award

Quality leadership preparation is essential to quality leadership practice. Research reveals an important relationship between preparation and leaders’ career outcomes, practices, and school improvement efforts. Exemplary university-based educational leadership preparation programs have authentic, powerful, and field-embedded learning experiences that connect research and theory with practice. To celebrate exemplary programs and encourage their development, UCEA has established an Award for Exemplary Educational Leadership Preparation. This award complements UCEA’s core mission to advance the preparation and practice of educational leaders for the benefit of all children and schools.

Leadership educators are invited to nominate their programs for recognition at the 2017 UCEA Convention. The program or programs (up to three) determined most worthy of recognition will receive a cash award, an engraved plaque, and recognition in multiple UCEA publications. In addition, the award-winning program(s) will be recognized at a session during the 2017 UCEA Convention, on the UCEA website, and through a case-study publication.

This award will be made to programs within colleges, schools, and departments of education. For example, university-based programs preparing leaders to lead in elementary, middle, or high schools or programs focusing on the development of district-level leadership are eligible for recognition. More than one program within a department, school, or college of education may apply.

Award Criteria

Applications will be judged on the extent to which the program (a) reflects UCEA’s research-based UCEA Institutional and Program Quality Criteria (available at the URL below) on the features, content, and experiences associated with effective leadership preparation and (b) has demonstrated evidence of program effectiveness. The Handbook of Research on the Education of School Leaders (2nd ed., Young & Crow, 2016) addresses both of these criteria in depth.

The Procedure

For the full set of award criteria and instructions, please visit:

http://www.ucea.org/opportunities/exemplary-educational-leadership-preparation/

Step 1: Read through the award criteria and instructions. Submit a statement of intent to apply (through the URL above) by Monday, May 1, 2017. Upon receipt of a program’s intent to submit an Award Application, the program contact will be invited to an Award Dropbox Folder where program application materials should be deposited.

Step 2: Conduct a Self-Evaluation of your Program using the UCEA Institutional and Program Quality Criteria Rubric (at the URL above).

Step 3: Fill out an EELP Cover Sheet (at the URL).

Step 4: Prepare Parts I–V of the Award Application as described at the above URL. Save each part as a separate PDF file.

  o Part I: Program Description: The program description should align to the research-based UCEA Institution and Program Quality Criteria and should be no more than 25 pages.
  o Part II: Course Content: Please provide syllabi for core courses in the program.
  o Part III: Field Work: Please provide a field work guide describing field work requirements, documentation, and assessments.
  o Part IV: Program Effectiveness: Evidence of program effectiveness can include information such as key findings from follow-up studies of graduates, a summary of accreditation evaluations and reviews, etc. However, please do not exceed 10 pages of evidence.
  o Part V: Faculty Vitae: Please provide a curriculum vitae for each faculty member who participates in the delivery of the program.

Step 5: Submit the Cover Sheet and Parts I–V by depositing them in the Dropbox noted in the explanation for Step 1.

Please Note: All materials must be submitted by Thursday, June 29, 2017.

Please email mar5q@virginia.edu or call (434) 243-1041 with questions.
Over the past couple of years, winter time has been an active time for sweeping changes in education policy and politics in the United States. In December 2015, we witnessed the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) signed into law, becoming the latest reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). In so doing, ESSA effectively replaced No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB), which was arguably the one most significant revisions of federal education policy in many decades (McDonnell, 2005). NCLB expanded the federal role in U.S. education policy as well as federal regulations. This most recent reauthorization maintains many of the basic requirements of NCLB, such as school report cards and annual measurements of student achievement among whole student populations and subpopulations. However, ESSA provides greater flexibility, particularly in terms of the student assessments that states may utilize. ESSA also removed the requirement to develop and implement teacher and school leader evaluation systems. ESSA allows greater flexibility for states and districts to develop and implement their evaluation systems, stipulating that such systems and their criteria be made public.

Then there was what can only be described as one of the most bitter and divisive U.S. Presidential campaigns in recent history (if not ever). In November 2016, we saw the election of Donald J. Trump to the U.S. Presidency at an occasion in which one major candidate had a majority of the popular vote, but not in the Electoral College. In the closing months of the Obama Presidency, it is a time to take a retrospective look at President Obama and his influence on federal education policy.

This is exactly what our contributing scholars did in a recent publication that appeared in Educational Researcher. In their article, “Waiving as Governance: Federalism During the Obama Administration,” Andrew Saultz, Andrew McEachin, and Lance Fusarelli (2016) analyzed how the Obama Administration used executive power to grant waivers from federal education policies. Further, Saultz et al. sought to compare the use of waivers in previous administrations and in other sectors of government, such as health and welfare. They acknowledge that the executive’s use of waivers to shape state policy is nothing new, but education waivers under Obama differed in purpose and specificity from those in previous administrations’ use of waivers. Saultz et al. hold that Obama did so as a means of circumventing Congress, which sought to hinder his policy objectives at every turn. Our contributing scholars are noted experts in their fields, and I thank them for responding to my invitation to contribute to this Point/Counterpoint.

• **Andrew Saultz** (PhD, Educational Policy, Michigan State University) is Assistant Professor with the Department of Educational Leadership at Miami University of Ohio. Dr. Saultz’s research expertise is in educational policy and the politics of education. His research has been published in journals including Public Opinion Quarterly, Educational Policy, American Journal of Education, Theory and Research in Education, Journal of School Choice, Public Performance and Management, Teachers College Record, Peabody Journal of Education, and Educational Researcher.

• **Andrew McEachin** (PhD, Education Policy, University of Southern California) is a policy researcher in the economics, statistics, and sociology department at the RAND Corporation. Prior to joining RAND, he was an Assistant Professor of Education Policy at North Carolina State University and an Institute of Education Sciences postdoctoral fellow at University of Virginia’s Curry School of Education. The unifying goal of his research is to generate rigorous, policy-relevant evidence to help educators and policymakers in their efforts to raise student achievement and narrow achievement gaps. His research agenda focuses on using advanced quantitative methods to study the determinants of persistent achievement gaps, as well as evaluating the effect of popular responses by policymakers and educators to reduce these gaps. Examples of these include standards-based accountability, school choice initiatives, teacher labor markets, and curricular intensification. His work has been published in journals including American Educational Research Journal, Education Finance and Policy, Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, Educational Researcher, and Journal of Policy Analysis and Management. He is also working on projects funded by the Smith Richardson Foundation, Spencer Foundation, and the Walton Family Foundation.

• **Lance Fusarelli** (PhD, Educational Administration, University of Texas at Austin) is a Professor and Interim Chair of the Department of Educational Leadership, Policy and Human Development at North Carolina State University. Dr. Fusarelli conducts research in the politics of education, federal education policy (NCLB), poverty and demographic change, and superintendents—school board relations. In 2012, he was ranked 79th in the nation among scholars whose research contributes most substantially to public debates about schools and schooling. He serves as co-editor of the Series in Education Policy (Palgrave Macmillan) and serves on the editorial board of Educational Researcher, the Journal of School Public Relations, and the National Advisory Board, UCEA Center for Research on the Superintendency and School Governance. He serves on the advisory board of the Hill Center in Durham.

In this Point-Counterpoint, Lance Fusarelli posed four questions to Andrew Saultz and Andrew McEachin:

1. In what ways did the Obama Administration’s use of waivers impact ESSA?
2. What are the major implementation issues with ESSA?

3. How much power will actually devolve to the states under ESSA?

4. Will the Obama Administration’s use of waivers have any lasting impact on federal education policy?

The following are their responses to these questions from their own unique perspectives—one as a policy researcher at the RAND Corporation and the other as a faculty member in educational leadership.

1. In what ways did the Obama Administration’s use of waivers impact ESSA?

Saultz: First, it catalyzed Congress to update ESEA because many were frustrated with the U.S. Department of Education’s overextending the use of waivers. While waivers are typically used to provide states flexibility, the Obama Administration used ESEA waivers to cajole states to change policies (i.e., teacher evaluations). Waivers are used in many policy areas, but in education they were used in a fundamentally more prescriptive way. Congress has been in a stalemate over the last few years but was able to leverage bipartisan support for ESSA, in part because many were upset with what was perceived as executive overreach. In this sense, the Obama Administration use of waivers shifted political attitudes of many constituencies, resulting in the political right and left coalescing around limiting the role of the executive branch.

Second, waivers impacted the language within the law. Specifically, ESSA narrowly defines the use of waivers and prohibits the federal government from creating national standards (read Common Core) and teacher evaluation policy. The new law continues mandated testing in reading and math but also allows state discretion on new components of the accountability system and evaluating teacher quality (more on those below).

In a more macro sense, ESSA is a logical reaction to an unprecedented level of federal involvement in educational policy at the executive level. Congress ensured that states could choose certain provisions of new accountability systems and narrowly defined the powers of the U.S. Department of Education under ESSA.

McEachin: At a general level, both the waivers and ESSA looked very similar to the Harkin-Enzi ESEA reauthorization proposal. While the Harkin-Enzi plan continued an Adequate Yearly Progress like accountability structure, it focused its interventions on the bottom 5–10% of schools based on overall performance and subgroup performance. The main difference between ESSA and the Harkin-Enzi plan is the Secretary of Education’s ability to shape education policy using competitive grants or waivers.

2. What are the major implementation issues with ESSA?

McEachin: In many ways, ESSA provides states more opportunity to create an accountability system that fits their context than under NCLB. However, this flexibility assumes states have the capacity to implement two key aspects of the new law, including a nonacademic indicator in their school accountability system and both defining teacher effectiveness and ensuring an equitable distribution of effective teachers.

There has certainly been a growing push to include more than test scores in the teacher and school accountability models. However, many of the new measures schools systems have included, such as school climate, discipline, or access to advance courses, were not designed to be used in a summative assessment format. States are then left in a tricky situation where they need to include a new indicator, but there is a limited evidence base on the validity and reliability of these measures. We will likely see a variety of implementations from simple measures like attendance to more complex measures attempting to capture student engagement or school climate.

Similarly, we should expect to see wide variation in definitions of teacher effectiveness across states. There is far more available information for policymakers and practitioners in this area. However, recent work on teacher churn and the sorting of students among teacher-quality dimensions has documented that states still have a long way to go to ensure every student has access to a high-quality teacher.

Saultz: I agree that both teacher policy and the nonacademic indicator could cause potential implementation challenges. I also worry that further complicating the state accountability systems by including more measures may increase confusion among educators and parents. Expanding the definition of school quality is important, but states need to make sure to publicize the new metrics and ensure that people understand what these data are communicating.

I also worry about the implementation of new standards and the possibility of states changing test yet again. For example, Ohio is now on its third different set of statewide standardized tests in 3 years. For accountability and teacher evaluations to work effectively, there needs to be continuity in test-based measures so that educators know what knowledge and skills will be tested.

3. How much power will actually devolve to the states under ESSA?

Saultz: States certainly have more discretion under ESSA than NCLB. For example, ESSA requires that states create an accountability system that includes a “nonacademic” indicator. Examples listed include school climate, discipline, or access to advanced courses. States have the power to determine which indicator they want to include as a measure to evaluate school quality. States may include more than one nonacademic indicator if they so choose. Further, states now have the ability to determine teacher effectiveness, as there is no ESSA equivalent to the highly qualified teacher provision of NCLB. ESSA also prohibits the federal government from incentivizing or mandating any specific content standards. This should be seen as a Congressional response to Race to the Top and the NCLB waivers, which both pushed states to adopt the Common Core State Standards. Under ESSA, states will have the autonomy to choose whichever content standards they want. In sum, states have substantially more power under ESSA than NCLB.

McEachin: It is important to keep in mind that states had a lot of flexibility under NCLB. States were allowed to define proficiency, set annual proficiency goals to meet Adequate Yearly Progress, set subgroup N sizes, select their own standards and assessments, and so on. In this respect no two states had the same
accountability system. Under ESSA, the variation will only increase as states have even more flexibility to design school accountability systems.

4. Will the Obama Administration's use of waivers have any lasting impact on federal education policy?

McEachin: As Saultz notes above, the policy conversations leading up to the reauthorization of ESEA, as well as the language within ESSA, paint a pretty clear picture that the Obama Administration's use of waiver has already impacted federal education policy. Future Secretaries of Education will have a much more limited role in the shaping of future state and local education policy. For example, it will be more difficult for future administrations to use competitive funding as a carrot to incentivize states to implement new policies related to standards, teacher evaluation, and school choice. However, the long-term effects of the Obama Administration's waivers are less clear.

It is unlikely that future administrations will be able to shape state and local policy similar to the Obama Administration. But during this election cycle, both major party candidates foreshadowed a less reform-minded, local-control-oriented Department of Education. Furthermore, the President-Elect has discussed the basic outline of a sweeping federal school-choice initiative and reduction in the scope of the Department of Education. While this plan is a different approach to policymaking than the Obama Administration's waivers, it could very well have similarly large effect. In short, future administrations may have to use different approaches to shape federal, state, and local education policy.

Saultz: ESSA includes strong language severely limiting the use of waivers by the U.S. Department of Education. However, Race to the Top and the NCLB waivers already were able to shift policies in ways that the Obama Administration wanted. For example, 43 states and Washington, DC altered teacher evaluation systems in response to these reforms. While future administrations may not be able to use waivers to the same degree, these policy changes will not easily be reformed at the state level. One of the main legacies of the Obama Administration is a lesson to Congress on what may happen if they stall in efforts to renew an outdated law. This gave the executive branch enough leverage to alter policy in unprecedented ways. Further, the Common Core, despite the history as a policy from the National Governor's Association, will be tied to federal efforts to move toward national standards. President-Elect Trump has been an outspoken critic of the Common Core, and I do not envision a scenario where the federal government looks to coordinate or incentivize national standards anytime in the near future.
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Q&A With Curtis Chin, Writer/Director of Documentary Film *Tested*

Curtis Chin, a Detroit native, community activist, and award-winning writer (ABC, Disney Channel, Nickelodeon, National Endowment for the Arts, New York Foundation for the Arts) wrote and directed the documentary, *Tested. Tested* looks at the lack of racial diversity at our nation’s top public schools. The gap in opportunities for different races in America remains extreme. In New York City, where Blacks and Hispanics make up 70% of the city’s school-aged population, they represent less than 5% at the city’s most elite public high schools. Meanwhile, Asian Americans make up as much as 73%. This documentary follows a dozen racially and socioeconomically diverse eighth graders as they fight for a seat at one of these schools. Their only way in: to ace a single standardized test.

1. What choices, interests, or circumstances led you to produce this particular film?

I actually came to this subject more from the racial equality and social justice lens than an education one. I was looking for a follow-up film to my first documentary, which was about a famous hate crime that happened in my hometown of Detroit. That film took me to nearly 500 universities and nonprofits around the world, so I was looking for a subject that addressed the same themes of race and equity.

I also think my personal experiences with public schools drew me to this subject. I started in schools that were 80% African American and graduated from a high school that was 95% White, so I have seen the range of opportunities available to students. I also know that stereotypes have opened and closed certain doors to me. For instance, my family has been in this country since the 1800s, but when I started school, the teachers immediately put me in the English remedial class, assuming I couldn’t speak English. Conversely, when they started the math classes, they put me in the advanced section, thinking I would be great at math. As an Asian American, I know that I always got an extra point or two in any math or science class, just because of the stereotypes associated with my race. I’m sure African Americans and Latinos face different stereotypes that also limit their opportunities.

2. How did you choose the families to be in your film?

We actually had a pretty broad net at first, including families that didn’t know about the test or weren’t planning to take it. However, we soon discovered that the journeys would have been too divergent to follow, so we had to limit the film to families who had engaged parents who would sign off on the film, as well as families who had plans to take to take the test. In the end, we followed 20 families; about half make it into the film. Since the film is specifically about diversity, we wanted to avoid the single-story trap, so we included a wider range of families than a typical film.

3. Experiences like the ones you shared take place within complex environments. What related stories or experiences would you have liked to have included if you had more time or a broader focus?

We’re pretty happy with the diversity of families in the film. However, we did try to include a gay family, but the two families we were considering during casting process both fell through.

4. What has been the response from the NYC community, particularly families and the school system?

It’s funny. The NYC Department of Education did everything they could to stop us from making the film, but once they saw it, they have been pretty supportive. Not only have they been showing the film to staff and teachers, but they have also inquired about showing the film to all the families they are prepping for the test. We’ve also had screenings with Lincoln Center, the New York Public Library, Teach for America, and other New York education groups. Since then, we have also translated the film into Spanish, Chinese, Korean, and Bengali to allow immigrant families to better access the film.

5. What has been the response internationally to the film?

So far, we have screen the film in eight countries, but we have invitations from another half dozen. The conversation has been different depending on the country or where viewers are from. For instance, I’ve done six screenings in the UK, and I have invitations for another six or seven. The topic is really ripe there because they have a very similar system of grammar schools. While they were banned in the 1950s, after Brexit, the new prime minister has proposed bringing them back. In Germany and Spain, it’s the issue of diversity and integration. For countries in Asia, where testing is more ingrained, the tone is really different as well.

6. Have you followed up with the kids since filming?

I do keep in touch with the educators and tutors, and occasionally a university or nonprofit will want one of the families to participate in a Q&A. However, we are thinking of checking in with the kids as they apply to college, to see how much the high school matters.

7. What surprised you the most in making the film?

During filming, I actually got five people to cry on camera. I thought to myself, “Damn, I’m good.” But then I realized, particularly for the lower-income families, that they felt this was their opportunity to share their stories, so they invested in the process. The wealthier families seemed to be doing it for their kids’ college applications, but the lower income families were doing it to help other families.

8. For the aspiring documentary filmmakers in the UCEA community, what advice would you share about engaging in this kind of work?

I would encourage anyone with a story or subject they’d like to explore to just pick up the camera and start filming. Young people communicate through video, and that’s the best way to reach them. I would also say, don’t be afraid if you’ve never filmed anything before. You’re on a college campus and you have all the resources there to make it happen. I’m also happy to offer advice, as well. Just shoot me an email.
A Conversation With April Peters-Hawkins

Juan Manuel Niño  
The University of Texas at San Antonio

Dr. April Peters-Hawkins, current UCEA president, discusses her thoughts on her recent appointment and what informs her scholarly interests. She earned a PhD and MA in Educational Policy and Leadership from The Ohio State University. In addition, she has an undergraduate degree in Human Development and Social Policy from Northwestern University, and a master's degree from Columbia University in School Social Work. Dr. Peters-Hawkins presides as an Associate Professor of Educational Leadership & Policy Studies in the College of Education at the University of Houston. Prior to this, she was a faculty member at the University of Georgia as well as a consultant for the Atlanta Public Schools. In her early career, she served as a middle school teacher, a school social worker, dean of students, and a high school principal. Dr. Peters-Hawkins centers her research on equity and social justice for the most vulnerable populations of students, particularly in urban settings. Her research interests include women in school leadership, mentoring and support for early career administrators, as well as leadership and small school reform. Her scholarly works have been published in prestigious outlets, including Teachers College Record, The Journal of School Leadership, International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, and Educational Administration Quarterly.

JMN: Hello, Dr. Peters-Hawkins. Thank you for agreeing to be interviewed for the UCEA Review. I thought you would be a perfect person to interview, given your leadership in organizing the most recent UCEA convention and your new role as UCEA president. Let’s me begin by asking what was your path toward the professoriate?

APH: Well, I started as a teacher, held various positions, and then became a principal. It was during the middle of my work as a principal that I thought about how I might approach the field differently. I thought about my impact and the tremendous amount of influence a principal has. However, I also thought I could do this work more broadly from the perspective of a professor. Honestly, at the time I graduated from Ohio State, my PhD was focused on preparing scholars for the professoriate. My doctoral focus was centered on the principalship. As such, I looked at the principalship from a 30,000-ft. view to reach the field in a much deeper and broader manner. That’s what propelled me into the professoriate.

JMN: So, your doctoral program was more aligned with scholarship than practice?

APH: At that time, Ohio State only had a PhD focus, not an EdD. I was deliberate in the selection of a PhD, as I had been accepted to several EdD programs. Some were very good, nationally acclaimed programs with reputable accomplishments. I looked at some high-quality EdD programs, but their primary focus was to prepare principals. Even though I knew I wanted to be a principal, I was seeking a program that would prepare me differently. At the end of my doctoral program, I was convinced I wanted to be a principal. I think my program was a great experience. Having the principal experience was extremely beneficial as I took on the professoriate. So, in the end, it all worked out.

JMN: As a scholar, what influences your work?

APH: Several important ideas influence my work. Certainly, when I came into academia, my experiences as a practitioner reinforced my scholarship. I have written on the principalship, mentoring, and women of color; specifically, African American women principals at the high school level. Additionally, based on my experiences, as a female principal and early career work on effective mentoring, my practitioner experience influenced and propelled my own research agenda. I think what also has influenced my work has been my engagement with students related to teaching and thinking about the kinds of information or knowledge students need. This informed how I prepared to serve and lead each school. Another influence has been my work formally and informally in my program areas. Currently, I have been working on numerous projects. Specifically, right now I am focusing on how we structure programs to prepare practitioners. In that experience, I am working to revise and develop programs to support practitioners who lead schools. Finally, what is going on in the broader educational context also influences my research. Some of these projects are at the conceptual stages but they definitely influence my thought process and ultimately my research agenda.

JMN: What are your scholarly interests?

APH: My interests lie broadly within the principalship, but specifically in thinking about the types of support needed for early career principals. I’m also interested in how programs prepare practitioners to lead effectively and how we support our students to become social justice leaders. I think many folks have the interest of preparing and helping but not the deep understanding of the principalship. So, I’ve been interested researching around these topics as well.

JMN: You talked about mentorship; how do you mentor junior faculty members into the professoriate?

APH: It’s interesting you mention that, because in none of my professional experiences, with one or two exceptions, have I had effective mentorship. I think the same concepts apply in terms of how we support early career faculty, particularly faculty of color. In some instances, you may find one student of color in the program, so I think it’s important to provide them with that kind of mentoring, support and space. I have found myself and I continue to find myself in that space of helping other early career faculty so that they are productive, comfortable, and committed to the organization.

JMN: As a person of color, I find numerous mentorship opportunities at UCEA. How did you become involved?
APH: I became involved with UCEA when I was recommended by a colleague to become the plenum representative. They thought it would be a great opportunity for me to get to know people. Later, I was encouraged to take on leadership roles, like becoming a member of the Executive Committee, and then ultimately running for president. It has been a process over the years to see what the organization does. My involvement with UCEA has also given me opportunities to get involved and contribute to the growth of the consortium.

JMN: Your participation with the organization is impressive, as I am sure you have sacrificed time and resources to contribute on many levels to the progress of UCEA. Now that you have served as a Plenum Representative, member of the Executive Committee and now president, do you see UCEA as a platform to bridge your work into the consortium?

APH: I think a lot of good work has already been started by my predecessors. We are passionate about change and equity. Certainly, there are things that I want to continue but I want to be sensitive to the needs of the different organizations in the consortium. I realize that we are not all in the same kind of institutions, so I need to be mindful that there is space to continue to work for opportunities for everyone.

JMN: Is there something that needs to be addressed within the consortium?

APH: I think we have come a long way, just in the short time I’ve been part of the leadership in UCEA. One of the things we have done quite well is to be responsive to the happenings in our broader society that impact us as educators and professionals. In taking a stand, we have been able to amplify our position. Using this approach, I hope to be vocal when unfortunate situations happen. During my presidency, I want to take our responsiveness further, to help our constituents understand how they might help their students, community, and partners, engage with the work on the ground. Perhaps that could be developing some teaching tools for our constituents and partners. We haven’t done that yet, and that’s something I’m hopeful we can do under my presidency. Certainly, I realize the presidency is one position. You can’t get everything done without everyone’s willingness to work. I would like to see myself as the facilitator of some of these things, understanding that we all have a stake in this. I can’t get it done without everyone’s help.

JMN: Sounds like a great opportunity to further engage in social justice work. How do you address issues of equity in the community, or communities you serve?

APH: That’s interesting, because I’m in a new place. I’ve only been here since August, and I’m learning a whole new context. Houston is a little more urban than my previous workplace in Georgia, where I served in a variety of different contexts. Personally, I think the issues of equity in different districts vary, but what I see, or how I address them generally, is first to try and understand: What is the context? I think this is amplified for me because of my new urban setting. We try to identify the partners who can help us. We’ve already been engaged in that work as we reach out to hear people talk about from their own experiences. One of the things I like to start with is looking at ourselves first and then looking out from there. When we address issues of equity, we think about where we are in the process. Perhaps we consider, what are some of the resources available to us? What are the strengths? We like to think and operate from an assets-based approach, but also we need to determine where we want to be. Sometimes we need to have those critical conversations with constituents to understand the position of where the organization wants to be, where the community wants to be, and where they feel it needs to be. Ideas and steps like these are ways I approach teaching for a more equitable environment. Both from a professional perspective in terms of the 30,000-ft. level of my principalship experience, but also from a teaching level in the classroom.

JMN: As a professor, what do you read to inform your own kind of practice and scholarly works?

APH: I read numerous things. There are several scholars who are writing about equity concepts in journal articles, books, or in cases. So, I use all those various forms to inform myself and my students. Additionally, I would say there are some very interesting and intellectual pieces that are not necessarily part of the scholarly canon. In reading those pieces I get an additional perspective, whether it be political or social commentary, that is very helpful in shaping the way I think about some of these concepts we research and teach. I also consider them in the broader work I conduct in program development.

JMN: It’s interesting you mention readings outside of the traditional canon. As a junior scholar, I reflect on the outlets and the ways each intentionally informs practice. Perhaps these additional outlets offer something different than the traditional outlets that we esteem so highly?

APH: That’s a really good question and one I’ve batted around a lot. I think that we are moving toward a place where there are other spaces for our work to get more traction and have more appeal across a wider audience. I have not figured out exactly how to do that. However, a number of scholars have become good at being public scholars. I love their effort and work. They are blogging, doing TedTalks, or doing things that the scholarly community is responding to, as a way to reach out in multiple ways to a broader audience. Also, I think we, as scholars, are reading past the passages of scholarly canon. We are being influenced by people who are in other spaces but who are brilliant scholars in their own right. I think all of these multiple forums help to influence the profession broadly. We are now thinking about getting our message out there and getting our work out in ways we had not previously envisioned.

JMN: Do you think UCEA can adopt another creative approach, in thinking about these new ways we read and access knowledge?
APH: I think UCEA has attempted to be very creative in the ways we present work. Besides the traditional lecture and presentations, we have introduced EdTalks and Critical Conversations, which I love. I think the Critical Conversations are powerful ways to get conversations started about teaching and the communities we serve. UCEA has adopted some creative approaches to the convention, for example, the Fireside Chats and the Film Festival. I will mention something new to this past convention, something the entire planning committee, including me, supported was that we created space to host a clinical faculty panel. We had clinical scholars from UCEA institutions as panel discussants for the Executive Committee and Plenum Session. We also created spaces within the program and invited clinical faculty to participate. Having clinical faculty present and participate helped opened up the dialogue to be more inclusive to what we are doing to prepare practitioners and scholars. A lot of our clinical colleagues at our institutions have very solid practical experience. Some of them are also very much interested in scholarly work, and before this, there hadn't been a dedicated space to hear those voices.

So, if there is one additional thing that we could do to be more creative, I would suggest to provide the space for these faculty who have been attending the convention but somehow haven't been acknowledged for their position and roles in their member institutions, the way we would like to. Most of our organizations need our clinical colleagues. They can't function effectively without them. We wanted to honor that role and provide space for them. I was very excited, all the way up to the convention, to have our clinical panel. After the convention, I was speaking to several clinical faculty who were so appreciative and so excited about the opportunity. I would like to see us continue with providing a more intentional space for our clinical faculty members.

JMN: That's a great opportunity. I think some of us who are in this faculty role now are former practitioners who try to understand how to do the good work. How do you think UCEA can be more inclusive? I think you eluded to it in continuing this invitation to support clinical members.

APH: Yes, that's a great thing we should continue to do. I think in terms of how I've been approaching this work this past year and how I make this connection, I have to be thoughtful about it and consider, how can we include our colleagues with whom we work every day? These are the people we sit on committees with, we teach with, and with whom we plan. We need their influence, and we want to provide a space for them to be there to give their input. As such, we need to consider them not only in the local context but also in the national context, the convention.

JMN: How can UCEA be a resource for those individuals who are not part of the UCEA consortium?

APH: I think the way we continue to support our non-UCEA colleagues is to continue to have our resources available electronically for anyone who is interested. The conventions are a great way to network and learn. Anyone can attend the convention, including people who are not part of the consortium. However, I think it might be a little harder for some of those folks, because it may not be as well known if their university is not represented. Maybe we need to think about a space for those situations. One of the things UCEA does well is to provide a space for institutions who are interested in becoming members. It is a very encouraging space for institutions to learn about the membership process and seek more information to be part of the consortium. I also appreciate the different levels of membership for different institutions. At the individual level, we need to continue to do all of these things as well as be a welcoming space in the conventions and offline with webinars to include folks who are interested in this work.

JMN: How do you envision social justice leadership?

APH: I have a couple of thoughts on that topic. Social justice leadership reminds me of something my mother used to say to me when I was a principal: “You can't be a leader with a committee of one.” I think social justice leadership requires a collective effort that highlights our lived set of experiences and our unique passion we bring to the work. We are strengthened by the same passion other people have but in a different area. For me, social justice leadership looks for the opportunity to collaborate, looks for the strength in numbers, and looks for the opportunity to advocate. Social justice leadership is not just saying that we are social justice oriented. It calls for us to engage in resistance and advocacy. For example, I'm not just sitting in my office thinking about women or people of color. I reposition my thinking about any person who needs advocacy and use resistance to move the needle forward. We need to have open-mindedness. I encourage my students about the need to advocate for their folks. We have to move toward change. Social justice leadership influences the motion. It looks for the opportunity to enact change.

However, it’s tiresome work. It’s challenging work and many times can be weary. That is why I think an important tenet of social justice leadership is a collective effort. Through our intentional masses we strengthen those numbers and create change. As social justice leaders, we need to be mindful of who we are serving and why. We can't sit down on the job. We can't fall asleep.

JMN: Your message is timely as our country faces a transition. Now more than ever, especially in Texas, issues of diversity need to be at the forefront. Race, class, and gender have become polarized topics. As leaders of equity we cannot remain silent and at the margins. It’s difficult work, like you said, but we need to have the courage to persist and use resistance to move the needle forward. We need to advocate. Social justice leadership is not just saying that we want to. It calls for us to look for the opportunity to collaborate, looks for the strength in numbers, and creates change. As social justice leaders, we need to be mindful of who we are serving and why. We can't sit down on the job. We can't fail asleep.

JMN: I want to thank you for your time and a great conference in Detroit. Your planning committee did an excellent job.

APH: I'm glad you enjoyed that. We wanted people to enjoy the convention.
2017 UCEA Convention Call for Proposals

Echando Pa’lante: School Leaders (Up)rising as Advocates and (Up)lifting Student Voices

I. General Information
The 31st annual UCEA Convention will be held November 16-19, 2017 at the Sheraton Denver Downtown Hotel in Denver, CO. The purpose of the 2017 UCEA Convention is to engage participants in discussions about research, policy, practice and preparation in the field of education with a specific focus on educational leadership. Members of the 2017 Convention Program Committee are Mariela A. Rodriguez (University of Texas at San Antonio), Erin Anderson (University of Denver), Miriam Ezzani (University of North Texas), and Cristobal Rodriguez (Howard University).

II. UCEA Convention Theme
The 31st Annual UCEA Convention theme, Echando Pa’lante: School Leaders (Up)rising as Advocates and (Up)lifting Student Voices, is intended to encourage opportunities for reflective dialogue regarding the educational contexts that students, teachers, principals, and superintendents will be facing within a changing national climate and its impact on educational policy. The words in the theme echando pa’lante are a derivation of ‘echando para adelante,’ which translates from Spanish as moving forward. Yet the terms imply more than just that action. They describe the will to keep going especially when times are tough and intrinsic motivation is needed to keep moving forward. Traditionally used within Latinx, Spanish-speaking communities, these words serve to inspire one to challenge themselves no matter what the odds. Within the 2017 UCEA Convention theme, echando pa’lante reflects the value of student voice and agency as they move forward in meeting their educational goals. The term also represents the advocacy work of school leaders who assist students in meeting their goals by creating and sustaining equitable learning environments.

The second part of the theme focuses on the words rising and lifting as they relate to the important role of school leaders. These terms represent the ways in which school leaders rise as advocates for students in times that the educational terrain may not be supportive especially for students from diverse and traditionally under-represented groups. Such groups include students who speak languages other than English, students participating in special educational programs, and students who identify as LGBTQ. Advocacy plays a crucial role in the support of student voice, engagement and learning. School leaders who incorporate advocacy into their leadership practices help to promote student well-being. As advocates, school leaders understand that their work is rooted in social justice. In this manner school leaders, together with teachers, parents, and community members help to lift students’ spirits and voices as they move forward in their personal growth and educational attainment.

The terms rising and lifting are also symbolic as they represent the geographic landscape of the City of Denver, the convention city for the 2017 UCEA Convention, with its signature mountains and peaks. As such, the theme focuses on the various environments in which school leaders find themselves engaging as advocates for the students they serve. This includes advocacy work in schools, communities, and in challenging restrictive educational policies. This has clear implications for the important role of faculty in leadership preparation programs who must create opportunities for community engagement within field experiences and the value of engaging in research projects that highlight principals as advocates for student voice. Aspiring school leaders must see current leaders in action as advocates for students and the communities in which they lead. Such experiences should offer future school leaders in-depth opportunities to learn from and engage with leaders who uprise and uplift student voice and help to move students pa’lante in both academic and personal development, especially in contested terrain.

To address the 2017 UCEA Convention theme, “Echando Pa’lante: School Leaders (Up)rising as Advocates and (Up)lifting Student Voices,” UCEA invites submissions that (1) offer analyses of leadership practices that support student voice, engagement, and learning; (2) examine how we prepare school and district leaders to support student voice, engagement, and learning; (3) explore the myriad ways of defining student voice, engagement, and learning; (4) support advocacy work in schools and local communities; and (5) support advocacy work directed at policy makers and elected officials.

The following suggested topics and related questions are provided to stimulate thinking about the 2017 UCEA Convention and theme Echando Pa’lante: School Leaders (Up)rising as Advocates and (Up)lifting Student Voices, although proposals addressing related themes are welcome.

1. Leadership that Uprises and Uplifts. School leaders must be responsive to the diverse knowledge, strengths and needs that exist within and across multiple communities. How can leadership that uprises and uplifts bring life and vitality to educational organizations and local communities? How can such leadership support student voice, engagement and learning? How does such leadership create socially just and equitable schools that are inclusive and humane for all stakeholders? In what ways do school leaders finesse the competing demands of districts and communities in order to allow student voices to be heard and subsequent actions to be taken?

2. Leadership Development. Leadership development is essential to leadership practice. How do the recently revised leadership standards inform leadership that uprises and uplifts? How can leadership development programs partner with districts and schools to prepare leaders to effectively lead in ways that support student voice, engagement and learning? What are the implications of de-
III. UCEA Convention Session Types

A. Paper Sessions. These sessions are intended for reporting research results or analyzing issues of policy and practice in an abbreviated form. Presenters are expected to provide electronic copies of papers. The proposal summary should include a statement of purpose, theoretical framework, findings, and conclusions. For research reports, also describe data sources and methods.

B. Ignite Presentations. Ignite presentations are intended to stimulate informal, lively discussions using a cluster of four to five 5-minute presentations with no more than 20 slides per presentation, where each slide is displayed for approximately 15 seconds while the speaker addresses the audience. Ignite sessions are an ideal way to present innovations, effective strategies and tools, problems of practice, collaborations, etc. The proposal summary should be for an individual (5-minute) Ignite presentation that describes the purpose and topic of the 5-minute presentation, relevant literature, findings (if applicable), and examples of questions or areas to be addressed. Example of an “Ignite” Session: http://www.youtube.com/user/iGNiTe?blend=1&cb=4#p/u/3/rqSkulkwQ98

C. Symposia. A symposium should examine specific policy, research or practice issues from several perspectives, contribute significantly to the knowledge base, and allow for dialogue and discussion. Session organizers are expected to chair the session and facilitate discussion. Symposia participants are expected to provide electronic copies of papers presented during the session.

D. International Community-Building Sessions. These sessions, regardless of format (i.e., paper, symposia, conversation, etc.), require participants to be from two or more different countries. These sessions must focus on critical issues of leadership practice, development or research from multiple international perspectives. The proposal summary should describe the purpose of the session, the session format, and a list of the national contexts that will be represented.

E. Innovative Sessions and Mini-Workshops. Proposals utilizing innovative presentation/interaction strategies are encouraged, such as web-based projects, films, and the use of technology to increase interaction and participation. The proposal summary should describe the scope and purpose of the session or mini-workshop (to be held during the convention), the innovative format, and how the format will enhance adult learning and discussion.

F. Critical Conversations and Networking Sessions. These sessions are intended to stimulate informal, lively discussions around a series of provocative questions or research in process. Sessions may be structured in a variety of ways: 1) a session could include a panel of participants who facilitate and guide the conversation; 2) a session could be organized as a dialogue where the organizers and attendees discuss an issue or series of questions; or 3) a session could be structured to provide scholars with common research interests dedicated time to meet, plan, discuss and consider developing collaborative projects, papers, linked research, and other scholarly pursuits that will be a continued focus beyond the convention. The proposal summary should describe the purpose of the session, the ways in which participants will engage in conversation/dialogue, and examples of questions or areas to be addressed.

G. UCEA Film Festival. Participants may submit 5-minute videos that explore broadly the landscape of quality leadership preparation, including research and engaged scholarship, preparation program designs and improvement efforts, policy work, and the practice of...
educational leaders. These submissions cannot be submitted through All Academic. Additional details can be found in the UCEA Review and on the UCEA website: http://www.ucea.org. Video submissions are due July 31, 2017.

H. Post Convention Work Sessions and Workshops. These sessions, which provide both 2- and 4-hour sessions for scholars of similar interest, are encouraged for (a) groups of scholars who are working on projects directly related to the core mission of UCEA and (b) scholars who wish to present a workshop for faculty members attending the convention. Proposals should describe the purpose of the session, relevant literature, how the time will be used, the role and expertise of facilitators, outcomes for participants, and plans for disseminating information from the session/workshop to UCEA member institutions and the field.

IV. Submission Guidelines
Submission length must not exceed 3 single-spaced pages (approximately 1,500 words or 6,000 characters) using 12-point font (Times New Roman). References are required and must not exceed 1 single-spaced page (approximately 400 words or 2,200 characters). Through the act of submitting a proposal, an individual is entering a professional agreement to review proposals for the convention, to attend and deliver the content described in the proposal, and in the event that a paper is being presented, the submitter agrees to share a copy of the work with convention attendees. Furthermore, lead authors are required to upload an advance copy of their paper into the All Academic System through the UCEA Convention site 3 weeks prior to the convention (October 30, 2017). Ignite presenters are expected to upload a 2-page summary of the talking points they will be sharing at the convention prior to the October 30 deadline. Failure to live up to these commitments may lead to the submission being removed from the convention program.

V. Participation Limits
To promote broad participation in the annual convention, an individual may appear as first author on no more than two proposals. In addition, an individual may appear on the program no more than four times in the role of presenter. The participation limit does not include service as chair or discussant or participation in invited sessions or any session connected with UCEA headquarters, committees, or publications.

VI. Criteria for Review of UCEA Convention Proposals
All proposals will be subject to blind, peer review by two reviewers, which will occur electronically. Proposals MUST NOT include names of session organizers or presenters. Primary authors of submitted proposals agree to serve as proposal reviewers.

Research Paper Proposals will be evaluated for
• Relevance of the proposal to educational leadership and/or convention theme,
• Appropriateness of the theoretical/conceptual framework,
• Appropriateness of the methods, including analytical strategies,
• Anchoring of proposal content to relevant scholarly literature,
• Quality of writing, and
• Audience appeal.

All other proposals will be evaluated for
• Relevance of the proposal to educational leadership and/or conference theme,
• Thoroughness and clarity of the proposal,
• Consistency of proposal content and purpose with proposed format,
• Anchoring of proposal content to relevant scholarly literature, and
• Audience appeal.

VII. Proposal Reviewers
UCEA invites all convention attendees and participants to serve as reviewers for the 2017 Convention. Through the act of submitting a proposal, an individual is entering a professional agreement to review proposals for the convention. UCEA encourages submitters to invite their co-authors to participate in this important professional activity. Individuals can volunteer to serve as a reviewer on All Academic through the UCEA website.

VIII. Deadlines
Proposals must be received by Monday, May 8, 2017, by midnight Eastern Standard Time. All proposals must be submitted electronically at the link to be provided at the UCEA homepage (http://www.ucea.org). This site will officially open April 7, 2017.

IX. Graduate Student Summit
Successfully launched at the 2012 Convention in Denver, the Symposium will be returning once again this year for the 2017 Convention in Denver, CO. Doctoral students from UCEA member institutions are invited to submit proposals for this preconference event. Further details regarding the Graduate Student Summit call for proposals can be found on the Graduate Student portion of the UCEA website: http://www.ucea.org/graduate-student-opportunities/graduate-student-summit/
I. General Information

The 6th annual UCEA Graduate Student Summit (GSS) will be held at the Sheraton Denver Downtown Hotel in Denver, Colorado. The summit will commence at 12:00 pm on Wednesday, November 15, 2017 and conclude at 11:30 am on Thursday, November 16, 2017. The purpose of the 2017 UCEA Graduate Student Summit is to provide graduate students a space to engage in authentic dialogue about their scholarly work. This summit will offer opportunities to meet and network with graduate students and faculty, to present your work and receive feedback on your research. It will include:

- Paper sessions, in which you will share your research and receive constructive feedback.
- Ignite! sessions, in which you will share your research and/or ideas for research projects and receive constructive feedback.
- Roundtable sessions, in which you will share your research and/or ideas for research projects and receive constructive feedback.
- Mentor feedback sessions for paper, Ignite!, and roundtable session presenters, in which you will get direct feedback from distinguished UCEA faculty on a paper that you would like to publish, a proposal, or your dissertation research plan.
- Networking sessions, where you will have the chance to network with faculty and students from other UCEA institutions interested in similar research topics and talk with UCEA Executive Committee members and Plenum Session Representatives.
- Social gatherings for graduate students, where you will have the chance to make connections with others sharing similar life experiences in graduate schools across the globe.
- Developmental workshops for graduate students, where you will hear from emerging and established scholars on such topics as creating a research agenda, crafting a CV, applying for jobs, the publishing process, and grappling with and making it through graduate school.

II. Theme

The UCEA Graduate Student Summit is an extension of the UCEA Convention. In keeping with the UCEA Convention, students should demonstrate how their proposals for the GSS address the UCEA Convention theme, “Echando Pa’lante: School Leaders (Up)rising as Advocates and (Up)lifting Student Voices.” Please refer to the 2017 UCEA Convention Call for Proposals for a full discussion of the 2017 theme.

III. Graduate Student Summit Session Categories

This year, we are providing three session categories, each of which provides a tiered outlet for ideas and works in various stages of completion. If you will have a manuscript-length paper completed by the end of October, you should submit a proposal for a paper presentation. If you have an idea that is in-progress, a useful strategy to share, or poignant idea/question to propose, you should submit a proposal for an Ignite! presentation. If you have an idea about a potential research project and/or have an outline developed, but would like feedback on how to proceed, you should submit a proposal for a roundtable presentation.

A. Paper sessions. These sessions are intended for reporting research results or analyzing issues of policy and practice in an abbreviated form. You should submit for a SINGLE paper presentation only—not an entire paper session. Presenters are expected to provide electronic copies of papers. Your submitted proposal summary should include a statement of purpose, conceptual/theoretical framework, findings (even if preliminary), and conclusions/implications. For research reports, also describe data sources and methods.

B. Ignite! sessions. These sessions are intended to stimulate informal, lively discussions using a cluster of four to five 5-minute presentations with no more than 20 slides per presentation, where each slide is displayed for approximately 15 seconds while the speaker addresses the audience. The intent of an Ignite session is to spark interest and awareness of multiple yet similar topics while encouraging additional thought and action on the part of presenters and members of the audience. Ignite sessions are an ideal way to present innovations, effective strategies and tools, problems of practice, collaborations, etc. You should submit for a SINGLE 5-minute Ignite! presentation only—not an entire Ignite! session. Your submitted proposal should be for an individual (five-minute) Ignite! presentation that describes the purpose and topic of the 5-minute presentation, relevant literature, findings (if applicable), and examples of questions or areas to be addressed. Example of an “Ignite” Session: http://www.youtube.com/user/iGNiTe?blend=1&ob=4#p/u/3/rqSkulkwQ98

C. Roundtable sessions. These sessions are intended for discussing works-in-progress where you may have an outline developed, but have not started writing the formal elements of a paper, collecting data, and/or drafting final assertions/implications. Presenters are expected to provide electronic copies of outlines. Your submitted proposal should include the overall topic, research questions, relevant literatures you are pulling from, and a general outline for the research study.
Sample proposals for each will be posted to the UCEA graduate student development webpage at http://gradstudents.ucea.org in mid-March. Please refer to those exemplars as you craft your own proposal. Should you have questions about proposal drafting, feel free to email the UCEA Graduate Student Council at uceagradconnex@gmail.com.

IV. Criteria for Review of Proposals
To participate in the GSS as a presenter, you must submit a proposal, and that proposal must be accepted. All proposals will be subject to blind, peer review by the UCEA Graduate Student Council and at least two outside reviewers. The text of the proposal must not include your name. Priority will be given to single-author papers or papers co-authored by graduate students. The lead author of each proposal also agrees to serve as a reviewer for other GSS proposals. An author's failure to live up to either of these commitments may lead to the proposal being removed from the GSS. Proposals will be evaluated for:

• Relevance of research problem, policy, or topic to the convention theme and/or broader discourse in the field regarding leadership preparation;
• Thoroughness and clarity of the proposal;
• Conceptual/theoretical framework, methods, analysis, and presentation of findings (for empirical research); and
• Significance, especially for PK-12 educational leadership and/or PK-20 education policy.

V. Participation Guidelines and Proposal Deadlines
Graduate students engaged in research, policy, or practice in educational or youth-serving agencies may submit proposals for consideration. Proposals must be received by 11:59 pm EST on Monday, May 8, 2017. All proposals must be submitted electronically at the link to be provided at the UCEA homepage (http://www.ucea.org). The site will open on Friday, April 7, 2017. Please follow the prompts for submitting to the 2017 GSS.

You may submit more than one proposal to the GSS, and you may submit the same proposal to both the GSS and the UCEA Convention. Please note that these submissions are separate. If you submit a proposal to the GSS and also wish to submit it to the UCEA Convention, you must go through all the same steps in the AllAcademic system, but through the pathway for the UCEA Convention, too.

Submission length must not exceed three (3) single-spaced pages (approximately 1,500 words or 6,000 characters; excluding references and tables/figures) using 12-point font (Times New Roman). References are required and must not exceed one (1) single-spaced page (approximately 400 words or 2,200 characters). The text of the proposal must not include your name.

The lead author of the proposal is required to upload an advance copy of the work into the AllAcademic system through the UCEA Convention site three (3) weeks prior to the convention (Wednesday, October 25, 2017). This is required for your faculty mentor to review your work in order to be able to offer specific, relevant feedback. By submitting a proposal, too, the lead author of the proposal also agrees to serve as a reviewer for other GSS proposals. An author's failure to live up to either of these commitments (uploading an advance copy and/or failing to serve as a reviewer) may lead to the proposal being removed from consideration and/or the GSS program.

Please carefully review your proposal before submitting it. The AllAcademic system directly copies the information provided in the proposal for the program, so check your title, author names, and affiliations.

VI. Summit Registration
The summit immediately precedes the 2017 UCEA Convention. Registration for the 2017 UCEA GSS will be available online through the UCEA registration site in June 2017. The cost of attending the 2017 Graduate Student Summit will be announced along with the regular convention registration rates. The cost of registering for the UCEA Convention is separate fee, and registration for both the UCEA Convention and the GSS is required for admission to the GSS.

If you have questions at any time, please feel free to email the UCEA Graduate Student Council at uceagradconnex@gmail.com

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. Topics include preplanning, preparing an application, the interview, postinterview tactics, negotiations, and sample materials.

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 ucea-list@virginia.edu.
UCEA Announces 2016 Award Recipients

UCEA’s annual awards were presented at the 30th annual convention in Detroit, MI, November 17-20, 2016.

Roald F. Campbell Lifetime Achievement Award:
   Ellen Goldring

The Roald F. Campbell Lifetime Achievement Award was instituted by UCEA in 1992 for the purpose of recognizing senior professors in the field of educational administration whose professional lives have been characterized by extraordinary commitment, excellence, leadership, productivity, generosity, and service. At the same time, the award celebrates the remarkable pioneering life of Roald F. Campbell, whose distinguished career spanned many years and exemplified these characteristics. The 2016 recipient of the Roald F. Campbell Lifetime Achievement Award is Ellen Goldring (Vanderbilt University).

UCEA Master Professor Award:
   Michael Dantley

The UCEA Master Professor Award is given to an individual faculty member who is recognized as being an outstanding teacher, advisor, and mentor of students. The recipient of this award has taken a leadership role in his or her academic unit and has aided in the advancement of students into leadership positions in the K-12 system while promoting and supporting diversity in faculty, students, staff, programs, and curriculum in the field of educational leadership. The 2016 UCEA Master Professor recipient is Michael Dantley (Miami University).

Jay D. Scribner Mentoring Award:
   Carol A. Mullen

The Jay D. Scribner Mentoring Award honors educational leadership faculty who have made a substantive contribution to the field by mentoring the next generation of students into roles as university research professors, while also recognizing the important roles mentors play in supporting and advising junior faculty. This award is named after Jay D. Scribner, whose prolific career spans over four decades and who has mentored a host of doctoral students into the profession while advising and supporting countless junior professors. The 2016 recipient is Carol A. Mullen (Virginia Tech).

Paula Silver Case Award:
   Dorothy Hines-Datiri

The Paula Silver Case Award was instituted by UCEA in 1999 to memorialize the life and work of Paula Silver, former UCEA associate director and president-elect, who made significant contributions to our program through excellence in scholarship, advocacy of women, and an inspired understanding of praxis. The 2016 recipient is Dorothy Hines-Datiri (University of Kansas) for her June 2015 article: When Police Intervene: Race, Gender, and Discipline of Black Male Students at an Urban High School, Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership, 18(2), 122–133.

Jack A. Culbertson Award:
   Ann M. Ishimaru

The Jack A. Culbertson Award was established in 1982 in honor of UCEA’s first full-time executive director, who retired in 1981 after serving 22 years in the position. The award is presented annually to an outstanding junior professor of educational administration in recognition of contributions to the field. The 2016 Jack A. Culbertson award recipient is Ann M. Ishimaru (University of Washington).

Hanne Mawhinney Distinguished Service Award:
   Pamela D. Tucker

On occasion, UCEA’s leadership has found it appropriate to honor UCEA faculty for their outstanding service to the organization and the field. In 2015, the award was renamed in honor of Hanne Mawhinney, who embodied the idea of distinguished service and went above and beyond the call of duty in service to UCEA. The Hanne Mawhinney Distinguished Service Award was given in 2016 to Pamela D. Tucker (University of Virginia).

Edwin M. Bridges Award:
   Diana G. Pounder

The Edwin M. Bridges Award recognizes significant contributions to the preparation and development of school leaders. The award recognizes contributions to preservice preparation as well as continuing professional development aimed at school leaders broadly defined, and the locus can be in universities or in the field. The 2016 recipient is Diana G. Pounder (University of Utah).

Exemplary Educational Leadership Preparation Program (EELPP) Award:
   University of Washington Leadership for Learning Program

To celebrate exemplary programs and encourage their development, UCEA has established an Award for Exemplary Educational Leadership Preparation. This award complements UCEA’s core mission to advance the preparation and practice of educational leaders for the benefit of all children and schools. The 2016 award goes to the University of Washington Leadership for Learning Program.

JRLE Best Article Award:
   Michael D. Steele
   Kate R. Johnson
   Samuel Otten
   Beth A. Herbel-Eisenmann
   Cynthia L. Carver

Criteria for the Journal of Research in Leadership Education (JRLE) Best Article Award include contribution to knowledge in the field regarding leadership preparation (significance), overall quality of
the article, and impact or “reach.” The 2016 recipients of the JRLE Best Article Award are Michael D. Steele (University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee), Kate R. Johnson (Brigham Young University), Samuel Otten (University of Missouri), Beth A. Herbal-Eisnmann (Michigan State University), and Cynthia L. Carver (Oakland University) for the February 2015 article: Improving Instructional Leadership Through the Development of Leadership Content Knowledge: The Case of Principal Learning in Algebra, Journal of Research on Leadership Education.

Looking Ahead

It’s not too early to think about honorees for the 2017 convention. The next cycle of UCEA awards begins in late spring with selections completed by the end of summer. Additionally, each April UCEA announces the recipient of the William J. Davis Award. The Davis Award is given annually to the authors of the most outstanding article published in Educational Administration Quarterly during the preceding volume year. Please refer to future announcements in UCEA Review, in UCEA Connections, and on the website.

Contributions to the award fund are welcome and should be sent to UCEA, the University of Virginia, Curry School of Education, 405 Emmet St., Charlottesville, VA, 22903.

Award Nominations for 2017

Nominations for UCEA’s 2017 awards competition are due May 31, 2017. Please see www.ucea.org for information on criteria and the nomination process.

Excellence in Educational Leadership Award

Nominations Due March 31

The UCEA Executive Committee is calling for nominees for the 20th Annual Educational Leadership Award, in recognition of practicing school administrators who have made significant contributions to the improvement of administrator preparation. This distinguished school administrator should demonstrate an exemplary record of supporting school administrator preparation efforts. This award, one of national recognition, provides a unique mechanism for UCEA universities to build good will and recognize the contributions of practitioners to the preparation of educational leaders. The UCEA Plenum Representative (PSR) at each participating university should consult with colleagues and other constituencies designated by faculty to identify a worthy recipient. The nomination deadline is Friday, March 31, 2017.
The 2016 UCEA Convention in Detroit, Michigan included several events for Jackson Scholars and their dedicated Mentors. The Jackson Scholars Network Convocation featured two motivating keynote addresses by Dawn Williams of Howard University and Julian Vasquez Heilig of California State University, Sacramento. After the inspiring convocation, second year Scholars presented their dissertation research in the annual Jackson Scholars Network Research Seminar:

**Teachers as Social Justice Leaders: Understanding Complex Relationships Between Teachers, Equity, and Student Success.** Facilitator: Ann Ishimaru, University of Washington
- Marilyn McCoy Player, Auburn University
- Jacqueline Jeanetta Perry-Higgs, North Carolina State University
- Darrius A. Stanley, Michigan State University
- Aditi Rajendran, University of Washington
- Jocabed G. Marquez, Texas State University

**Examining the Curricular and Pro-Social Contributions of the Broader School Community.** Facilitator: Jeffrey S. Brooks, Monash University
- Kimberly Renee Starks Berglund, University of Missouri
- Julie Kelly Desmangles, Clemson University
- Charles Derek Collingwood, University of Arizona
- Ada Is Armond, University of North Carolina at Greensboro

**Examining Higher Education Programming and Policy Effecting Underrepresented Students.** Facilitator: Elizabeth Murakami, Texas A&M University-San Antonio
- Dallawrence Dean, University of Texas at Austin
- Genesis Ross, Miami University
- Hugo Alberto Saucedo, University of Texas at San Antonio
- Vanessa Ann Sansone, University of Texas at San Antonio

- Chy Benelli McGhee, New York University
- Rui Yan, University of Utah
- Mahmoud Sayed Marei, University of Arizona
- Julia Mahfouz, Pennsylvania State University

**State Level Policy in Complex Contexts: Examining Practice-Based Institutional Outcomes of Policy.** Facilitator: Hollie Mackey, University of Oklahoma
- Tomas Sigala, University of Texas at El Paso
- Liliana Estella Castrellon, University of Utah
- Nahed AbdelRahman, Texas A&M University
- Amieris Lavender, Michigan State University

**Student Success: Examining What We Know to Improve Schooling in Complex Contexts.** Facilitator: Sonya Douglass Horsford, Teachers College, Columbia University
- Paul David Spradley, University of Pittsburgh
- Joycelyn LaTonia Hughes, Howard University
- Kimberly Charis Ransom, University of Michigan
- Asia Nicole Fuller Hamilton, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
- Elizabeth Auguste, College of William and Mary

The Jackson Scholars Network is extremely proud of all of the members of the 2015-2017 cohort for their research and presentations. We are also very grateful to all of the chairs of our research seminar sessions for their dedication and guidance. The Jackson Scholars Network also hosted the annual Julie Laible Memorial Orientation Session for new 2016-2018 cohort members and their Mentors. Their time together included an introduction by Associate Co-Directors of Graduate Student Development Lisa Bass of North Carolina State University and Hollie Mackey of the University of Oklahoma, a networking activity, and time to connect.
Jackson Scholars and Mentors gathered for the Annual Recognition Ceremony to celebrate the work and accomplishments of everyone involved. The meaningful tradition included a welcome by UCEA President Mónica Byrne-Jiménez of Hofstra University and an explanation of the legacy and significance of Barbara L. Jackson and the Jackson Scholars Network by UCEA Executive Director Michelle D. Young of the University of Virginia. Attendees also paused to recognize and appreciate the service and dedication of outgoing Associate Director of Graduate Student Development, Gerardo R. López of the University of Utah. Khalula Murtadha of Indiana University-Purdue University led the group in our wonderful tradition, “I am because we are, and we are because I am.” Afterwards, Terrance L. Green of the University of Texas at Austin offered a stirring benediction. In closing, the group was inspired by a wonderful impromptu spoken word performance by first year Jackson Scholar Anthony Keith of George Mason University.

In the spirit of UCEA engagement and camaraderie, the Jackson Scholars Network coordinated its first flash mob. The Jackson 5 flash mob was a successful celebration that occurred immediately after the moving UCEA Presidential Address. Scholars, mentors, and supporters performed a surprise dance routine together to the tune of ABC by the Jackson 5. Khalula Murtadha of Indiana University-Purdue University led the group in our wonderful tradition, “I am because we are, and we are because I am.” Afterwards, Terrance L. Green of the University of Texas at Austin offered a stirring benediction. In closing, the group was inspired by a wonderful impromptu spoken word performance by Jackson Scholar Anthony Keith of George Mason University.

2017 David L. Clark National Graduate Student Research Seminar

The Clark Seminar is co-sponsored by UCEA, Divisions A & L of AERA, and SAGE Publications. It brings together promising graduate students and distinguished faculty for 2 days of generative academic dialogue. This year’s seminar will be held April 26-27, 2017 in San Antonio, TX, prior to the annual AERA conference. We are pleased to announce this year’s distinguished faculty mentors and scholars selected to participate in the seminar. Congratulations!

2017 Clark Seminar Scholars

- David Aguayo, University of Missouri
- Michelle Amiot, University of Utah
- Gwendolyn Baxley, University of Wisconsin-Madison
- Justin Benna, University of New Hampshire
- Marvin Boomer, North Carolina State University
- David Casalaspi, Michigan State University
- Elise Castillo, University of California, Berkeley
- Andrene Castro, University of Texas at Austin
- Davis Clement, College of William & Mary
- Amanda Cordova, University of Texas at San Antonio
- Julie Dallavis, University of Notre Dame
- Craig De Voto, University of Illinois at Chicago
- Emily K. Donaldson, University of Washington
- Stephanie Hall, University of Maryland
- Renata Horvatek, Pennsylvania State University
- Julie Kallio, University of Wisconsin-Madison
- René Kissell, University of California, Berkeley
- Michael Kucera, University of Illinois
- Courtney Lemon-Tate, Temple University
- Rachel Levy, Virginia Commonwealth University
- Katherine Lewis, Texas State University
- Tanya Long, Texas State University
- Abby Mahone, Lehigh University
- Bradley Marianno, University of Southern California
- Neoma Mullens, University of Georgia
- Anh-Thy Nguyen, George Washington University
- Jentre Olsen, University of Oklahoma
- Xiang Qi, Chinese University of Hong Kong
- Aditi Rajendran, University of Washington
- Luis Rodriguez, Vanderbilt University
- Samantha Shewchuk, Queen’s University
- Phillip A. Smith, Teachers College, Columbia University
- Darrius Stanley, Michigan State University
- Kendra Taylor, Pennsylvania State University
- Claudia Vela, University of Texas Rio Grande Valley
- Samantha Viano, Vanderbilt University
- Jeff Walls, University of Minnesota
- Mark Weber, Rutgers University
- Bryan Wilkinson, Florida State University
- Aaron Wisman, University of Louisville
- Cathy Woods, Washington State University
- Sijia Zhang, University of Alabama

Faculty Mentors

- Enrique Alemán, Jr., University of Texas at San Antonio
- Floyd D. Beachum, Lehigh University
- Michael Dantley, Miami University of Ohio
- Sara Dexter, University of Virginia
- James W. Koschoreck, Northern Kentucky University
- Colleen Larson, New York University
- Elizabeth Farley-Ripple, University of Delaware
- Sonya Douglass Horsford, Teachers College, Columbia University
- Melissa A. Martinez, Texas State University
- Morgan Polikoff, University of Southern California
- Stacey Rutledge, Florida State University
- Terah T. Venzant Chambers, Michigan State University
- Noelle Witherspoon Arnold, Ohio State University
- Irene H. Yoon, University of Utah
CONFERENCE ACTIVITIES

This has been a busy year for UCEA on the international front, both in terms of activities at the annual conference and in developing relationships with other international organizations. In addition to the annual International Summit held on Monday, November 20, 2016, the last day of the conference, there were over a dozen other sessions woven throughout the main body of the event that had an international focus, including International Community Building Sessions that examined Leadership Practice and Accountability Policy: Lessons From the U.S., Denmark, Finland, and Sweden; Mexico/U.S. Collaborative: Re-envisioning Principal Success in Complex Contexts; Cross-Cultural Intersections of Gender and Race Among English, South African, and American Black Female School Leaders; Redefining School Leadership for Immigrant Mexican-Chicano Children: Success in Bi-national Contexts; and Factors That Help and Hinder Social Justice Leaders Around the World.

There was also a session organized by the International Successful School Principalship Project (ISSPP) that examined Leading Visible and Invisible Low-Performing Schools in Cyprus, England, Norway, Puerto Rico and Sweden; a preconference work session organized by the International School Leadership Development Network; as well as a conference session presented by their High Needs Schools network that examined Contextual Issues and Challenges for Principals in High Needs Schools in the U.S., Sweden and New Zealand.

A critical conversation organized by the directors of the UCEA Center for the International Study of School Leadership questioned Why Internationalism Is Essential to Educational Administration. Other conference paper sessions with international perspectives examined Educational Leadership and Policy in an International Context, which included a presentation about secondary education in Belize; International and Comparative Perspectives on Instructional Leadership; Privatization and School Choice Within International Educational Institutions; and Equity-Oriented Leadership for Social Justice. In other words, a broad range of research issues having an international (as well as national) impact was brought to the conference for discussion by scholars from the U.S. and abroad.

As for the Summit itself, the theme this year was UCEA Engagement and Participation in Global Initiatives, which was organized in response to last year's survey of the membership that requested input about next steps in our international initiatives. Survey responses made it clear that UCEA members desired to become more involved in international activities. In response to this need, we organized the following three presentations:

1. Exploring the Promise of High-Impact Engagement: Stories From the Buffalo-Tanzania Education Project (BTEP) was a conversation led by Mara Huber, Associate Dean for Undergraduate Research and Experiential Learning at the University at Buffalo.

2. Developing Global Citizenship and Intercultural Competencies: Examining the Work of the International Higher Education Teaching and Learning Association (HETL) was presented by Patrick Blessinger, HETL Executive Director and Adjunct Associate Professor, St. John's University.

3. Challenges to Educational Leadership and Policy Across the Globe: Developing an International Survey was a discussion led by Phillip Woods, Centre for Educational Leadership, University of Hertfordshire, UK and Immediate Past Chair, the British Educational Leadership, Management and Administration Society (BELMAS).

With over 50 participants, drawn from perhaps 20 or more nations in attendance, these presentations generated some very lively discussion at times. Across all three sessions, there was a common concern about how individuals need a better understanding of the predispositions, misinformation, and even prejudices they may bring to their engagement in new contexts. There seemed to be consensus that UCEA needs to engage its members in workshops and sessions, perhaps as soon as at our next conference, to address our individual and collective responsibilities as researchers and academics as we expand our interests beyond our own borders.

Drawing from notes collected by Philip Woods during his discussion about developing a comparative survey of the field of educational administration and leadership (in service to the implementation of a possible International Congress), several critical issues and suggestions emerged. For example, rather than simply starting...
from scratch with this new initiative, we ought to learn from the experiences of international projects, such as the ISSPP, that have tried in the past to develop a common international survey about educational leadership. There are lessons to be learned from that experience that could save time and avoid repeating past mistakes. Participants were also in agreement that we should avoid grouping countries hierarchically, such as from First to Third World or highly developed to underdeveloped, because of the inherent deficit-model thinking it perpetuates. Rather, the thinking was that we go into this experience open to new approaches to school leadership. We also need to be careful as to how we define concepts like “democracy” in the research instrument and to remain attentive to differences in national contexts and how meanings of key concepts can vary accordingly. Moreover, an often-expressed concern was about the increase in xenophobia around the world and that UCEA must remain committed to working against it. Response to a request from Philip for participation in the development of a survey was immediate, and the following have already expressed interest:

- Lawrie Drysdale, University of Melbourne, Australia
- Jim Brandon, University of Calgary, Canada
- Jack Leonard, University of Massachusetts, U.S.
- Curtis Chin, writer/director of film Tested, New York University, U.S.
- Chet Gautnam (Nepal), Delaware State University, U.S.
- BetsAnn Smith, Michigan State University, U.S.
- Khaula Murtadha, Indiana University-Purdue University, U.S.
- Ross Norton, University of Otago, New Zealand
- Katarina Norberg, Umea University, Sweden
- Olof Johansson, Umea University, Sweden
- Teresa Wasonga, Northern Illinois University, U.S.

Those interested in engaging in any of the three activities presented at the Summit should either contact me or the presenter for the particular session of interest.

Before turning our attention to this year’s work on building UCEA international organizational relationships, I want to first thank Ira Bogotch and Carolyn Shields for organizing several wonderful opportunities for UCEAs international participants to visit area schools and other sights of interest in Detroit. I especially wish to thank Carolyn Shields for opening her beautiful home to accommodate and host an international reception. I think all who attended would join me in saying it was an enjoyable evening of good food, good wine, and good fellowship among colleagues. Thank you, Carolyn.

Building Organizational Relationships

In addition to the events at the conference reported above, this was a busy year for the UCEA in terms of developing international organizational relationships. In 2016, UCEA signed two new Memoranda of Understanding (MoU), one with the International HETL, and the other with the Institute for Educational Administration and Leadership–Jamaica (IEALJ). These new MoUs are in addition to existing UCEA relationships with BELMAS; the Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration and Management (CCEAM); the New Zealand Leadership and Educational Administration Society (NZLEAS); the ISSPP; the European Educational Research Association’s (EEERA) Network 26; and the Tanzania Council for Educational Leadership, Administration and Management. We are also currently in negotiations to develop a MoU with the World Educational Research Association.

The purpose of these MoUs is to provide general guidelines for partnerships of mutual benefit between these various organizations from around the world and UCEA. The MoUs recognize the mutual aims and similarity of missions of the organizations, including the sponsorship and dissemination of research, improvement of the preparation and professional learning of school leaders, and the influence of policy. These informal partnerships share and promote a commitment to issues of equity and diversity across educational systems and to the success of all students, regardless of background. Where possible, we agree to collaborate in developing strategies and implementing actions that address significant issues and concerns in higher education that have strong implications for the scholarship and practice of teaching and learning. These collaborations include, but are not limited to, promoting awareness of the organizations’ programs, publicizing their conferences and events, and providing information about publications and newsletters.

Perhaps as a result of these MoUs, there were 14 attendees from the U.S. at the NZLEAS conference in Dunedin, New Zealand, April 2016; 14 at the BELMAS Conference in Carden Park, Cheshire, July 2016; and 15 at the EERA Conference in Dublin, August 2016. You might want to add a couple of upcoming events being hosted this spring by two of our MoU partners: the (INTER)National Conference on Educational Leadership and Management, organized by IEALJ, to be held in Kingston, Jamaica, March 2-3, 2017, and the ISSPP Research & Practice Conference, to be held in San Juan, Puerto Rico, April 21-25, 2017.

One other item of note: During the past year, with the approval of the Executive Committee, we also have begun exploring the possibility of national memberships for universities that are preparing school leaders in two East African nations: (a) Ethiopia, with Addis Abba University serving as the lead institution for a consortium of about three universities with Educational Administration programs from different regions in that country, and (b) Tanzania, where the lead institution will be Aga Khan University in Dar es Salaam, which has a regional network in East Africa that includes campuses in Kenya and Uganda that also prepare school leaders. These negotiations are in their very early stages, and more details will be provided as they develop.
Thanks to Our Exhibitors & Sponsors

In the 30 years that UCEA has held its convention, many institutions have served as generous sponsors and exhibitors. In all cases, these cooperative endeavors served to create a more dynamic relationship between UCEA and those institutions and organizations. UCEA acknowledges the substantive contributions that the following sponsors and exhibitors have made to this year’s 30th Convention. We greatly appreciate their support and continuing endorsement:

Exhibitors

SAGE Publishing
Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group

IAP – Information Age Publishing, Inc.
Rowman and Littlefield

Sponsors

Host Sponsors
Wayne State University
Michigan State University
The Wallace Foundation

Partners
Pennsylvania State University
Texas A&M University
University of Houston

Contributors
Brock International Prize
Chapman University
University of Louisville

Donations
Mónica Byrne-Jiménez
Casey Cobb
Ellie Drago-Severson Chetanath Gautam
Elizabeth Gil
Mark Anthony Gooden
Liz Hollingworth
W. Kyle Ingle
Gerardo R. López
Carol Mullen
Kent Peterson
Amanda Potterton
Andrea Rorrer
Megan Tschannen-Moran
Pamela D. Tucker
Dawn Williams

Thank you to all reviewers, facilitators, discussants, attendees, and volunteers who made the Convention possible!

2016 Film Festival

If you missed the UCEA Film Festival at the Convention, you can still watch the featured 5-minute videos! They are available online: www.ucea.org/conference/2017-film-festival/
Nov. 16-19, 2017
Sheraton Denver Downtown Hotel, Denver, CO
Echando Pa’lante: School Leaders (Up)rising as Advocates and (Up)lifting Student Voices

EDITOR’S NOTE

Wildlife experts say fencing and bear spray are better security measures than guns against grizzly bears.

Contributing to the UCEA Review

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

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

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

Interview Editor:
Juan Nino (University of Texas at San Antonio) 
juan.nio@utsa.edu

Point-Counterpoint Editor:
W. Kyle Ingle (University of Louisville) 
william.ingle@louisville.edu

Innovative Programs Editor:
TBA

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

2017 Calendar

Deadline for nominations, Excellence in Educational Leadership Award, Mar. 31

Apr. 2017 Deadline for submissions, Summer UCEA Review, April 1
All Academic opens for proposal submission, April 7
International Successful School Principalship Project Research & Practice Conference, San Juan, Puerto Rico, April 21-25
David L. Clark Seminar, April 26-27, San Antonio, TX
Jackson Scholars Spring Workshop
William L. Boyd National Educational Politics Workshop, April 27, San Antonio, TX
AERA meeting, April 27 - May 1, San Antonio, TX

May 2017 Deadline, intent to apply for Exemplary Educational Leadership Preparation (EELP) Award, May 1
Deadline, UCEA Convention 2017 proposals and Graduate Student Summit proposals, May 8
Deadline, UCEA awards nominations, May 31

June 2017 Deadline, EELP Award application materials, June 29

July 2017 BELMAS conference, July 7-9, Stratford-on-Avon, England
UCEA Film Festival submissions due, July 31

Aug. 2017 Deadline for submissions, Fall UCEA Review, Aug. 1
ECER annual conference, Aug. 22-25, Copenhagen, Denmark

Nov. 2017 UCEA Graduate Student Summit, Nov. 15-16, Denver, CO
UCEA Convention, Nov. 16-19, Denver, CO
UCEA International Summit, Denver, CO