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Demographic Forecasts
By 2042, racial minority groups will make up most of the U.S. population (U.S. Census Bureau, 2013). Because they have high percentages of minority students, unprecedented changes are expected for minority-serving institutions (MSIs). According to the U.S. Census Bureau’s projection, upon which Taylor and the Pew Research Center (2014) built, Hispanic and Black Americans will have grown substantially, comprising 45% of the 2060 population.

Within a century (from 1960 to 2060), the White American population will have decreased from 85% to 43%. Immigration and intermarriage account for much of this change. Americans must not only embrace diversity and reexamine how we think about race, but also educators must prepare for these shifting demographics, including within our White-centric professional organizations. U.S.-based demographic shifts inform what we share here in our growing pains as culturally competent leaders.

Genetic and Purpose
Organizational diversity is one major focus of social justice advocacy that can propel racial justice and human rights. Professional associations with this vision can spark much-needed cultural transformation and reinvention. Organizational renewal is similar to self-renewal, but it is played out on a systemic scale involving complex power dynamics. Our thesis herein is twofold:

1. Professional organizations should include MSIs in their mission, leadership, and change efforts.

2. Organizational diversity led by professional organizations could make educational culture more inclusive.

Revitalizing professional organizations has long been on the radar of educational associations, such as the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration (NCPEA) and University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA). Both are committed to the mission of supporting the preparation of school leaders. They offer professional development trainings (e.g., webinars) on leadership for the 21st century and, importantly, catalyze university-school-community partnerships that foster and select generations of leaders who are social justice minded and thus more competent to lead schools (Gooden, 2015; Mullen, 2011; Mullen, Rodriguez, & Allen, 2015).
**Contributing to the Review**

The content of the *UCEA Review* is not peer reviewed, and any opinions printed in the Review should not be viewed as a statement by UCEA, UCEA Executive Board members, UCEA member institutions, or UCEA faculty. The opinions expressed are those of the authors alone. The *UCEA Review* serves as a source of information and news and a place where program innovations are shared and critical questions are raised. Members use the review for debate, to share opinions, and to engage the educational administration community in conversation and debate. If you have ideas concerning substantive feature articles, interviews, point/counterpoints, or innovative programs, *UCEA Review* editors would be happy to hear from you. The Editorial Team (see back page of the Review) meets twice a year. One to two features appear in each issue of the Review, which is published three times a year.

UCEA Past President Mark Gooden (2015) captured the growing pains of this organization’s leadership as it tackled the moral problem of “societal discrimination against women and people of color” (p. 10). Grappling with resistance to make an organization or institution more inclusive takes courage. Learners who come to think and learn differently, including those in governance roles, can bring about organizational renewal that simultaneously renews leaders themselves (Mullen et al., 2015).

**Organizational capacity** involves a wide range of capabilities, knowledge, and resources (Malen et al., 2014). Of primary importance, in our mind, are the rallying, empowerment, and mobilization of underserved populations in creating a boundary spanning socially just culture. Leaders who experiment with peer-led interventions can raise the caliber of justice and thereby change their learning environments.

Mature organizations fade away, granting to members the challenge of reinventing them (Mullen, 2011). Social justice interventions are vital for organizational renewal, in the process disrupting the status quo of White leadership. Female leaders and nondominant groups are at the fore in the struggle to educate for racial justice and human rights while educating forward, diversifying institutionally, and extending globally.

About the 2014 UCEA conference theme of educating for racial justice and human rights, professional organizations in educational leadership and education more generally rally around this vision. Peer leaders who work intentionally and interdependently have a greater threshold for diversifying the membership and leadership of predominantly White institutions (PWIs) that perpetuate business-as-usual.

One initial step depends on the willingness of the executive leadership of PWIs to reach out to MSIs, with a vision and flexible planning. Such outreach reflects a commitment on the part of organizational leaders to think, operate, and partner in new ways. Arriving at mutually agreed-upon expectations with MSI partners can spark new synergies and frameworks and provide momentum for inclusion and change.

As an example, we have grown from the leadership opportunity to help diversify NCPEA’s governance and membership to include MSIs, over the years benefiting from the talent and expertise from within these institutions (Mullen, 2011). More than 4 years ago, under then-incoming President Fenwick English’s leadership, NCPEA’s Executive Board decided to move in the direction of developing the organization’s capacity for renewal and inclusion, specifically in partnership with MSIs. A takeaway is that new leadership may rally with institutions that are not predominantly White or privileged, or at the center of influence.

Putting pen to paper around this initiative, we have published our own stories as diverse female leaders, two of whom are faculty at MSIs—Mariela Rodriguez and, formerly, Tawnannah Allen—and one who participated in the initiative to include racial minority scholars from MSIs in NCPEA’s governance body—then incoming NCPEA President Carol Mullen, who joined President Fenwick English and the Executive Board (Mullen et al., 2015).

**Organizational Diversity by Design**

When diversity is construed as an ecosystem going beyond a person, group, or program, the field of educational leadership is broader and it can have more impact. We operationalize **organizational diversity** as a construct associated with cultural transformation, social networks, and peer learning.
To make a difference at the level to which we aspire, we have had to reeducate ourselves as learning partners who think differently and act deliberately. Intentionality is “an important element of designing for leadership,” yet this intent must be combined with other elements, such as “interdependence” (Young, 2013, pp. 5-6). When intentional, organizations become active agents that diversify by design, beyond individual and group levels. By interdependence, we mean that organizational members partner to build capacity for school communities and preparation programs.

In our scholarship, we depict how diversity can be a dynamic human enterprise working on behalf of an organization to identify its weaknesses, synergize its causes, and broaden its reach. Our research focuses on (a) diversifying professional organizations to benefit the educational leadership field and renew mature organizations and (b) preparing future principals from educational leadership programs in MSIs to create equitable and just schools for traditionally marginalized student populations (Mullen et al., 2015; Rodríguez, Mullen, & Allen, in press).

Change can be initiated by leaders from PWIs who hold leadership positions in professional associations and from and on behalf of MSIs. Because peers in governance roles have leverage to “induct” new, diverse institutional members, they are in a position to renew organizations. Identifying unexplored pathways necessitates an entirely new way of approaching and conducting business. For us, diversification refers to the building of communities by partnering with MSIs, such as Hispanic-serving institutions (HSIs) and historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs), through such means as mutually beneficial agreements and research that incorporates advocacy. Involving members of disenfranchised groups and preparing leaders for demographically changing school communities are related goals.

NCPEA’s partnership with MSIs is resulting in gains: a diversified Executive Board, new collegial relationships, original scholarship with scholars of color, leadership and journal editorship of faculty representatives from MSIs, and the creation of a directory of HSIs and HBCUs listing over 100 MSIs offering degrees in educational leadership. By including stakeholders from MSIs in its governance structure, policy initiatives, and scholarly profile, NCPEA is not only increasing participation within the organization but also broadening the impact of MSIs in education.

Uniting the policy, research, and practice of scholar-practitioners supports the future work within principal preparation. The diversification of professional organizations in educational leadership and education more broadly is necessary. First, today’s graduate students are tomorrow’s faculty members who will be a more diverse teaching body. Second, PWIs must transform if they are to reflect changing demographics in schools and the professions and thereby benefit from the capital associated with faculty from MSIs. The leadership of professional organizations should be intentional about including disenfranchised people, some of whom come from MSIs.

MSIs that have principal preparation programs are tasked with the important work of cultivating and harnessing student diversity in the schools that their graduate students, aspiring principals and district leaders, will serve. Perhaps a MSI partner of UCEA, such as Howard University, an HBCU and recent full institutional member, can provide a laser focus on the challenging problem of preparing education leaders for student and family income and health disparities in high-poverty areas, as but one outlet of social justice advocacy.

Given our research about the geographic location of the MSIs with HSIs along the southwest states and HBCUs along the east coast of the United States (Rodríguez et al., in press), these are areas near large urban school districts that host culturally and linguistically diverse students. Thus, principal preparation programs in MSIs in these regions have responsibility for preparing future school leaders who will keep the needs of culturally and linguistically diverse students at the forefront of their decision making regarding curricular and instructional programming, as well as resource allocation.

**Literature Touchstones**

Faculty of color effect change through their diverse research topics, teaching practices, and student advising (Laden, 2009). However, in 2011, only 947 Black men and 1,524 Latinos earned doctorates, compared with 14,000 White male counterparts (Survey of Earned Doctorates, 2011). Saenz and Ponjuan’s (2009) research confirmed the worrisome vanishing of Latino males from postsecondary education.

The struggle of Black males and Latinos includes access to higher education and visibility within the academy. According to the National Center for Education Statistics (2012), in 2011 Black males and Latinos held fewer than 5,000 professorships and assistant professorships. For Black women and Latinas, the numbers were even lower, with less than 3,000 professors and 4,000 associate professors. Interestingly, at the assistant professor rank, Black women held about 6,500 of those positions, and Latinas only around 3,700.

Mentors have been identified as critical for assisting Latina students in the navigation of doctoral programs (González, 2006). Similarly, a study of Latina junior professors by Ek, Quijada, Alánis, and Rodríguez (2010) highlighted the need for professional development (e.g., mentoring) beyond the degree, given their low representation in the faculty ranks. Diverse graduate students need better guidance within the academy and, we add, disciplinary organizations.

Professional organizations that are places of renewal influence the communities they lead. This view of community differs from that of faith-based or neighborhood organizations (e.g., Big Brother–Big Sister program; State of New Jersey Department of Education, 2013). Community herein references action learning (e.g., see Raelin, 2006), whereby members value teaching and learning from one another and confronting the status quo. Partnering organizations can adopt this model and benefit from exploring social (e.g., peer) learning for the purpose of organizing for social justice (Mullen, 2011; Mullen et al., 2015).

Our scholarship as a query concerns what social learning can facilitate for established associations that have diversity goals (Mullen et al., 2015). Included in our area of study are learning-oriented leaders, salient problems, reflective inquiry, tasks, agreements, actions, and coaches (Marquardt & Waddill, 2004), but with the goal of diversifying professional organizations by learning from MSIs and their contributions.

**Strategies for Organizational Renewal**

Strategies for revitalizing a professional association to diversify its governance structure and membership include an interrogative mindset, collaboration among learning-oriented leaders, partner-
ship outreach, and executive contributions from MSIs. However, as with any process of change, there will be tough challenges. Stagnant governance practices and the way decisions get made may be more obvious than notions of who or what “belongs” within the changing structure or community.

We have been developing frameworks of organizational renewal based on our research, reading, and leadership experiences. Insights are that particular strategies (e.g., social networking, peer relationships, diversity goals) help in the transformation of mature organizations. From our practical research we recognize

- the commitment to establish new diversity goals that can benefit all learners and fulfill outreach efforts;
- the importance of networking as faculty leaders across different types of institutions that prepare prospective leaders of schools and districts;
- the value of cultivating relationships with mentors, colleagues, and friends to forward social justice agendas; and
- the richness of knowledge provided in socially oriented perspectives and methodologies.

Social networking. To understand how social networking can occur in an organization, let’s consider our experience as leaders and members of NCPEA. First, the annual convention is an excellent opportunity for collegial interactions. We, the representatives of the MSIs (and PWIs), described such interactions in a scholarly account (Mullen et al., 2015). Second, social networking is very beneficial and rewarding. We each have specific persons with whom we have networked through NCPEA and UCEA.

Such fortuitous networks have led to connections with people who reinvent the organization and turn possibility into reality through their vision, work, and leadership. As studied, NCPEA leaders believe social networking to be vital to the work and growth of the Executive Board and its interactions.

Peer relationships. Another commonality in our stories is the value of cultivating peer relationships. By our definition, a peer relationship includes caring, invested people with shared goals. Such a mentor and friend is Fenwick English of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, former president of NCPEA and UCEA. His encouragement, cultivation, and influence, and specifically his belief in our effectiveness and talent as organizational leaders with knowledge capital, are prevalent in our account (Mullen et al., 2015). English’s expressed intention of reinventing mature organizations through diversity initiatives, combined with cultivating diverse relationships as an integral part of this vision, influenced a particular professional association’s change process (Mullen, 2011).

This theme also reflects NCPEA’s mission to reach out to scholars and students in educational leadership programs to encourage participation, service, and publication, as well as attendance at the annual conference. All conference attendees gather at a scheduled social. Such a simple way to connect is an anticipated event grounded in custom and tradition that elicits a communal sense of belonging.

Diversity goals. A last theme gleaned from our published stories is the organization’s commitment to fulfill outreach goals through diversity commitments (Mullen et al., 2015). The HBCU faculty representative, explaining her goals in this capacity, described outreach efforts with colleagues as she investigated possibilities for a two-way relationship with new faculty members from MSIs and the changing professional organization. The HSI representative, in her vignette, referred to a project of hers with the HBCU representative—a directory listing all HSI and HBCU in the United States with programs in educational leadership. On behalf of the professional organization, they worked to raise awareness of MSIs; to recruit from these institutions to strengthen the organization and principal pipeline; and to diversify, often by reinventing older associations.

Roles and responsibilities specifically for these representatives from MSIs were developed by two NCPEA presidents, in consultation with the Executive Board. In this particular case, a memorandum of understanding was reviewed and accepted by the two MSI faculty representatives. The agreement that followed incorporated such organizational task items as these:

- Prepare a database of HSI and HBCUs that offer educational leadership graduate programs.
- Turn the database into a directory, with contact information for each institution identified.
- Prepare an outreach plan to contact these institutions and give them information about the professional organization.
- Carry out the outreach plan by contacting institutions regarding membership and participation in this association.

The three of us can see more clearly now how we are connected through common purpose and at the organizational level. In retrospect, our stories speak to a shared commitment to organizational diversity and renewal through outreach.

---
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Outreach Developments

MSIs with educational leadership programs, particularly HSIs and HBCUs, total 100 4-year universities. Our current steps include engaging in outreach efforts to attract faculty members from these universities to join NCPEA. Faculty from MSIs who become involved in this organization, like faculty from non-MSIs, will likely want to involve their graduate students in networking opportunities, as well as publication venues, conferences, webinars, and proliferating (inter)national agendas.

This infusion of new members should amplify networking efforts across institutions and beyond this association, the purposes of which are to provide opportunities for success to faculty of color and educate school leaders to advocate for all students. NCPEA currently has the involvement of MSIs at the level of individual faculty and leaders, not as institutional members. This is most definitely an area of growth.

Questions Prompted

Questions arising through these efforts to diversify mature organizations are intended in part to bring awareness to the need for recruiting more graduate students and faculty from HSIs and HBCUs into the educational leadership fold. We share five prompts for organizational development and diversification.

1. What are the federal definitions and designations of HSIs and HBCUs?
2. Where are HSIs and HBCUs located in the United States?
3. How does their geographic location connect to problems of practice faced by public schools in those regions (such as the influx of English language learners, high student mobility rates, and graduation completion)?
4. What types of educational leadership degree programs do these postsecondary institutions offer?
5. What recruitment strategies can be applied toward engaging more graduate students and faculty members from these types of postsecondary institutions?

Partnering Beyond our Borders

Ideas and information from our outreach to graduate students and faculty from HSIs and HBCUs support Hackman and McCarthy’s (2011) finding that more ethnic minorities are comprising educational leadership faculty positions nationwide. We wonder how many of these ethnic minorities have the opportunity to partner with different institutions and contribute to the renewal of their disciplinary organizations and of society.

Stakeholders in HSIs and HBCUs can seek out opportunities offered by NCPEA, UCEA, and other professional organizations and education entities, helping to cement justice and human rights as core values. This topic of organizational diversity is relevant for faculty in principal preparation programs seeking to build a diverse network of scholar-practitioners.

We also wonder about the national and global implications of revitalizing professional organizations relative to MSIs. As Gasman (Gasman, 2013; Gasman, Baez, & Turner, 2008) has declared, it is time for the United States to think globally. Considering demographic shifts, most children in the nation are racial minorities (U.S. Census Bureau, 2013), which is expected to have an unprecedented effect on MSIs that enroll high percentages of ethnic-minority students.

Educational leadership organizations can more vigorously improve the future of marginalized groups by expanding the dialogue taking place in education. And faculty members in MSIs can contribute to and gain from a global conversation about improving educational opportunities for children and youth (Gasman, 2013; Gasman et al., 2008).

In the United States, HBCUs have “improv[ed] the lives of Black Americans since their inception during a time of racial segregation” (Gasman, 2013, para. 3). These institutions play a crucial role in the socialization and promotion of ethnic-minority students, including Latino/as and Asian Americans, offering partnering benefits for professional associations and higher education institutions beyond faculty–faculty synergies and cultivation.

Professional associations can serve as a platform for undertaking the work that may educate through learning-oriented leadership and institutional diversification (see Gooden’s 2015 account of UCEA’s process of revitalization around equity values). Global conversations advance “the important work achieved by MSIs” and, perhaps more importantly, foster “solidarity and collaboration across them” (Gasman, 2013, para. 6) in an effort to create socially just learning environments with a diversity-oriented outreach mission.

Thus it is timely for peer networks to revitalize their professional organizations by supporting the leadership of MSIs. Faculty members in professional organizations and preparation programs that educate future leaders and educators (e.g., principals, teachers) can benefit from outreach programs to build a larger, more diverse network. Our hope is that readers find something worthwhile and useful here.

Finally, we call for executive leaders to facilitate the development or renewal of professional associations through peer learning with diverse partners. As UCEA Executive Director Michelle Young (2014) has expressed in the UCEA Review, the complexity of the times speaks to the need for an entirely “different kind of collaboration. In the past, the approach of the UCEA consortium has been to find solutions primarily within the higher education community. . . . Complex problems require cross-sectional coalitions” (p. 5). Cross-sectional coalitions that include MSIs will penetrate often unfamiliar territory while questioning the biases and assumptions encountered in problem solving. We cannot assume that our professional associations are already working with MSIs in meaningful ways or even have basic knowledge of them (Mullen et al., 2015).

Call to Action

Do we have work to do? Yes. Will we meet challenges? Most assuredly. Is the mission of this organization worth the risk? Definitely. If diversification of our professional associations is to take place on a large scale, it will begin here and now. It will begin with us, with the people, entities, and organizations that embody UCEA’s goals and philosophies about change and leadership. By developing leaders with a passion for diversifying at organizational levels and through social networking and partnering with MSIs, we will not only be including a group of educators who will be enriched by their opportunity to serve but also be able to see our own organization reinvented, or at least enriched, by the work we find so im-
important to the educational leadership of tomorrow. As one starting point, organizational processes that recognize the diversity expertise of MSIs could offer a powerful way forward.
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New Strategies Issue

Strategies for School System Leaders on District-Level Change is an annual publication that highlights promising practices in the systemic improvement of U.S. K-12 school systems, with a particular focus on the system-level leadership implications of this work. Each issue explores a particular theme and includes one or more case studies, illustrating how the theme plays out systemically in a real-world context. Strategies is developed and published by Panasonic Foundation in cooperation with UCEA and AASA. The 2015 issue is available at UCEA.org.
From the Director: Developing Future University Faculty for the Educational Leadership Field

Michelle D. Young
UCEA Executive Director

What They Didn't Teach You in Graduate School, Advice for New Faculty Members, and other books of this nature are designed to fill in preparation gaps for graduates of PhD programs who plan on entering academe (Boice, 2000; Gray & Drew, 2008). The transition from student to novice professor can certainly be a jarring one, particularly if the transition involves moving from one institutional type to another (e.g. from a research institution to a teaching college or from a large public to a small private) or if the graduate program from which the novice professor graduated involved little more than coursework and the dissertation.

Over the years, the UCEA Review has hosted discussions about the quality of preparation provided to educational leadership graduate students (Perry, 2011; Young, 2006). For the most part these discussions have focused on the development of those planning to work as educational leaders within schools and school systems in the United States. For example, in 2006, Young suggested a model for how the MEd, EdD, and PhD are distinguishable with regard to a number of key program components, “such as degree objective, primary career intention, knowledge base, research methods, internship, and the capstone experience” (p. 6). In 2011, the Fall issue of the UCEA Review was focused on the educational doctorate, including a piece by Jill Perry, the director of the Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate initiative, in which she provided a historical overview of the EdD and the importance of aligning the degree to development of scholar-practitioners as well as a Point-Counterpoint by Chris Golde and David Imig concerning the EdD dissertation (Byrne-Jimenez, 2011; Golde, 2011; Imig, 2011; Perry, 2011).

Less attention within these pages has been dedicated to the development of those who will some day enter higher education as faculty. Although important exceptions have contributed to thinking and practice around the development of future educational leadership faculty, UCEA would welcome a contemporary conversation on this issue. Is there a set of signature experiences essential for future educational leadership faculty members, particularly those entering research institutions?

The shifting expectations for faculty within higher education (McCarthy & Hackmann, 2009) indicate that current and future faculty members will be expected to teach, advise, research, attain grant funding, publish, and serve their departments, institutions, and the field with both greater intensity and in different ways than was previously the case. These trends have significant implications for faculty in many fields, particularly when paired with trends in the educational leadership faculty pipeline.

What are some of those trends? In their most recent study of the educational leadership professoriate, McCarthy and Hackmann (2009) found that a larger percentage of faculty remain untenured as compared to previous cohorts, that a larger number of faculty lines are not tenure eligible, and that the size of the typical educational leadership faculty had shrunk. These trends existed in both UCEA and non-UCEA institutions, though the trend was harder felt in non-UCEA institutions. Furthermore, significant faculty turnover has occurred, with 60% of the educational leadership faculty hired within the past decade, meaning that leadership faculties are much smaller, more junior, and less protected than in previous decades. Such trends warrant a consideration and conversation around how and how well we are preparing doctoral students for their future roles in the academy.

The Typical PhD Program in Educational Leadership

Although programs differ depending upon their focus, PhD programs typically require 66–90 credit hours of coursework. PhD students are often supported through grants, fellowships, and research/graduate assistantships, allowing them to enroll full time. However, in some places full-time students are self-supporting. PhD coursework is often divided into five curricular blocks: a Core, a Concentration, a Research, Cognate, and a Dissertation Block. Below, I have outlined an example PhD curriculum with an educational leadership focus. The example is provided for the purpose of discussion and should not be interpreted as a recommended UCEA curriculum.

PhD Foundational Core Block. For those programs that utilize a core, this usually consists of four or five classes that serve as a foundation for the PhD program. The core often represents a focus that is broader than the program area, emphasizes educational and theoretical issues that the faculty members consider to be foundational, and encourages different levels of analysis in the formulation and consideration of educational issues and problems. The following courses might be found in the core of an educational leadership PhD program:

• Theoretical and Ethical Foundations of Education and Leadership
• Foundations of Educational Research and Theory
• Educational Policy in the U.S. and Abroad: Current Issues
• Diversity and Equity in Education: Current Issues
• The Laws and Politics of Education
• Education and the Economy

Concentration Course Block. The Concentration Course Block is linked to a program’s focal area of study, in this case leadership. It typically consists of five or six courses. Some leadership programs may schedule students from PhD and EdD programs to take courses together, whereas others may shape the courses specifically for PhD students:
These and other skills must be developed within the research core. How to engage in systematic reviews of the literature. Rather, appropriate scope and scale, nor do they automatically understand knowing how to ask a research question, particularly one of

As Golde (2011) noted, students do not enter doctoral programs to pursue systematic, programmatic, and empirical investigations. The 3rd year generally focuses on advanced research methods. The 2nd year shifts to emphasize core knowledge and foundational understanding of research methods and educational issues. The 2nd year shifts to emphasize core knowledge and advanced research methods. The 3rd year generally focuses on student cognates and the opportunity to develop research skills through apprenticeships or mentoring relationships. The final years are usually dedicated to the dissertation. By the end of the program, a PhD graduate should have developed the content area knowledge and research expertise necessary for a university faculty position.

What’s Missing?

According to Boice (2000), few new faculty members falter due to lack of ability or desire; rather, “the most telling mistakes” include time management, scholarly productivity, teaching effectiveness, and learning “to elicit effective collegial support” (p. 1). Furthermore, the focus of faculty transition books tends to be on elements like teaching and service, time management, publishing, grant writing, service in and outside the university, and work–life balance. It would seem that strong content knowledge and research expertise is necessary but not necessarily sufficient for success in academe.

The above example, which may poorly depict the efforts of some programs, doesn’t take into account the learning experiences fostered through student–faculty projects and mentoring, professional development seminars offered by universities (e.g., Preparing Future Faculty Program), or collaborations with peers. It also doesn’t take into consideration the innovations introduced within university programs to build out different skill sets. Take the dissertation, for example. Whereas many programs still use the traditional five-chapter dissertation, which includes the introduction, literature review, methodology, findings, and discussion, some are introducing new models. Pedagogically the traditional dissertation format walks a student through the process of research, from design, through data collection and analysis, to writing up the results; however, it is a format that often proves difficult to transform into publications. Given that it is the most significant research experience for most doctoral students, it may not be the best model for developing a strong publication record. Furthermore, the transformation process is often left to the graduate to figure out alone.

One alternative to the traditional five-chapter dissertation is the three-article dissertation. This model, first introduced by Reid (1978), is used by a growing number of disciplines (e.g., biology and natural sciences, economics, psychology) and universities. Instead of one study, the student engages in several, preferably interrelated, studies and develops three or more publications from this work. The publications may be single authored or may have multiple authors. The “defense” of the dissertation generally involves the review of an introductory paper that outlines the overall research program, the relationship among the articles, as well as the role the student played with regard to research contribution and authorship.

Although there are drawbacks, the advantages of the three-article dissertation are obvious. The research process reflects the work and expectations of the field at large, rather than the expectations for student work. Thus, the student is provided with authentic opportunities to develop research expertise as well as hone scholarly writing skills. Through this model, the student is also likely to be mentored through the process of submitting a manuscript for publication, making sense of reviewer and editor comments and suggestions, and revising and resubmitting. Additionally, the research will be available to the scientific community much more quickly, and because it moves beyond dissertation abstracts, is likely to be more widely read.

But what of the trends I mentioned previously: shrinking numbers of faculty, fewer tenure lines, and higher percentages of junior faculty? What are the implications of these trends for PhD preparation experiences? Coupled with changing budget models, shifting requirements for promotion and tenure, and calls for stronger partnerships with the field, these trends will translate into faculty work lives that are very different from those we recognize today.

UCEA’s Jackson Scholars Program, Graduate Student Summit, and graduate student convention strand take up some of these issues, such as the job search, planning a research agenda, grant writing, teaching, and working towards tenure. We have learned from alumni of these programs that these programs are valuable for many students and junior faculty members. For many, the learning experiences that take place outside of coursework can be as important to career success as the official PhD curriculum. Be that as it may, it seems that UCEA, as a community of research institutions, should consider taking a more intentional approach to identifying the implications of new higher education realities for
the preparation of future educational leadership faculty. I’ll be interested in hearing your thoughts.
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This study focuses on exploring the current job market for academic faculty members in the field of educational leadership. We analyzed all faculty job advertisements (N = 173) in this field for the 2012-2013 academic year. Among other things, this article details materials needed, skills required, qualifications required, needed responsibilities and experiences, as well content areas required.

As institutions attempt to hire the strongest faculty members who are the best fit, it is essential to understand “that the relationship between a person and an organization begins prior to the person’s first day on the job” (Reeve & Schultz, 2004, p. 351). Reeves and Schultz (2004) posited that the relationship begins at the first point of contact between the person and the organization, which is commonly through a posted job advertisement. Institutions thus should explicitly express their employment needs through job advertisements to attract the right applicants.

The goal of this study was to explore the current demands, duties, and qualifications of faculty members in the field of educational leadership. We address this goal by analyzing job advertisements for educational leadership faculty members. What follows is a review of the literature where we explore themes that include preparation for pillars of the academic career and recruitment of faculty members.

Preparation for Academia: The Pillars

Both Atwell (1996) and Berelson (1960) maintained that there has been an ongoing debate over the importance of university teaching versus university research since the start of graduate education in the United States. This debate is evident in the work of Gardner (2005), who noted, “Some critics of traditional graduate education have even gone so far as suggest separate degrees: the Doctor of Philosophy degree for researchers and the Doctor of Arts degree for college teachers” (p. 162). Thus, there is often friction between where a professor’s efforts should be placed. These two pillars, teaching and research, often make up the core of an academic’s focus.

Service is the third traditional pillar in an academic’s distribution of effort equation (Adams, 2002; Gardner, 2005; Scott, 2006; Wade & Demb, 2009; Ward, 2003). To complicate the equation, engaging in administration duties is often expected of most faculty members (Arreola, 2000; Flaherty, 2014; Scott, 2006; Theall, 2014). Administrative duties are often seen as an additional hidden pillar of the professoriate, although this aspect is much less discussed. In many of today’s universities, faculty members are expected to master all aspects of the faculty role: teaching, research, service, and at times administration (Adams, 2002; Driscoll & Lynton, 1999; Laden & Hagedorn, 2000; Theall & Arreola, 2001; Wade & Demb, 2009).

With regards to educational leadership faculty members, Hackmann and McCarthy (2011) found that in 2008, 74% of educational leadership faculty members reported that teaching was their primary strength followed by research (18%), and service (8%). This holistic focus on all pillars (being slightly more focused on research) is evident at University Council of Educational Administration (UCEA) institutions whose mission is to promote research on leadership, improve leadership preparation, and influence educational policy. In UCEA institutions, Hackmann and McCarthy found that teaching was a primary strength of 57% of educational faculty members, followed by research (34%), and service (9%). The following sections examine each of these pillars in detail.

**Teaching.** The largest portion of a professor’s time is typically dedicated to engaging in teaching (Preparing Future Faculty, 2014; Ward, 2003). Ward (2003) noted, “Teaching is part of the very definition of what it means to be a faculty member” (p. 15). Two separate longitudinal studies by Nyquist et al. (1999) and Austin (2002) confirmed that many graduate students receive mixed messages regarding the importance of teaching. It is not surprising that for many beginning faculty members, teaching multiple courses can be the most time-consuming and daunting task of their role.

More recently, results from Ziker’s (2014) Time Allocation Workload Knowledge Study hosted at Boise State University indicated that faculty spend about 40% of their combined week and weekend on teaching-related tasks. This equates to approximately 24.5 hours, which is almost 60% of a 40-hour work week (Ziker, 2014). In contrast, the 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty indicated that faculty spent 61.7% of the week on teaching-related tasks (Zimbl, 2001). In juxtaposition, these two studies indicate that faculty time devoted to teaching has remained fairly consistent over 15 years.

**Research.** Adams (2002) noted that research expectations typically align with the mission of the institution. While liberal arts colleges often support interdisciplinary as well as traditional disciplinary research, urban institutions often value practical and applied research that assists their communities (Adams, 2002; Wade & Demb, 2009). Flaherty (2014) detailed how higher education institutions often place value on research that has the potential to impact publications, tenure, and promotion through publicity and garnering external funding.

Results from the Time Allocation Workload Knowledge Study indicated that faculty members spend 17% of their workweek on research and 27% of weekend hours on research activities (Ziker, 2014). These findings are a significant increase from the findings from the 1999 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty that indicated full-time faculty and staff spent 4.8% of their workweek on research (Zimbl, 2001). In contrast, Hackmann and McCarthy (2011) found that in 2008 educational leadership faculty spent about 15% of their workweek on research, 54% on teaching, and 25% on service. Research, it seems, usually occurs outside traditional working hours for many university professors. One probable explanation for this increase is the pressure of other university responsibilities such as teaching and service during the workweek. Thus, faculty might be adjusting their times to meet the demands and consequently work on research interests outside of regular work hours.

**Service.** Service is the third traditional pillar in academia (Thelin, 2004; Wade & Demb, 2009). Unlike teaching and research,
that have explicit meanings, service is a vague and excessively inclusive term (Driscoll & Lynton, 1999; Ward, 2003). Many tasks fall under the broad heading of service (Flaherty, 2014). What qualifies as service, however, varies greatly depending on the institution, the college, and the department (Driscoll & Lynton, 1999; Ward, 2003).

Internal service might be at the institutional or discipline level. Internal service supports the academic profession and higher education as a whole and is attached to the premise of shared governance (Ward, 2003). Such duties may include participation in departmental or college-level committees or advising of students who are majors of the department (Adams, 2002; Preparing Future Faculty, 2014).

Administration. Although administration may not be viewed as one of the three core pillars of academia, administration certainly plays a large role in the academic environment, even for those new to the professoriate. In the Time Allocation Workload Knowledge Study, Ziker’s (2014) findings suggested that distinguishing between service and administrative duties can be difficult. Administrative reporting to the institution can include but is not limited to student learning assessment reporting; committees for hiring, promotion, curriculum, and budget planning; student activities; and service to associations and community service organizations (Flaherty, 2014). Administrative duties, along with teaching, research, and service, require faculty members to manage their time and their resources wisely to maintain and progress through rank, promotion, and tenure.

Methodology
In this document analysis, we sought to gain a current picture of what the job market looks like for those seeking a faculty position in educational leadership. To capture the entire application cycle for academic faculty jobs for the 2013-2014 academic year, data collection began on August 15, 2012 and ended on April 15, 2013. The data source included four websites that post university educational leadership job advertisements: HigherEdJobs, UCEA, American Educational Research Association, and the Chronicle of Higher Education.

We began analysis by developing an initial codebook. This codebook included the code, a definition of the code, and examples of appropriate use of the code. The coding scheme was refined through three rounds until three coders reached a consensus. Once the codebook was well defined, we used the constant comparative method to code each of the faculty job ads (as described by Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Patton, 1990; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). One researcher individually coded each job advertisement. A second researcher then confirmed or disconfirmed each code. When disagreement was noted, the researchers discussed the issues until agreement was reached. In a final round, a third researcher confirmed each of the codes for every job advertisement.

Results
We located 173 faculty job ads in the field of educational leadership. As detailed in Table 1, some job advertisements were explicit about requiring documents such as a cover letter (90.17%), curriculum vitae (68.79%), and references (65.05%). Only 6.36% of the job advertisements requested teaching evaluations, and only one university directly requested a list of courses that have taught by the applicant.

As detailed in Table 2, some job ads asked for previous K-12 administration experience (24.86%), but few required an actual administrative certification (8.67%). Only 12.72% of the faculty job ads required teaching experience. Only 2.31% of ads required evidence of publishing. The data in Table 2 are divided into required and preferred qualifications.

Table 3 details responsibilities requested of faculty candidates. Advising students was the most common responsibility (60.12%). Teaching graduate students was a requirement in 56.65% of the job ads, while teaching undergraduate students was required in only 9.24% of the job ads. Engaging in research was noted in over half of the faculty job ads.

Technology experiences requested are detailed in Table 4. Over 32% of job ads required online teaching experiences. This percentage is likely higher given that an additional 12.14% required hybrid instruction experiences and 5.78% required course management software experiences.

Some faculty job ads explicitly required certain skills and abilities of candidates. Over a quarter of the faculty job ads for educational leadership called for interpersonal skills, the ability to work with diverse people, and the ability to build partnerships. Self-control, flexibility, innovativeness, confidentiality, and stress management were listed in only one faculty job ad each. Some job ads noted the need for a faculty member who was visionary (n = 2), a critical thinker (n = 4), resourceful (n = 2), creative (n = 11), energetic (n = 4), and dynamic (n = 12).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Preferred</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate degree</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>93.06</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-12 administrator experience</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>24.86</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching experience</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12.72</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration license (principal/superintendent)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record of publications</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher education administrator experience</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1
Application Material Requested for Educational Leadership Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material requested</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cover letter</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>90.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum vitae</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>68.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>65.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online application</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>46.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transcript</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>41.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications/writing samples</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>23.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching evaluations</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6 lists only those experiences requested in at least 10% of the faculty job ads. Lesser themes included mentoring, being an international scholar, teacher preparation, community college experiences, and accreditation experiences.

Educational leadership faculty job ads tended to detail what courses would be required of the ideal candidate to teach. As detailed in Table 7, courses most often required included leadership, policy, research methods, and school finance.

Table 3
Responsibilities of Educational Leadership Faculty Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advising</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>60.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching graduate level</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>56.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging in research</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>50.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>39.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University/community service</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>34.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis and dissertations</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>30.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service activities</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>26.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervising internships</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committees</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum development</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requiring travel to teach</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in P-12 schools</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct professional development</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program evaluation</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External funding</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching undergraduate level</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage faculty/staff</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4
Technology Experiences of Faculty Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology experiences</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Online instruction</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>32.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional technology</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid instruction</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course management software</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5
Skills of Faculty Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Preferred</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal skills</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>36.42</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with diverse people</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>28.91</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building partnerships</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>24.86</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to social justice</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19.70</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant writing abilities</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UCEA is a consortium of higher education institutions that engage in research about school leadership, leadership preparation, and policies regarding educational leadership and administration. Out of the 173 jobs offerings, 52 (30%) were from UCEA institutions while 121 came from non-UCEA institutions.

Table 8 details the tenure line for each of the job ads in the study. We found that 64.74% were explicitly hiring tenure-track positions while 5.78% were explicitly hiring for nontenured lines.

Table 8
**Tenure Lines of Faculty Job Advertisements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenure line</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure track</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>64.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non tenure track</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>29.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 details the faculty rank noted in the faculty job advertisement. Most common was the rank of assistant professor (64.16%) followed by associate professor (46.24%). These numbers are likely higher given that 13.29% of the faculty jobs ads simply requested a professor or faculty member, where rank was not explicitly noted. Note that the data do overlap since job ads could cross rank titles. If we compare these data to the Hackmann and McCarthy (2011) study, we see that 57% of the faculty lines in 2008 were tenure eligible, compared to slightly more than 64% in the current study.

Table 9
**Rank of Faculty Job Ads**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>64.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>46.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor/faculty</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct faculty</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director/program coordinator</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Ranks could overlap in certain advertisements.

**Discussion**

Some of the most useful themes for UCEA institutions that came out of this research focus on qualifications, responsibilities, experiences, and teaching expectations for faculty in the field. For example, to secure a position as an educational leadership faculty member, it is essential to earn a doctoral degree. Other qualifications include P-12 administrator experiences (about 25%), teaching experiences (about 13%), and having a P-12 administrator license (about 9%). With regards to prior experiences, we found that universities most often requested candidates to have experience with teaching (64.74%), research (54.34%), and educational leadership (45.66%). P-12 administration experience was requested in more than 40% of the job advertisements.

In these job ads, the responsibilities of educational leadership faculty members followed the three traditional pillars. Advising and teaching were required in about 60% of the advertisements, whereas serving on thesis and dissertation committees was noted in about 30%. Research was noted in 50% of the advertisements, whereas general scholarship was noted in about 40%. Service to the university and community was requested in about 34% of the advertisements, and about 20% requested service to university committees.

Hackmann and McCarthy (2011) found that in 2008 the five most common emphasis areas of existing faculty members were leadership, instructional leadership, principalship, law, and research methods. In contrast, the job ads in the current study indicate that policy and finance are in the top five emphasis areas of need. Principalship was the 10th most common requested course and law was the 12th.

This study accomplished three significant tasks. First, it presents data on what the field of educational leadership looks like at a particular point in time from the perspective of the jobs that are currently available. This study could be duplicated in the future to determine shifts in the field. Second, this study lays out exactly what a prospective faculty member should be thinking about when applying for a position. Additionally, graduate students can proactively seek experiences that make them a more attractive candidate in the field. Third, this study informs professors in the field of educational leadership who mentor future faculty members. As UCEA institutional members, it is imperative that we provide the right experiences for our students to secure the academic jobs they soon may seek. By understanding the skills, dispositions, and experiences university programs are currently seeking, preparation programs can adjust their programs to meet these needs.

By using the findings of the research above, better guidance can be given to grooming faculty members for the reality of the current job market. Recruitment is about finding the right person for the job. Mentorship is about preparing a person for the job that lies ahead. We hope this research can influence both aspects of the faculty job search.

**References**


New JRLE Editors Announced

Washington State University is pleased to continue hosting the Journal of Research on Leadership Education (JRLE) under the new editorship of Sharon Kruse and Gordon Gates. As incoming editors, we wish to acknowledge and thank Gail Furman and Michele Acker-Hocevar for their editorial leadership of JRLE that contributed immeasurably to the growth and prestige of the journal. We are thankful for all they have done in service to the profession and are proud to call them colleagues.

We are introducing and invite submission for manuscripts focused on leadership pedagogy. JRLE is now accepting for review pieces that present a single, research-based instructional practice for the college classroom or in-service professional learning opportunity to advance leadership practice, in addition to our standard format for empirical or conceptual manuscripts. Submissions pertaining to pedagogy should be 1,500 to 2,000 words and provide sufficient description of the teaching strategy, tool, or activity to be readily implemented by instructors. Linkages to national standards may be included as should supportive readings, instructional procedures, and extensions for students/professionals beyond the initial learning experience. It is expected that authors include evidence of successful implementation/use of the practice in a leadership education setting. Reflection on the utility of the pedagogy for leadership preparation is encouraged. Submissions shall undergo a peer-review process by members of the editorial review board.

Furthermore, we extend an invitation to attend and participate in our interactive session during the upcoming UCEA Convention that focuses on the art of reviewing. Offered in collaboration with JCEL, the session will explore the editorial skill set of UCEA journal editors, as well as reviewers who have won outstanding reviewer awards in the past several years. Attendees will benefit from the session by improving their reviewing skills and their ability to contribute to the wider field. An additional benefit of the session may well be more clarity for authors concerning what reviewers look for in determining the quality of submissions.

Dr. Sharon D. Kruse is academic director and professor at Washington State University, Vancouver. Her scholarship broadly addresses two concerns: (a) to help teachers and school leaders better understand the key role leadership plays in schools and (b) to explore how education is currently structured and influenced by social and organizational complexity. Sharon’s recent publications include Building Strong School Cultures (with Karen Seashore Louis, 2009), “Decision Making for Educational Leaders: Under-Examined Dimensions and Issues” (with Bob L. Johnson Jr., 2009), and “Work Smarter, not Harder: Problem-Solving Strategies for School Leaders” (2009).

Dr. Gordon S. Gates is professor and academic director at Washington State University, Spokane. His interests and research focus on the emotional aspects of leadership practice: (a) educator stress and coping with conflict, change, and uncertainty; (b) distributed and teacher leadership; and (c) mindfulness and resilience by both individuals and organizations. Gordon is a series editor for Research on Stress and Coping in Education published by Information Age. Recently, he edited Series Volume XIII, Mindfulness for Educational Practice: A Path to Resilience for Challenging Work (2015).

Note: As of Fall 2018, JRLE will be moving to the University of Houston, under the editorship of Anthony Rolle. R. Anthony Rolle, PhD, currently is professor and chair for the University of Houston’s Department of Educational Leadership & Policy Studies in the College of Education. Dr. Rolle conducts research that explores and improves relative measures of economic efficiency for public schools. Concomitantly, his research explores and applies measures of vertical equity to analyses of state education finance mechanisms. Utilizing these techniques recognizes that demographic differences among communities affect organizational processes and that all public schools do not have the same expenditure priorities. Dr. Rolle’s work is published in over 50 books, chapters, journal articles, and monographs such as To What Ends and By What Means? The Social Justice Implications of Contemporary School Finance Theory and Policy, Modern Education Finance and Policy, Measuring School Performance and Efficiency, Journal of Education Finance, Peabody Journal of Education, School Business Affairs, School Administrator, and Developments in School Finance. In addition, Dr. Rolle has conducted K-12 education finance and policy research for such organizations as the University of Washington’s Institute for Public Policy & Management, the Washington State Legislature and Democratic House Majority Whip, the Indiana Education Policy Center, the National Education Association, and the Office of Attorney General for the State of Missouri as well as agencies and commissions in Arkansas, Colorado, Missouri, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas. Formerly a member of the Board of Directors for the American Educational Finance Association (AEFA), and an AEFA Jean Flanigan Dissertation Award winner, Dr. Rolle earned a BS from Santa Clara University, a master’s in Public Administration from the University of Washington, and a PhD from Indiana University.
Innovative Programs:
University of Tennessee–Knoxville Leadership Academy

Preparing Transformational Leaders for Urban, Suburban, and Rural Contexts
Through University–County School District Partnerships

Kristin Huggins
Washington State University

Since 2010, educational leadership faculty at the University of Tennessee in Knoxville have been preparing transformational leaders to lead in urban, suburban, and rural contexts through the Leadership Academy, one of the educational leadership programs housed within the Center of Educational Leadership in the College of Education, Health, and Human Sciences. The Leadership Academy partners with two county school districts, Knox County Schools and Blount County Schools, to prepare educational leaders who have the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to lead in schools with varying performance levels, including transforming underperforming schools and increasing capacity in high-performing schools. These partnerships include collaboration between Leadership Academy faculty and county school district leadership for the 6-month selection process and throughout the entirety of the 15-month program.

Program Structure
Each year, 11 individuals who have demonstrated the potential to be transformational leaders are selected as Leadership Academy Fellows. The Fellows begin the program in May after selection in April. At that time, they also become assistant principals in county schools where they are matched with an exemplary principal who will mentor them throughout their time as a Fellow. While being involved in preparation for the following school year at the schools where they will be assistant principals, the Fellows begin taking courses in the summer after selection to prepare them for their new role. During the school year, the Fellows are assistant principals at their various schools Monday through Thursday and attend classes in the Leadership Academy on Friday. Utilizing the in-practice experiences in which the Fellows engage during the first 4 days of the week, Fellows along with Leadership Academy faculty connect theory to practice in Friday coursework.

Rigorous Selection Process
With applications due each November, over 100 Leadership Academy aspirants apply for 10 coveted Leadership Academy Fellow spaces. Initially, the aspirants complete an application packet. The application packet includes (a) an application portfolio as outlined in the Tennessee State Board of Education’s Learning-Centered Leadership Policy; (b) three professional rating forms, including one from the aspirant’s principal, that provide evidence of strong leadership ability; (c) a copy of the aspirant’s most recent performance evaluation; (d) an essay response to a prompt that details a challenging educational issue to assess each aspirant’s communication skills, problem solving, and thinking; and (e) a current résumé that provides evidence of strong leadership experience and a commitment to ongoing professional learning. After submitting the application packet, Leadership Academy aspirants complete the Gallup Principal Insight Profile, which provides insight in the aspirant’s achievement drive, planning, and relationship building.

All of the materials gathered in the first two parts of the application process are reviewed by county school district leadership and Leadership Academy faculty. From that review, between 60 and 80 aspirants are invited to a “behavioral interview” conducted by both county school district leadership and Leadership Academy faculty, which includes a question-and-answer component, simulations, role-plays, and in-basket activities. During the question-and-answer component, the interviewers ask questions derived from McREL’s 21 Leadership Responsibilities (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005), with each individual on the interview team having specific “listen fors” and a rating scale for the responses the aspirants provide.

Once the interviews are completed, between 10 and 20 aspirants are chosen to move forward in the process and are given a performance assessment. This performance assessment occurs in conjunction with each having individual interviews with the county school district superintendents. After these parts of the process have been completed, the entire selection committee of county school district leadership and Leadership Academy faculty meet to decide on the final 10 candidates. The entire selection process occurs between November and April. The selected Fellows are presented to their county school district board of directors in April after selection before beginning the program.

Program Features
Taught as a cohort, Leadership Academy Fellows engage in coursework that is aligned to the Interstate School Leaders Licensure
Standards defined by the ISLLC and Tennessee Instructional Leadership formation leaders and their developing level of competence as to understand their thinking in moving toward becoming trans-the future. Engaging in this feedback process allows the Fellowsing what they might do differently if the situations occurred in critically about their approach to those situations, and consider-with Fellows analyzing in-practice leadership situations, thinkingfellow cohort members. The focus of the feedback is concernedinformally, from faculty, practitioners, mentor principals, and provided verbal feedback on an ongoing basis, both formally andreviewed throughout the program. Additionally, Fellows are pro-vided with artifacts, and exhibits, which are systematically built andreviewed throughout the program. Additionally, Fellows are pro-vided verbal feedback on an ongoing basis, both formally and informally, from faculty, practitioners, mentor principals, and fellow cohort members. The focus of the feedback is concerned with Fellows analyzing in-practice leadership situations, thinking critically about their approach to those situations, and considering what they might do differently if the situations occurred in the future. Engaging in this feedback process allows the Fellows to understand their thinking in moving toward becoming transformational leaders and their developing level of competence as defined by the ISLLC and Tennessee Instructional Leadership Standards.

Recognized Success

Since the inception of the Leadership Academy in 2010, every single Fellow has been hired immediately upon graduation from the program into a full-time administrative position. Due to the Leadership Academy’s success in preparing transformational leaders for multiple contexts, their efforts have been recognized by the Tennessee Department of Education through being awarded a professional development grant. The grant will allow Leadership Academy faculty to provide professional development to three rural school districts concerning what they have learned from the past 5 years of developing transformational leaders. Additionally, their partnership efforts were recognized by the Executive Director of Leadership Development for the Tennessee Department of Education, who acknowledged, “The Leadership Academy is the model of what partnerships should look like” (Technical Assistance Webinar, 2013, February 6). Indeed, the Leadership Academy faculty acknowledge that the county school district partnerships are essential to the Leadership Academy success.

For more information concerning the Leadership Academy at the University of Tennessee, contact Betty Sue Sparks: bsparks6@utk.edu.

http://cel.utk.edu/academy.html
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UCEA Welcomes New Member

Texas Christian University

UCEA welcomes Texas Christian University (TCU) as a new associate member. The mission of the TCU Educational Leadership Program is to develop teacher-scholar leaders who make a difference for the common good. Furthermore, the program is committed to preparing individuals who will contribute to the creation of a humane and just society. To accomplish this, the TCU College of Education engages students in ethical, responsible, and meaningful scholarship and practice; fosters community collaboration locally and globally; and expects excellence in all college endeavors. As a program, the goals for student learning focus on equipping their students to

1. Enhance relationships within their organizations and between organizations and the broader community;
2. Create an organization with greater capacity and responsiveness;
3. Use data and evaluation to enhance the quality of people, programs and learning within the organization;
4. Grow the human and social capital of the institutions; and
5. Ensure the effectiveness and coherence of the instructional program of the institution.
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Join UCEA’s LinkedIn Group

If you are interested in receiving UCEA HQ announcements and engage in conversations around leadership research and preparation, you may want to join the UCEA LinkedIn Group “UCEA Headquarters.” Join colleagues from multiple countries and institutions in meaningful conversations about the educational leadership field. LinkedIn is a free professional network service. Members keep abreast of career, research and mentoring opportunities as well as important policy issues. They are alerted to UCEA publications, awards and other opportunities. If interested, members can also use the group as a resource to obtain knowledge as well as share opinions and perspectives.

What to do next:
1. Log into www.LinkedIn.com
2. Search for the UCEA Headquarters Group.
3. Follow the LinkedIn instructions to join a group.

UCEA will approve your request to join. We look forward to welcoming you to the group.
A New Federal Role in Education?  
Incentivizing District Mergers?  

W. Kyle Ingle  
University of Louisville

It has been a long road since the last reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) in 2002. The federal legislation, better known as No Child Left Behind, gave us the highly qualified teacher provision requiring stronger teacher qualifications, adequate yearly progress among student racial/ethnic subpopulations and program enrollments (e.g., free or reduced-price meals, special education), strong accountability and consequences for schools, greater parental choice, and an emphasis on improvement efforts using research-based practices. Much has happened domestically and internationally since that time—a massive economic recession, the never-ending war on terror in multiple fronts, the election (and re-election) of the first African American U.S. President, and important U.S. Supreme Court decisions on issues such as health care and marriage equality, just to name a few. Given the presence of Amendment X in the U.S. Constitution (“The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people”), the federal role in education is an interesting evolution in policy. Indeed, Michael Kirst (2004) noted that between 1862 and 1963, the U.S. Congress considered and rejected legislation 36 times that would have provided unrestricted general aid to schools. And yet, 2 years later, the first authorization of ESEA was enacted in 1965. Very early in ESEA’s history, scholars saw the potential for an expanding federal role in this policy arena over time (e.g., Sundquist, 1968).

ESEA, in its various reauthorizations, has played an important role in forcing states and districts to meet the needs of underserved populations of students. This includes the establishment of high-stakes testing that penalizes districts and schools failing to attain growth within specific subpopulations. The next iteration of ESEA provides an opportunity to expand or contract the federal role in education. There have certainly been critics of the No Child Left Behind Act and of testing as a means of rewarding or sanctioning for schools, teachers, and students (e.g., Hout & Elliott, 2011). Some have seen the use of federal funding as a potential tool to overcome inequities that result from a school finance system based on local property taxes, seeing federal funding as a way to avoid the recalcitrance of state legislatures in addressing inequities (Biddle & Berliner, 2002; Crampton, 2003; Filardo, Cheng, Allen, Bar, & Ulsoy, 2010; Filardo & O’Donnell, 2010; Thompson, Crampton, & Wood, 2012). Hopkins, Thompson, Linquanti, Hakuta, and August (2013) have called for a reauthorization of ESEA that more adequately addresses the unique needs of English learners. So given ongoing concerns with school funding, inequities, de facto segregation, and the public’s desire for efficiency and accountability, might federally incentivized district mergers and consolidation be a possible solution? Our contributing scholars are noted experts in their fields, and I thank them for responding to my invitation to contribute to this Point-Counterpoint.

• Sean P. Kelly (PhD, Sociology, University of Wisconsin–Madison) is associate professor and director of the PhD program in the Department of Administrative and Policy Studies at the University of Pittsburgh. His research focuses on the social organization of schools, student engagement, and teacher effectiveness. Dr. Kelly’s research has appeared in the American Educational Research Journal, Educational Researcher, Teachers College Record, Sociology of Education, and Social Science Research. He is the editor of Assessing Teacher Quality: Understanding Teacher Effects on Instruction and Achievement, published in 2012 by Teachers College Press. In 2014 he received the Exemplary Research in Teaching and Teacher Education award from AERA’s Division K. Dr. Kelly’s current research includes the CLASS 5.0 development project, an Institute for Education Sciences funded educational technology study of classroom discourse. Dr. Kelly currently serves as the UCEA Plenary Session Representative for the University of Pittsburgh. He also serves on the editorial boards of the American Educational Research Journal and Research in the Teaching of English.

• Thomas A. DeLuca (PhD, Educational Administration, Michigan State University) is assistant professor with the department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies in the School of Education at the University of Kansas. Dr. DeLuca’s experience in K-12 public education includes serving as a teacher, principal, and finance director in both rural and urban districts. Dr. DeLuca also has 11 years of private sector experience with a Fortune 500 company where he worked in technology, finance, and international sales. Dr. DeLuca’s research focuses on the politics of K-12 education finance and policy, the influence of empirical evidence in decision making and resource allocation, alternative service-delivery models, and the structure and economics of K-12 educational organizations. Dr. DeLuca’s research has appeared in journals including the Journal of Education Finance and School Business Affairs. Dr. DeLuca currently serves as the UCEA Plenary Session Representative for the University of Kansas. He teaches graduate courses in educational finance and instructional supervision.

There Is Still a Role for District Mergers in Promoting Equality of Educational Opportunity

Sean Kelly  
University of Pittsburgh

In a Pittsburgh Post-Gazette editorial (Kelly, 2015), I recommended that the next reauthorization of the ESEA (titled “No Child Left Behind” in the 2002 legislation) consider developing an incentive program to promote voluntary school district mergers. This recommendation would entail a novel and ambitious use of ESEA that would change existing patterns of local control. My argument in favor of such an incentive program is based primarily on re-
search showing that underperformance in school is often the result of a concentration of poverty, rather than a lack of effort or talent on the part of educators, coupled with the observation that district boundaries make it difficult or impossible to create the kind of integrated schools with the social conditions necessary to be successful. Realizing that school mergers will meet steep political resistance, in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette editorial I reasoned that administrative efficiency and economies of scale provide some incentive to wealthier bedroom community districts to voluntarily merge with central city districts. To some, this assertion may be naïve; research shows that with existing enrollment patterns, further school consolidations are likely to have a minimal impact on fiscal efficiency in most cases (Howley, Johnson, & Petrie, 2011).

Nevertheless, I maintain that the basic recommendation for a federal district-merger incentive program has merit and might yield substantial educational improvements, while promoting the overall social and economic well-being of metropolitan areas. This recommendation rests on three sets of empirical findings. First, research shows that concentrations of poverty in neighborhoods and schools are the primary culprit behind low-performing schools; greater accountability will result in minimal school improvement under such circumstances. Second, in recent years, the segregation of poor and minority students in low-performing schools has largely been driven by increases in between-district segregation. The district boundaries themselves help to generate concentrations of poverty. Third, despite an existing history of school consolidation, in many states district consolidation will produce a clear improvement in equality of educational opportunity.

The term concentration of poverty refers to the extent to which the poor live in neighborhoods where the majority of their neighbors are also poor, rather than integrated into the population more broadly (Jargowsky, 1997). Unfortunately, this term is increasingly applicable to U.S. cities, where spatial income segregation has increased in recent decades (Reardon & Bischoff, 2011). Defining high-poverty neighborhoods as concentrations of more than 40% of persons living in poverty, Jargowsky’s (1997) analysis of 337 metropolitan areas found that the number of high-poverty census tracts more than doubled from 1970 to 1990. In many metro areas, income segregation overlaps with racial and ethnic segregation, such that Blacks and Hispanics are disproportionately affected by concentrations of poverty. Milwaukee provides an extreme example. In 1970, only 8.4% of the city’s Black population lived in a high-poverty neighborhood, compared to almost 50% by 1990 (Jargowsky, 1997).

Although there is not a one-to-one correspondence, residential segregation drives school segregation, particularly in elementary schools, which have smaller catchment areas than middle or high schools. As a result, many metropolitan areas have high levels of school segregation, where the majority of poor students attend schools with other poor students (Orfield & Lee, 2005). As of 2011-12, 19% of public school students in the United States attended a high-poverty school (where 75% or more of the students met federal poverty guidelines for free or reduced-price lunch), with 34% of all central city students attending high-poverty schools (Kena et al., 2014).

It is this concentration of poverty that is primarily to blame for low test scores and graduation rates in so-called “failing schools.” Since the landmark Equality of Educational Opportunity Study, also known as the “Coleman Report,” hundreds of studies have demonstrated that observed differences in achievement between schools are largely due to the aggregate characteristics of the students who attend different schools, rather than to the effects of the schools per se (Coleman, 1966/1990; Scheerens & Bosker, 1997). The challenges of overcoming concentrations of poverty have been best illustrated by “summer learning” studies of elementary schooling that carefully compare patterns of achievement growth when students are in school versus out of school. In these studies, differences in achievement are largely accounted for by initial disparities that students bring to school and differential learning when school is not in session (Downey, von Hippel, & Hughes, 2008; Entwisle, Alexander, & Olson, 1997).

As students transition to secondary school, early achievement problems lead to problems of student engagement, and high-poverty schools become increasingly challenging instructional environments (Kelly, 2010). Concentrations of poverty, both in neighborhoods and in schools, are associated with differential economic resources (and the schooling supports such resources allow for), structural characteristics of the family and household that inhibit learning, and differences in cultural and social capital. As one example, consider this finding from Prudence Carter’s (2005) study of family, culture and schooling in a high-poverty neighborhood; less than a third of her respondents had someone they could talk to about jobs or their future, and only 1 in 6 could mention a single adult they knew with a college education or white-collar job. Of immediate concern to school administrators, one indication of the social and behavioral problems created by school segregation is that rates of teacher attrition are substantially higher in high-poverty schools (Ingersoll, 2001; Lankford, Loeb, & Wyckhoff, 2002).

Impartingly, the concentration of poor and minority students in segregated schools is to a substantial extent the result of school district boundaries themselves (Clotfelter, 2004; Owens, 2014). In his book, After Brown, Clotfelter (2004) decomposed changes in segregation in U.S. metro areas into three components: segregation between schools within districts, segregation created by the availability of private schools, and segregation across district lines. Recent increases in segregation have been largely due to segregation across district boundaries (see Clotfelter, 2004, Table 2.4). As an example of the contribution of district boundaries to school segregation, Clotfelter highlighted trends in school enrollments in the South Bend, Indiana, metro area between 1970 and 2000. In 1970, enrollment disparities between the South Bend public school district and neighboring suburban districts accounted for just 12% of the total segregation in the metro area. By 2000, between-district segregation comprised 73% of the total segregation (Clotfelter, 2004, Table 2.2).

In cautioning against a rush to consolidate schools, Howley et al. (2011) began by documenting the sharp decline in the number of school districts from 1930 to 1960 and discussed the negative effects accompanying county-level consolidation in West Virginia. Overall, they argued that the educational benefits from district consolidation have already been maximized. In contrast, I argue that in terms of the severe problems accompanying the isolation of poor students in segregated schools, in many states the existence of hundreds of small school districts still contributes to educational inequality. As an example, consider Allegheny County, Pennsylvania, where in addition to the Pittsburgh Public School district serving the city proper, there are more than 60 local educational agencies. As of 2010, almost 95% of the total segregation in the
Pittsburgh Metrow area was due to the existence of district boundaries (Kotok & Reed, 2015). Fortunately, the negative effects of this segregation have been somewhat muted in Pittsburgh, where a strong tax base continues to allow for adequate school funding (in 2009-2010 Pittsburgh Public ranked in the top 10 in per pupil expenditures among the largest 300 school districts). In other metro areas the social consequences of increasing segregation between districts have been compounded by rising financial distress in central city districts.

In the 1970s and ’80s, school desegregation efforts—both court ordered and voluntary—served to reduce the concentration of students with the fewest economic and social resources in predominantly minority (and high-poverty) schools. Today, as a result of increased suburbanization and White flight, much of the school segregation standing in the way of educational improvement efforts occurs across district boundaries. States such as Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Michigan, where large urban districts are ringed by dozens and dozens of suburban districts, are clear candidates for consolidation. Research in the social sciences, including my own studies of curriculum tracking (Kelly, 2009; Kelly & Price, 2011), shows that desegregation is not a panacea for educational inequality (Vigdor, 2011). Nor will voluntary district mergers address the segregation that is occurring within districts in states such as North Carolina, which have benefited from a past history of success at reducing concentrations of school poverty (Ayscue & Woodward, 2014). Yet, in many metro areas where district boundaries create what Gerald Grant (2011, p. 136) called “an invisible wall” between poverty and opportunity, district mergers are a necessary prerequisite to true school improvement.

Federal Incentives to Merge Local Districts: Alternative Perspectives

Thomas A. DeLuca
University of Kansas

While local district consolidation continues to be part of the national conversation, this proposal recommends infusing federal incentives into a local decision-making process. As a former district administrator whose research focuses on the internal allocation of resources, consolidation frequently serves as a component of my work, focusing on benefits such as gained efficiencies related to the inputs to education (e.g., revenue, expenditures, human resources) rather than positing that district consolidation might enhance educational opportunities and effect social change (DeLuca, 2013, 2014a, 2014b, 2015). Interestingly, state-level policies already exist offering financial incentives to districts willing to consolidate (Berry & West, 2010; Duncombe & Yinger, 2007; Wolenberg, 2012).

The unique twist on this proposal is that state-sponsored consolidation incentives typically focus on reduced spending, increasing efficiency, or expanding educational opportunities, and this proposal seeks to effect social change by offering incentives to high- and low-poverty districts to consolidate and effectively dilute high concentrations of poverty. Admittedly, there is precedent for federal legislation attempting to effect social change, such as the Civil Rights Act of 1964 that outlawed discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, or national origin and later expanded to include equal housing opportunities (Civil Rights Act, 1968). Moreover, the U.S. Supreme Court’s Brown v. Board of Education (1954) decision declared that state laws establishing separate public schools for Black and White students are unconstitutional. However, do these federal policies offer precedent for this proposal? Maybe.

Consolidation Logistics

In order for local school districts to consolidate, voters in each preconsolidation district must affirm the ballot proposal. For example, if administrators in three districts agree to consolidate, voters in one of the three may reject the initiative and derail the proposed three-district consolidation. In this situation, if two of the three agree to consolidate, voters in the approving districts must then reapprove a new two-district ballot initiative. While each state’s policies and procedures vary slightly, school district consolidation requires three basic steps: (a) voters approve the ballot initiative; (b) upon approval, original districts are legally dissolved; and (c) the new district is created and becomes the official legal entity. For reference, Michigan provides a 14-step process that includes legal authority citations, responsible parties, and a time frame (Michigan Department of Education, 2008).

Given the complexity of the process and a legacy of local control, offering districts federal incentives to consolidate raises several logistical questions: At what point in the process do the consolidating districts receive their financial incentives? Since preparing for and scheduling an election is not free (e.g., legal fees, information/marketing materials, facility capacity projections, enrollment projections), will districts be reimbursed for expenditures even if the initiative does not gain voter approval? One extreme alternative might be to remove voters from the process (i.e., eliminate local control) and mandate district consolidations to dilute selected high concentrations of poverty. However, this level of political experimentation is well beyond the scope of this essay.

Stakeholders and Resources

Students. Most would agree that students are the primary stakeholders when it comes to compulsory public education, raising the question, how do larger school districts affect student outcomes? Berry and West (2010) found “modest gains associated with larger districts as part of the consolidation movement” from 1930–1970, but “these gains were outweighed by the harmful effects of larger schools” (p. 24). While the data covered the most expansive district consolidations in U.S. history, 1930–1970, is there evidence to suggest different outcomes with federal consolidation incentives? Similarly, Summers and Wolfe (as cited in Berry, 2006) found African American students were particularly harmed by large school size, whereas Lee and Smith (as cited in Berry, 2006) found that students of low socioeconomic status did particularly poorly in large schools. Finally, Berry and West found that the impacts of district “consolidation on labor-market outcomes confirm that students from states with increasingly large schools earned substantially lower wages later in life” (p. 2).

Voters and taxpayers. Voters and taxpayers elect school boards to represent the community’s tastes and preferences, as
well as making consolidation decisions, all while balancing multiple competing interests. For example, how will consolidation affect each and every student? How will consolidation affect taxes that fund schools? Will consolidation affect the value of my home? Hu and Yinger (2008) found that “consolidation has a large positive impact on house values with relatively inexpensive housing, but a large negative impact with relatively expensive housing” (p. 632). While I do not disagree that providing equal learning opportunities for each and every student is one of society’s more important long-term responsibilities, this proposal raises many questions about the long-term community impact.

Operating expenditures. Intuitively, consolidating school districts should provide spending reductions through economies of size. However, study after study finds that significant spending reductions rarely materialize except when merging very small districts (500 or less pupils) to larger districts with 2,000 to 4,000 students. Conversely, once districts reach approximately 6,000 students, diseconomies of size
develop (Andrews, Duncombe, & Yinger, 2002; Gordon & Knight, 2008; Rooney & Augenblick, 2009). While most educators and taxpayers can broadly define economies of scale, diseconomies of size may be less understood. Duncombe and Yinger (2007) described diseconomies of size as increased per pupil spending as district size increases. Some diseconomy sources include higher transportation costs given the expanded geographical area (e.g., salaries, fuel, bus maintenance/replacement), labor relations where wages tend to level up to the higher of the consolidating districts, lower staff motivation, lower student motivation and effort, and lower parental involvement. Granted, motivation, effort, and involvement may not affect expenditures directly. These nonfinancial factors are economic costs that may adversely affect the overall district mission of improved student learning (Levin & McEwan, 2001).

Capital improvement bonds. Historically, school districts use bonds to finance large capital projects (e.g., new or upgraded facilities). Given the need to spend millions of dollars in a relatively short amount of time, school districts borrow funds with the promise of repayment over 10–30 years. Subsequent to consolidation, taxpayers from which district(s) (i.e., original districts, newly consolidated district) will take responsibility for repaying existing bonds approved by preconsolidation voters? These decisions should be part of the preconsolidation planning process, as voters will want to consider this information. After consolidation, pursuing new capital bonds will require significant administrative effort to understand the expanded community, earn the trust of new constituents, and identify potential Yes voters.

Curriculum and teaching. After ESEA’s 2002 reauthorization as the No Child Left Behind Act, standardized curricula and assessments became the norm. However, teacher quality continues to be a less-than-standardized resource. Teacher sorting challenges high-poverty schools, where high teacher-turnover rates marginalize those students who would most benefit from experienced high-quality teachers, as these same teachers move to positions in low-poverty schools. In one study considering the end of “student reshuffling,” Jackson (2009) found that “schools that experienced an increase in the black enrollment share [return to neighborhood schools] saw a decrease in the proportion of experienced teachers, teachers with high scores on their licensure exams, and a decrease in teacher value added.” (p. 248). He found that the aggregate decline in teacher quality in schools with increased Black enrollment shares was due to these schools losing experienced and effective teachers. How might federal incentives address teacher sorting? Athletics. Yes, even extracurricular activities and athletics must be addressed. With consolidation, yesterday’s cross-town rivals are now teammates or costars. Similarly, to what extent will consolidation affect access to after-school activities for high-poverty students attending schools outside of their neighborhood? Finally, while the all-important question of selecting a new district mascot could be resolved with a simple student election, Russo (2006) described the reality for many students, parents, and community loyalties: “What’s the hardest animal to kill in the world? A school mascot” (p. 11).

Alternatives to District Consolidation

Is district consolidation an all or nothing proposition? What alternatives might achieve the same results without consolidation? Expanding school choice options might allow parents to voluntarily enroll their children in selected schools, even those beyond their neighborhood. Although nonacademic obstacles might hamper this option (e.g., transportation, travel time, participation in after-school activities, day care), could these obstacles be avoided through district-provided services being reimbursed through a new ESEA Title program? What about offering high-quality veteran teachers incentives (e.g., stipend, professional development opportunities, opportunities to attend national conferences, additional classroom support) to serve in high-poverty schools? This short list provides alternatives to consider in lieu of whole district consolidation and all of its associated financial and political costs.

Final Thoughts

Incentivized or compulsory school district consolidation raises many logistical and political issues for students, parents, voters, taxpayers, and administrators. The proposed federal incentive program sees district mergers as a “necessary pre-requisite to true school improvement.” As an essay, I do not believe this novel and ambitious idea should be dismissed out of hand, but rather, I would encourage further investigation, clarification, and broad conversations to identify specific challenges from multiple perspectives. For those who read the UCEA Review Summer 2015 Point/Counterpoint, appreciative inquiry might provide a framework for this conversation.

Finally, we might learn from a natural experiment comparing spending and outcomes of county-bounded school districts (e.g., Florida, Maryland) to simulated comparable districts in states where school district boundaries are coterminous with community boundaries (e.g., Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania; see DeLuca, 2015). This would be especially valuable where each includes high-poverty urban and low-poverty suburban areas with comparable demographics.

Interestingly, when I first read Dr. Kelly’s essay, I was reminded of an unlikely, if not impossible, proposal from over 50

---

1 See Duncombe and Yinger (2007) for a distinction between economies of size and economies of scale.

2 Both economies and diseconomies of size (and scale) assume consistent service or product quality.
years ago:
We choose to go to the moon in this decade and do the other things, not because they are easy, but because they are hard, because that goal will serve to organize and measure the best of our energies and skills, because that challenge is one that we are willing to accept, one we are unwilling to postpone, and one which we intend to win, and the others, too. (Kennedy, 1962)

Fifty years later, New Horizons is taking selfies with Pluto.
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*Notes on the Profession* by Joseph F. Murphy
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The latest in the UCEA Monographs Series, Joseph Murphy’s lively essays, scholarly articles, stories, and poems tackle current problems in the professoriate, the state of schools and students, and advice and notes for leaders.

**Part 1: Essential Problems in the Professoriate**
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- Education Administration 75 Years Out: Avenues for Improvement
- A Disagreeable Colleague
- Of Questionable Value: The EdD Dissertation
- The Interment of EdD Disser
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- Notes of an Average Teacher
- Poems
- The Mournful Tale of the Death of Mr. School Improvement and the Wisdom of the Three Forensic School Improvement Sleuths

**Part 3: Notes on Students**

- Students in Peril: Deeper Understandings of the Failure of Students on the Wrong Side of the Advantage Gap
- Principles for Developing Culturally Appropriate Schools
- The Other Wall: Communities of Pastoral Care for Students

**Part 4: Notes for Leaders**

- The Five Intelligences of Leadership
- The Four Defining Characteristics of Highly Effective Leaders
- Backstage Roles for School Leaders
- Bad Leadership Numbers 1 and 2
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Interview With Enrique Alemán, Jr.

Juan Manuel Niño

The University of Texas at San Antonio

Enrique Alemán, Jr., is a Chair and Professor of Educational Leadership & Policy Studies in the College of Education and Human Development at the University of Texas at San Antonio. Before joining the University of Texas at San Antonio, Dr. Alemán was a faculty member at the University of Utah where he cofounded Adenlante, a university-school-community partnership for elementary students. A native of Kingsville in South Texas and a first-generation college student, Dr. Alemán melds his personal and professional interests with research that has the potential to address the structural and institutionalized inequities that historically have underserved students and communities of color. With Rudy Luna in the documentary Stolen Education, Dr. Alemán presented the story of Mexican American children facing discrimination in Texas schools in the 1950s, culminating in a 1956 federal court case, Hernandez et al. v. Driscoll. He has published articles in Harvard Educational Review; Race Ethnicity and Education; Educational Administration Quarterly; and Equity, Excellence and Education, as well as numerous chapters in edited books. Dr. Alemán earned his PhD in Educational Administration, with a concentration in Educational Policy and Planning and doctoral certification in Mexican American Studies, from the University of Texas at Austin. Dr. Alemán has an undergraduate degree from St. Mary’s University in San Antonio, Texas, and a master's degree from Columbia University’s School of International and Public Affairs in New York City.

JMN: Dr. Alemán, thank you for agreeing to be interviewed for UCEA Review. I thought you would be perfect to interview given your work on some of the issues affecting students and communities of color. Also, with your recent documentary, Stolen Education, how we can learn from this experience to inform how we teach and prepare aspiring school leaders to look at how policy can marginalize people unintentionally. Let me ask you, how did you become interested in your current research topic on policy?

EAJ: I’ve always been interested in issues of systemic racism and historical inequity. So for me, getting my master’s in public policy, I was always trying to figure out how policy was made; the history of policy; policy implementation; and more specifically, how policy could be understood, especially by educational leaders and educational actors. Additionally, my understanding of how policy was made and how policy was implemented—I understood that one can begin to address the major challenges that we continue face, especially for those who are interested in creating systems that are more equitable. So from a very early point in my career I always wanted to focus on those types of issues, especially for the communities that I work for and work with—Latino communities, undocumented students and their families, and trying to figure ways to understand their experiences and change their opportunities.

JMN: What frameworks guide your thinking when you’re looking at policy and these inequities?

EAJ: The frameworks that I’ve used in the past and that I feel most useful to me are critical race theories, Latino critical race theories, and specifically trying to center the experiences of students of color and trying to understand the history of racism in this country, especially as it manifests in schools. Using critical race theory and Latino critical race theories, I feel that I’m given the resources to center those experiences and to counter the majoritarian perspective. It’s not a black and white type of issue. It allows me to better understand the complexity; it allows me to talk about the long histories of oppression in this country. Centering on those experiences refocuses the attention on those who often have been silenced and the stories that have been invalidated. I think that’s part of the policy-making process: What stories get put at the center? Critical race theory and Latino critical race theory allow me to do that, and so those are the two frameworks that I’ve used most often in my work.

JMN: Who is your audience for understanding your work, when it comes to policy and the structures that are in place?

EAJ: Oh, I think I wouldn’t say audience. I would say audiences. I think the nice thing about being in academia, especially in our field, in educational leadership, one of the major audiences obviously are aspiring administrators, principals, leaders in both, and leaders across the educational pipeline. For me, that has to always be part of what I think about. I think, often those voices that are not invited to the table, like parents, youth, our teachers, we have to always try to incorporate and include their perspectives in the discussion. So I try to write, to do work with that in mind, including those voices. More than anything, I think of my parents, I think of my grandparents.

If you look at policy very traditionally, I think many types of people were not often included as an audience. And so what I try to do is to make it more so it that becomes my audience. That’s who I try to model. If I’m thinking whom I’m going to write for and what’s my work intended to do, it’s to include voices like my parents’ and my grandparents’, people who were never included in the policy-making process. That’s another one of my major audiences that I feel that my work has evolved into to try to really serve that community.

Lastly, I think a major audience has to be our youth, the students we work for. Any kind of policy-making framework or major policy framework doesn’t often include or very rarely includes the youth perspective. I think that we need to keep that in mind when we think of how we broaden our audience to include youth perspective, family perspective, and undocumented student perspective.

Rather than looking at one audience, I think of audiences, broadening that definition.
JMN: Many scholars intersect various interests with policy to critique our educational system. However, many professors publish about it but fall short in teaching about it. Sometimes professors in academia have a responsibility to integrate these issues and how to prepare educational leaders. How do you attempt to interweave policy issues as you prepare aspiring school leaders?

EAJ: I think that we have a responsibility as educational leadership professors. We work with, like you mentioned, aspiring leaders, but we also work with aspiring scholars. So I think we have to integrate praxis frameworks as much as possible because most of our students are currently in schools. They are currently practicing educators, and they’re on a day-to-day basis, they’re interacting and influencing the experiences of youth and families. So if we don’t think that is part of the policy process, we’re in big trouble. I think we have to infuse policy discussions—discussions about power, about privilege, about inequity—with the students we work with because they’re on a daily basis interacting with these communities. We don’t have 5 or 10 years to wait for people to change their minds. We have to influence change at this point, and so to me those are policy discussions that we should be having in educational leadership programs.

JMN: We can look at our audiences, our youth or our own students, but when we address issues of inequities in certain classes, some students may be a little surprised or discomforted. They might think how these issues of differences (sex, age, race, gender, ability, etc.) or about undocumented students might affect the accountability of the school. Current school leadership centers increased standardized test scores at the helm of effective school leaders. As such, then issues of marginalization remain and are not accounted for. Discussions get shifted to how we increase our standardized test scores, because that is what’s going to promote us as effective school leaders. And we do not talk about the social reproduction of the hegemonic forces that really perpetuate ideologies. So how do we begin change, how do we decolonize the academy to create more opportunities to talk about this in our own preparation programs?

EAJ: That’s a good question. How do we do that in the environment, in the culture we are currently operating in with a strong accountability push? I mean, at the core, what I try to do with my work, and I think you try to do with your work and other scholars, is humanizing policy. Often, when you talk about an accountability system or a school finance system, or teacher quality measures, that’s very dehumanized. We need to put the human aspect back into our work. If you’re talking about school funding or bilingual education policy, there are real human beings at stake here, their experiences, their quality of life, their ability to do well and provide for their family. We have to bring those experiences into the discussion right away. That has to be central to what we do. I think many traditional policy frameworks take the human out of it and make it more technical. I think we need more scholars, and I’m not saying there’s only one way to do it, I’m just saying that those who introduce critical frameworks, more humanistic frameworks, have to be part of that discussion. If you decide to do that or if someone decides to do that kind of work, then we need to add that to the decision making. We need to add that to the discussion, but that’s something that scholars have to decide upon themselves. I don’t know how we can lead schools, how people are expected to lead schools without understanding the human experience, without understanding that these policies have real-world impact on the experiences of young people. We should be talking about that in all our classes, whether that’s a human resource class, a budget class, or a leadership class.

JMN: All these issues of equity or inequity can be talked about and interwoven into the readings, into the assignments, into the expectations. However, traditional programs focus on male Eurocentric ideologies, which describe literature on leadership to focus on competitiveness and hierarchies, which can be found in our school system and help alienate students on the margins.

EAJ: Right, and I think students in positions of poverty, of inequity, of lack of access to high-quality programs have to be central, at least for me in the work that I do. I’m not saying that’s the only way, that’s the way that everybody should do it, but more of that kind of discourse has to be inserted into leadership programs. The more that we can discuss, the more we can get to the core of the issues that are most pressing for students, especially students of color and underrepresented students.

JMN: Are you in favor of a standard approach for preparing leaders for multicultural communities? Like a prescribed curriculum that we should all adhere to, especially UCEA institutions?

EAJ: I get nervous about standard approaches, because then who decides what the standard is? I just think there have to be some core elements that we should incorporate that would be helpful to implemented across the board. Talking about institutional racism as a core element and a concept, discussing how deficit thinking continues to be very pervasive across educational praxis, thinking, and practice.

JMN: A perspective from the K-20 pipeline can be embraced, as deficit thinking does not stop once students graduate. Even graduate students are victims of this phenomenon. We are susceptible to deficit thinking even at this level of the educational arena. It seems we operate with a standards approach. How can we address this issue?

EAJ: It would be great for UCEA to have ongoing discussions like this with groups of scholars from around the country at different levels, like you said, K-12 and higher education and community college, people who consider themselves more on the policy side and those who consider themselves more on leadership side. If there was a concerted national effort to have discussions about what can be done to broaden our understandings of policy and how we incorporate that as part of our daily practice, I think that would be great, and the more critical, the better. Again, I’m not saying not to include those who think about these issues more traditionally. They already dominate the conversation anyway. I think you need to invite multiple voices to the table. But having a critical
discuss these issues is important, and that would be something I would advocate UCEA do on an ongoing basis.

JMN: Your dissertation work looked at the financial aspects of low-funded school districts. However, not much has changed about finances in school systems; it’s based on taxing systems. Since 1965 we have been trying to create a more appropriate educational system in our country, but some scholars argue we just change names without changing how we play the game. The system we have in place no space for creativity on how we can get education in a more authentic, more grassroots approach rather than having to measure everything. How do we move from here?

EAJ: I spent the last 11 years of my life, the first part of my career, in the Whitest, most conservative state in the whole country. I centered these discussions in all my classes. I taught 12 different master’s and doctoral classes, everything from human resources to supervision to leadership to research methods. And in every one of my classes, we centered discussions about inequity, institutionalized racism, privilege, and intersectionality. Not every student agreed with doing that, but to me if you want to be an effective administrator in today’s increasingly diverse communities, then my responsibility is to introduce you to and to challenge you to think about these issues. Now, whether you want to use them or not in your own practice, that’s up to you. In your own research, that’s up to you. But my responsibility is to prepare students to be effective, and right now, what I would say is our educational leadership students are very, very underprepared to deal with these types of issues. So that’s what I’ve been trying to do with my career. If I can do it in the state of Utah and be fairly successful, then I think we can do it in a lot of other situations. That’s the determination that I think educational leadership programs around the country should make.

JMN: Now you said this case was 1956. Based on the findings that we’ve all seen from your video, how much has changed from 1956?

EAJ: A lot of the discourse and the ways we address English language learners. Additionally, a lot of the opportunities that students of color continue to be prevented from having are the same. If you look at the way students perform across student groups, Latino students continue to lag behind the dominant group. Educational institutions have not kept up or have not progressed as much as we would have liked. We see it right now, there’s some Republican politicians right now talking about the Mexican border, I think today—this morning—framing the issue related to immigration, everybody coming from Mexico are rapists, they’re thugs, and they’re thieves. So the way these conversations continue to be framed are very deficit oriented, are very racist. Racism continues to be part of the language that is used. In much the same way that in 1956 the children, the Mexican American children who were involved with this case, were framed as inferior, they were framed as foreigners even though they were U.S. born. They were framed as not being able, being dumb because they didn’t know how to speak English, even though they all testified in the case in English. So bilingualism was looked upon as very negative. Unfortunately, a lot of that same rhetoric is used today. What I try to do in the film is to ask people to think about what hasn’t changed almost 60 years later. That’s kind of the goal of the film. I try to address multiple audiences, going back to your original question. I showed it with fourth and fifth graders at a predominantly Latino school. I’ve showed it with aspiring teachers. And I’ve showed it with administrators and community colleges and in higher education institutions and had discussions about the pipeline, about opportunities in higher education and the dropout rate.

JMN: In your documentary, Stolen Education, what motivated you to see the fruition of this project?

EAJ: It merged my primary interests, which was doing qualitative research, historical research, and the fact that my own mother was involved in this court case and I didn’t know about it. I was always interested in trying to document what really happened and tie it to today. The issues that the film covers relate to the achievement gap, lack of access to higher education, and English language learners and how they’re treated in schools. The case was in 1956, and so the film and the research that I’ve done around it really came about from a personal interest. But, also tying it my primary research interests that I’ve been cultivating since 2004 when I started my academic career.

JMN: I viewed your video during my first year at the University of Texas at San Antonio, and being a native of South Texas, I was familiar with some of the experiences of students in your research. Our school system places labels on students, and many times those labels carry deficit perspectives.

EAJ: Unfortunately, yes and probably prevented you from having the same high-quality programming that you deserved. That’s what happened in 1956, that’s what happened to you, and you’re much younger than that. What I tried to do with this film is to provoke those types of discussions to say, yeah, we have an African American President, yeah, I’m a first-generation college student, and I’ve been fortunate.
to have mentors and to get into academia and to get tenure and do well. But I’m one person. If we look at these issues systematically, look at the ways the issues are framed and how students continue to be looked at, communities continue to be looked at in very deficit ways. Alarming that those major narratives haven’t changed much since 1956.

JMN: You mentioned how politicians make these deficit remarks about immigrants, specifically Mexicans. However, you hear other Latino politicians who agree with certain deficit ideologies. How do we advance as a society when intersections of difference are neglected?

EAJ: We are no different. The Latino, broad Latino group, there’s diversity within our group. There are people who internalize racism just as well as White people who have racist tendencies and racist language. So we’re no different. African American communities have the same issue with a diversity of opinion. There are people who internalize these stereotypes, who internalize the negative ways that people are portrayed in the media. It’s everyday life, and so again it becomes an issue of what side do you want to fall on? What kind of work do you want to do to challenge those negative stereotypes or racist ideologies? People who are in educational leadership, scholars, practitioners, we’re at the forefront. We’re dealing with students and families on a daily basis, and so to me part of our job should be is to have people confront those misperceptions. If you’re about equity, if you’re about providing opportunity for all, then we have to talk about race and racism. We have to talk about privilege. We have to talk about the permanence of racism in this country; otherwise, we’re not doing our job.

JMN: When you bring this notion of race and racism and White privilege to your classrooms, how do you weave it or how do you introduce it to students, especially when classrooms are not diverse?

EAJ: I had a handful of students of color in the 11 years that I was in Utah, especially in my master’s classes. I do it by sharing my own story. If I’m going to talk about White privilege, then I also have to talk about male privilege. I have to talk about the fact that I’m a U.S.-born person, and I have privileges as a U.S. citizen. I am heterosexual, and I have certain privileges as someone who comes from the heterosexual community. I have to show that this is one way of looking at it. You’re not going to agree with everything that I say. If you want to use these critical tools, I would argue it makes you a better administrator. I think it makes you a better leader to be able to wrestle with these critical tools and put them into practice. If you don’t want to use these critical tools, then that’s something that you have to decide as you go and lead a very diverse school. There are diverse schools in Utah. There are predominantly Latino schools in Utah, and if you’re a White male in a predominantly Latino school and you’re not willing to look at these issues critically, and you’re dealing with these students and families on a daily basis, then I don’t think you can be effective. So I always introduce it as another framework, another perspective, and there are tools associated with that if you wish to employ them. I’m pretty up front about it. This is what you’re going to learn. This is what I’m going to introduce you to, and this is what we’re going to talk about. That’s what the class is about. And you know, there are good days and bad days, but more often than not I think people are willing to talk about it. Wherever we disagree, we disagree, and we move on from there.

JMN: At some point, we kind of have to make spaces uncomfortable in order for us to reflect on how we have been privileging ideologies because we have benefited from them. But I think we all come to confront our own realities at our own different time or different space.

EAJ: Yes. My daughters are sitting right here. They’re listening to part of this. I always do talk in my classes about my own male privilege. Sometimes they do call me out even at home. I’m not a perfect person. To me, doing critical work, you always have to be self-reflective. I’m a person. As a male, I have certain power dynamics that I have access to, and there’s a power structure that I have access to that my daughters won’t. So if I’m really about social justice and being progressive, then I have to be putting those on the table, and I have to be willing to wrestle with my own privileges. But not everybody is going to accept that, and not everybody wants to put their privilege on the table. They are happy with that, and so my job is to do what you just said, to cause some discomfort and to ask them to challenge their own assumptions.

JMN: What is the role of a junior faculty member as one researches and influences policy for more diverse communities?

EAJ: I remember when I was at your stage of your career. The more comfortable you get in doing your work, the better perspective you get. Also, you begin to work with more students who are going into the field. Depending on the stage of your career, your role will change, your role in pushing these issues, your role in causing discomfort. That’s the nice thing about being in an academic field where you can have a long career. Your roles are going to change, and then you can partner with people at different roles, at different stages of their career. I can push issues and cause comfort-discomfort in certain ways now as a full professor that I could never do as a junior professor. It just took me some time to get there. You have to think about it in stages and understand that you don’t have to do it alone. You can partner with people at different stages and communities. How do we coalition across racial, ethnic, sexual orientation communities? How do we do that more effectively so that these issues aren’t pushed by individuals but are pushed by coalitions?

JMN: A final question, based from your previous professional experience: What new opportunities are on the horizon for the kind of work you do and policy issues here in our community where we have a large Latino population?

EAJ: I feel very fortunate to be coming to San Antonio! There’s a great faculty. They’re a young and more experienced faculty. Also, I feel like the city with the demographics that it serves, the strong influence of community organizations, and the number of districts, coupled with my 11 years of experience and my perspectives, I just feel like at this stage of my career
I can come back home and work to go to the next level. I feel like even though I’ve been able to achieve a lot, I feel like I’m just beginning and I’m excited about what the possibilities are now. There are groups like the Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund (MALDEF), like the Intercultural Development Research Association, and other community organizations. I want to be part of a community that’s willing to be progressive and that’s willing to push issues that serve families and students who haven’t always been served. I learned a lot about collaboration and partnership, you know, in my time at Utah. I hope to incorporate that type of perspective and framework into the work that I do here working with families, working with students, obviously working with the faculty I’m going to be part of. I am hopeful in being part of a team that can really influence policy, influence the way schools work for students of color.

JMN: I thank you for this opportunity to talk with you about your work and look forward to working with you and others, as everyone can be actors in the policy-making process.

EAJ: Yes, I’ve become more convinced of that in my career. I feel like everybody needs to be prepared to be a policy maker and a policy actor, even young people, especially teachers. Teachers are the ones who have to implement or basically live with decisions that are made at state capitals or even at district offices. So helping students and teachers to think of themselves as policy actors, you don’t just become reactionary. You can influence and be part of that process. We can do that more across communities and start changing things more systematically.
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An Analysis of Participant Survey Responses From the 2015 William L. Boyd National Educational Politics Workshop
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In April 2008, the Politics of Education Association (PEA) hosted the National Educational Politics Workshop in New York City. The workshop, held in conjunction with the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (AERA), provided an opportunity for emerging scholars to interact with leading politics of education scholars. PEA members chose to make the workshop an annual event and renamed it in honor of the late Dr. William Lowe Boyd of Pennsylvania State University, a luminary in the field of educational policy, politics, and administration. The Boyd Workshop gained the valuable co-sponsorship of UCEA, an organization with a long history of commitment to mentoring through programs such as the Barbara L. Jackson Scholars, and the David L. Clark National Graduate Student Research Seminar. These programs and the Boyd Workshop are a means of supporting UCEA’s goals, which include

- Promoting, sponsoring, and disseminating research;
- Improving the preparation and professional development of educational leaders and professors; and
- Positively influencing educational policy. (UCEA, n.d.)

On April 16, 2015, the eighth William L. Boyd National Education Politics Workshop was held in conjunction with the annual meeting of AERA in Chicago, Illinois. The schedule of events included light refreshments, meetings between mentors and mentees, and a panel of mentors. This panel of mentors included Dr. Bradley Carpenter (University of Louisville), who discussed transitioning from graduate student to junior professor; Dr. Stacey Rutledge (Florida State University), who discussed managing the work/life balance; Dr. Julian Vasquez-Heilig (California State University, Sacramento), who discussed incorporating issues of social justice in research on educational politics; and Dr. Tina Trujillo (University of California, Berkeley), who discussed the process of developing a research focus in education policy and politics.

Mentoring programs in K-12 and in postsecondary education are associated with a variety of positive outcomes (Bickmore & Bickmore, 2010; Buch, Huet, Rorger, & Roberson, 2011; Griffin & Reddick, 2011; Holley & Caldwell, 2012; Horowitz & Christopher, 2013; Lechuga, 2011, 2014; Reis, Strage, & Summit, 2014; Schlosser, Lyons, Talleyrand, Kim, & Johnson, 2011). Positive benefits for the mentees include personal and professional support (Holley & Caldwell, 2012), successful navigation of the hiring process (Reis et al., 2014), fostering and sustaining of motivation (Lechuga, 2014), and the provision of an ally within the profession (Lechuga, 2011). Additionally, research has shown that mentoring is advantageous beyond tenure and associate professorship (Buch et al., 2011). Mentor–mentee relationships, both formal and informal, can assist in the development and demonstration of research, teaching, and service. Assistant professors receiving mentoring report higher satisfaction (Schrodt, Cawyer, & Sanders, 2003) and a stronger sense of departmental ownership, connectedness, and understanding of work expectations (Bell & Treleaven, 2011). However, research also suggests that mentoring without careful consideration can be potentially damaging. Finding a suitable mentor, for example, is crucial to the success of mentoring relationships (Bell & Treleaven, 2011). Program evaluation is a necessary component for assessing program effectiveness and for improving future delivery (Guskey, 2002). In addressing the latter, this article summarizes the results of an annual survey administered to mentors and emerging scholars who participated in the 2015 William L. Boyd National Educational Politics Workshop. The online program evaluation instrument sought to gauge participants’ perceptions of the event and to seek guidance on how to improve its future delivery. The instrument consisted of 11 items, including both open-ended and close-ended questions (see Appendix for the survey items).

Results

The survey was forwarded to all 2015 workshop participants, yielding an overall response rate of 51.8% (see Table 1). Descriptive analysis suggested that respondents were positive about their experiences at the 2015 Boyd Workshop (see Table 2). A majority of participants, 82%, reported the meeting between mentor and mentee to be very productive. Only 2% of respondents reported the meeting to be unproductive. As to the quality of the mentor–mentee match, 60% of respondents reported an excellent match between mentors and emerging scholars. Only 2% reported a poor match in 2015.

Feedback on the panel of speakers was also positive—86% of participants indicated it as excellent or very good. The survey also revealed that an overwhelming majority of participants reported that the communications between workshop co-coordinators, the organization of the event, and the overall experiences were perceived positively. Furthermore, the length of the workshop was reported as “just right” by 84% of respondents and “too short” by 11%.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Workshop participant N</th>
<th>Respondent n</th>
<th>Response rate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emerging scholars</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>48.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Dr. Boyd passed away September 21, 2008. For more on the life and accomplishments of Dr. Boyd, see PEA (2008).
in rooms, and decreasing the noise level.

- Requesting more substantial refreshments, requesting smaller break-out rooms, and increasing the noise level.
- Assigning mentors, reporting a mentor who failed to show up, requesting more time with mentors, and interactions with mentors, reporting poor interactions with the mentors.
- Critical comments and suggestions (28.7%) included requesting more time with mentors.

Critical comments already have been acted upon (e.g., in-creased time with mentors). Others (e.g., provide breakout rooms, increased time with mentors). Others (e.g., provide breakout rooms, increased time with mentors). Others (e.g., provide breakout rooms, increased time with mentors). Others (e.g., provide breakout rooms, increased time with mentors).

In summary, the 2015 Boyd Workshop Feedback Survey yielded valuable results to improve upon the delivery of future events. Some critical comments already have been acted upon (e.g., increased time with mentors). Others (e.g., provide breakout rooms, provide more substantial refreshments) are difficult to accommodate due to logistics or limited financial resources. As always, ensuring the quality of the match between mentor and emerging scholar remains no easy task and takes time. The matching process remains a challenge for many reasons. It is complicated by what is both a positive and negative aspect of the workshop—its cost to participants. The workshop remains free of charge to emerging scholars, but mentors and emerging scholars bear the costs of travel to and from the workshop and AERA. Some participants sign up but cannot find the resources to get there, ultimately becoming no-shows. Likewise, a potential mentor might be a good match but unable to attend the conference or arriving too late in the conference, thus missing the event completely. However, the majority of respondents suggested that matching remains excellent or very good.

For 2016, we will continue with our practice of requesting mentors first, thus setting the capacity of how many emerging scholars we can accommodate. Matching and confirming attendance remains vitally important to ensure that mentors and emerging scholars actually have the opportunity to meet and develop these relationships. We remain committed to making good matches between mentors and emerging scholars based on research topic and/or methodologies and keeping the ratio of emerging scholars to mentors low. For 2016, we will reiterate the importance of mentors and emerging scholars contacting each other in advance of meeting personally. Two-way communication is integral to maximizing the experience. Over the past two Boyd Workshops, the co-coordinators sent a document via e-mail in advance of the workshop and the SIG Meeting in close proximity in terms of timing and location. President Tamara Young was successful in requesting that AERA schedule the events back to back and in the same hotel. Mixed responses were 26.5% of the responses. Critical comments and suggestions (28.7%) included requesting more time and interactions with mentors, reporting poor interactions with the assigned mentors, reporting a mentor who failed to show up, requesting more substantial refreshments, requesting smaller break-out rooms, and decreasing the noise level.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey item</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Very good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of mentor–emerging scholar match</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of panel of mentors</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of communication between workshop co-coordinators and participants</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall experience</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emerging scholar and mentor meeting productivity</th>
<th>Very productive</th>
<th>Somewhat productive</th>
<th>Somewhat unproductive</th>
<th>Very unproductive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to Likert-scale items, participants were asked open-ended questions: “How could the mentoring session be improved?” “How could the panel of mentors be improved?” “Overall comments/suggestions for future Boyd Workshops.” Open-ended responses were analyzed and coded as positive, mixed, or critical (see Table 3). Positive comments made up 44.8% of the open-ended responses. Mentors that were also members of the PEA reported greater satisfaction with having the William L. Boyd Workshop and the SIG Meeting in close proximity in terms of timing and location.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response type</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Sample comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>“I felt very fortunate to be allowed to participate. ... My conversation with my mentor richly contributed to my thinking moving forward” – Emerging Scholar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Excellent matching this year as my mentee and I had a great discussion! The Boyd Workshop is a fabulous experience and opportunity. Thank you so much to the organizers for all of your work.” – Faculty Mentor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>“I'm not sure the panel is necessary. The time with the mentors was extremely valuable. It was nice to hear what the panel had to say, but perhaps just one speaker would be sufficient.” – Emerging Scholar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Excellent panelists, but perhaps a representative or two of the older generation would complement the relative newcomers, giving a longer term perspective.” – Faculty Mentor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>“I would eliminate the panel and maybe give the mentors and scholars more time together or ask the whole table to participate in an activity together.” – Emerging Scholar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“I’d like to work with a small group rather than a single mentee.” – Faculty Mentor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
workshop that summarized tips for how to get the conversations started prior to meeting at the workshop. Although the onus is on emerging scholars and mentors to ensure that this happens, we acknowledge that making the time is not always easy.

Finally, we want to acknowledge the mentors who make this event possible. Mentors volunteer their time and expertise without any sort of honorarium provided to them. We also appreciate the faculty members who volunteered to serve on the panel. It is also important to acknowledge the valuable financial and logistical support provided by the leadership of our co-sponsors, the UCEA and PEA, in making this annual event possible.
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The William L. Boyd National Educational Politics Workshop for 2016 is tentatively scheduled for **Friday, April 8** from 2:30 to 5:00 pm in Washington D.C. The Boyd Workshop will continue to feature two sessions, one between mentors and emerging scholars and the other featuring a panel of speakers. In the meantime, if you have any questions, please contact Dr. W. Kyle Ingle at william.ingle@louisville.edu or Dr. Dana Mitra at dana@psu.edu
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Two elements of the UCEA website are focused on issues and information relevant to the graduate students of UCEA. The **Graduate Student Column** typically features scholarship written by graduate students at UCEA member institutions. Column entries explore a variety of topics and allow the authors to present developing research and to the UCEA graduate student community. The **Graduate Student Blog** is a more discussion-oriented format encouraging conversation between graduate students via posts and comments. Topics addressed in the blog include discussion and links to educational leadership and educational policy news relevant to graduate students, as well as updates and information about ways graduate students can be more involved in UCEA. Graduate students are invited to send in contributions for both the Graduate Student Column and the Graduate Student Blog. To find out more, please e-mail ucea@virginia.edu.
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Educational leadership has become the focus of considerable current attention. Recent research demonstrates the significance of effective leadership for quality schooling experiences. New national and regional educational policies and initiatives are changing the content and delivery of education and expected outcomes. And the terrains of schooling are shifting in dramatic ways. Jobs and the economy, the demographic characteristics and conditions of children and youth, expectations for student learning and accountability, education funding, politics and control, and growing inequities in educational opportunity and outcomes all contribute to increasing uncertainty, complexity, and demand on schools. All of these factors shift expectations for the work of school leaders. And all call for refocusing existing professional school leadership standards and their use in supporting the development, supervision, and evaluation of school leaders.

Professional standards are important to any profession. They define the work and the performance of members of a profession. They present a vision for the work that reflects what will be demanded of the profession in the future and an ideal to which the profession aspires. Standards reflect the values of the profession to its members and to the public. They articulate scope of work, domains of responsibility, ethical principles, and criteria of quality in the performance of work. Professional standards are aspirational in that they project the nature and quality of professional work into the future. In most professions, standards guide professional preparation and the supervision and improvement of practice. For some professions, they are the basis for governmental policy, rules, and regulations concerning licensure, evaluation, termination, and sometimes compensation and reward.

Given the purposes, functions, and importance of professional standards, it is essential to “get them right.” Doing so involves identifying the norms and practices of the profession, developing the best understandings that come from theory and research, and evoking value judgments on what work is to be privileged now and in the future. Despite significant research in the last 20 years, educational leadership is still in its early stages of having well-defined core practices and agreed-upon norms for prioritizing and enacting the work. Consequently, developing and agreeing upon good standards for school leadership can be complex, messy, and politically contentious business.

Such is the case with current efforts to revise the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards, under the leadership of the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). CCSSO is the organization that has coordinated the development of the ISLLC Standards since 1996. In this regard, CCSSO has worked on behalf of the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA), an umbrella organization that coordinates various work of member organizations, including the three major school leader professional associations: the American Association of School Administrators (AASA), the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP), and the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP).

The current climate of educational leadership standards revision places two essential questions squarely on the table. The first question is: Who should develop school leader standards? In other professions, what makes professional standards professional is not only their purposes, functions, and content but also that they are developed by the members of the professions themselves through their professional associations. Professional standards are frequently developed through committees of association members and leaders, and they are often put to vote and endorsed by houses of delegates. Such is the case, for example, with professional standards for nurses, social workers, lawyers, accountants, realtors, dentists, and veterinarians. In the educational leadership field, this process is more daunting.

Educational leaders are represented by three separate associations—AASA, NAESP, and NASSP—which must work collaboratively through the NPBEA to agree upon standards. In the past, many different actors have been involved in developing school leader standards. Policy makers—chief state school officers, governors, state legislators, and boards of education—have had significant voice about school leader standards as these actors set policy regarding school leader preparation, licensure, and evaluation. Preparation program associations and their accrediting organizations also have had a voice, because these standards inform preparation. And educational researchers have played an important role because of their understanding of theory and research on school leadership and because of their ability to look across and synthesize the best knowledge from research, practice, and policy in order to generate these standards.

With so many actors and so many interests involved, the challenge becomes deciding whose voices should be privileged in the process and ensuring that those voices are honored. It is also the challenge to establish sufficient trust among the actors who must work together if the resultant standards are to be jointly endorsed and if they are to be acted upon in ways that are sufficiently aspirational and enabling across the multiple purposes.

The second essential question is: What content should the standards contain? We have learned several things from our years...
of research on school leadership and from the past two years of work on revising standards that can help answer this question. We have learned that the content that is truly cared about must frame the primary standard domains themselves and the functions that capture key dimensions of those standards. It is the standards and their functions to which people attend and that drive policy and practice.

More importantly, we have learned that the work of school leadership and the contexts in which it is practiced have become substantially more complex and demanding in recent years and will become even more so in the future. The domains of school leaders’ work have both broadened and deepened, requiring greater articulation and nuance in descriptions of school leader work, and thus in the content of standards than ever before. In full disclosure, we are university faculty and researchers who have been working on the revision of the ISLLC standards, under the leadership of CCSSO and NPBEA. We have been leaders and members of the three work teams that gathered and analyzed information from practicing school leaders, reviewed research and states’ use of leadership standards, collaborated with representatives of the professional associations, drafted the 2014 set of revised standards, and analyzed and reported data from the public review. What we learned is that since 2008, when the ISLLC standards were last revised, the work of school leaders has become increasingly centered around developing and promoting quality teaching and learning for all students, whose needs are increasing diverse and complex, while having constrained resources and added legal and policy demands.

We have learned much about the elements of school leader work that are truly important to schools and student success now and in the future. The 2008 ISLLC standards are framed around six core leadership domains, five of which are enduring and remain important—setting vision and direction; managing the organization, operations, and resources; engaging families and community; behaving ethically and with integrity; and understanding the school context and advocating on behalf of students and schools. Within each are demands for additional leadership skills, such as managing resources within fiscal and legal constraints. The sixth domain—developing a school culture and instructional program—now dominates school leaders’ work. This domain now includes developing the capacity of faculty and the resources for instruction and student support; promoting intellectually challenging curriculum, instruction, and assessment; creating communities of care and support for students; and cultivating professional norms and communities for teachers. Added to the expansion of the six domains are new areas that have become increasingly important in recent years. This includes the leadership work to address inequities in student learning opportunities and outcomes and to lead organization change, particularly creating schools for continuous improvement. Also crucial are leaders’ own professional growth and development and capacity to work with other schools to support student learning. These aspects of school leader work are systemic; they are all important and work in dynamic interaction to create effective schools and promote student success throughout their schooling experiences.

We also have learned that as the complexity and demands of school leaders’ work increases, standards cannot be limited to and bound by any one model or approach to school leadership. Effective school leadership now and in the future will need to be, as some have called it, “ambidextrous.” It will need to be both task and relation oriented. It will need to be transformational as well as transactional in objective and strategy. It will need to reflect elements of visionary and strategic leadership, authentic and virtuous leadership, participative and distributed leadership, authoritative leadership, and interpersonal and organization leadership, among other models and approaches. Effective leadership will need to be dynamic, flexible, and situational. And effective school leaders will need the knowledge, skills, wisdom, and moral orientations to understand how to draw effectively upon different approaches.

Finally, we have learned that identifying and articulating the nature, functions, elements, and qualities of school leadership work is very different from identifying and articulating the knowledge, skills, and dispositions required for the effective performance of that work. Both are vitally important—the former for identifying the professional work to which the profession and others aspire, the latter for identifying the capacities that need to be cultivated, supported, and even evaluated to bring that work to life. The latter, we contend, should help enact the standards, not define them.

In conclusion, we believe that three things should happen. First, we believe that the professional school leaders associations should assume a primary leadership role to revise the ISLLC standards through the coordinating support of the NPBEA. The NPBEA is in the unique position to bring together these different actors and manage their respective interests in productive directions for the profession, while enabling the professional school leader associations to assume a leadership role in this work going forward. Given the debates that are occurring over what standards, how many, and in what form (as reflected in recent EdWeek news stories and blogs, e.g., May 1 and May 13, 2015), it is essential that these associations have a central role in decision making. We do not argue that others who can contribute to this work be excluded. Rather we believe that the standards and their enactment will be enriched by moving toward a more professionally oriented, collaborative, and transparent process of standards development.

Second, we believe that continued work should take seriously the lessons learned about school leader work and their implications for the development of the ISLLC standards. Specifically, we refer to the need for adequate articulation and nuance of key elements of leadership work essential to school effectiveness and student success, capturing those elements of work in the standards themselves, and framing the standards around leadership approaches that best represent the complex nature and function of school leadership work.

Third, we call for work to strengthen the relationships among the key organizations that are necessary not only for the development of effective ISLLC standards but also for their successful enactment. Indeed, the NPBEA may be the only appropriate forum for such work to occur.

For more information on the scholarship informing the content of the standards, see the following: Murphy, J. (2015). The empirical and moral foundations of the ISLLC Standards. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 53, 718-734.
20th ANNUAL CSLEE VALUES AND LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE

Moral Literacy and Ethical Leadership
From the Local to the Global
October 15 - 17, 2015

The Nittany Lion Inn, University Park, Pennsylvania, USA

We invite you to join us for the 20th Annual Consortium for the Study of Leadership and Ethics in Education (CSLEE) Values and Leadership Conference hosted this year by the Rock Ethics Institute at The Pennsylvania State University. The conference will be held at the historic Nittany Lion Inn on Penn State's University Park Campus, located in central Pennsylvania.

We encourage you to help promote the conference by sharing this flyer with all interested colleagues and students. The Rock Ethics Institute is also sponsoring a limited number of Graduate Student Scholarships that can be applied to the conference registration fee. More information about the program, featured presenters, registration, travel, and the Graduate Student Scholarship can be found at: www.csleevaluesandleadership.org.

The Call for Papers and guidelines for proposal submissions are posted on the conference website. Submit proposals by June 14, 2015 using the online submission form found at http://bit.ly/CSLEEProposal. Any questions you have about the conference may be addressed to the conference planning team using the contact form on the conference website.

The 2015 Values and Leadership Conference will consider moral literacy and ethical leadership through a variety of subthemes including:

- From policy to classrooms: diverse manifestations of ethics and ethical leadership in education
- Developing moral leaders: models of ethical development and ethical leadership
- Intersections of ethical leadership and moral literacy
- Ethical leadership, education, and social justice
- The future of ethical leadership: pressing concerns and new possibilities
- Education, ethics, and multiple literacies, including the intersection of ecological and moral literacy
- The juxtaposition of local and global perspectives on education, ethics, and leadership

Featured Speakers:
Dr. Davin Carr-Chellman, The Pennsylvania State University
Dr. Moses Davis, The Pennsylvania State University
Dr. Crystal Sanders, The Pennsylvania State University
Dr. Joan Poliner Shapiro, Temple University
Dr. Megan Tschannen-Moran, College of William and Mary

Publications are available in alternative media on request. Penn State is committed to affirmative action, equal opportunity and the diversity of its workforce. Penn State encourages qualified persons with disabilities to participate in its programs and activities. If you anticipate needing any type of accommodation or have questions about the physical access provided, please contact Debrah Leonard at 814-863-5237 or dfl4@psu.edu in advance of your participation or visit. UEd 18A 15-196
DAVID L. CLARK NATIONAL GRADUATE STUDENT RESEARCH SEMINAR
IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION & POLICY

A CALL FOR NOMINATIONS

The David L. Clark National Graduate Student Research Seminar in Educational Administration & Policy, sponsored by the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA), Divisions A and L of the American Educational Research Association (AERA), and Sage Publications, brings emerging educational administration and policy scholars and noted researchers together for two days of presentations, generative discussion, and professional growth. The majority of Clark Scholars go on to become professors at major research institutions around the world. This year’s seminar will be held at the beginning of this year’s AERA meeting in Washington, D.C. (tentatively scheduled for April 7-8, 2016).

Nominations for the David L. Clark National Graduate Student Research Seminar in Educational Administration & Policy are due November 6, 2015.

Nominees should be outstanding doctoral students in K-12 educational leadership and administration and/or K-16 education policy, seeking careers in research. Nominees must have substantially completed their courses and must have formulated a dissertation proposal. Students who have already started or completed their dissertations are unlikely to gain as much from the seminar as students who are in the early stages of formulating their research. Nominations of students from underrepresented groups are strongly encouraged.

Each university may nominate up to two students. Nominations must be accompanied by a student research proposal, and all materials will be submitted online via the UCEA website. The nomination form can be found at [https://members.ucea.org/clark/nominations/new](https://members.ucea.org/clark/nominations/new) and an overview of the Clark Seminar process can be found on the “David Clark Seminar” page of UCEA website (http://www.ucea.org/graduate-student-opportunities/david-clark-seminar/nomination-process/).

To nominate a student, the nomination form must be filled out completely by the nominator via the link above. The information requested includes: (a) nominator’s information (name, institution, mailing address, email address, and phone number); (b) nomination statement; (c) student information (name; institution; day, evening, and cell phone numbers; mailing address; email address); (d) an abstract of student research; (e) a title; and (f) a blinded statement of proposed research. Nominating institutions must also indicate the level of financial support that will be provided to support their nominee’s travel and participation. Given the cost of hotels and transportation, we recommend an allocation of at least $700 per student. Again, please note that the form must be submitted by the nominator and will require that the nominator gather the necessary information from the nominee to complete the nomination form.

The student’s statement of proposed research should be no more than two (2) single-spaced pages, not including the reference section, and should outline the problem he/she is pursuing or plans to pursue in his/her dissertation research, its intended contribution to theory and practice, specific research questions, and study procedures. The abstract and statement of proposed research should be devoid of any reference to the nominee’s name and/or institution. Student proposals are blind reviewed by three prominent scholars. Invitations will be issued to 40 doctoral students with competition based on the quality of the student’s proposal and his/her perceived capacity to gain from and contribute to the seminar. To be considered complete, both the faculty nomination and the student research proposal must be received by the deadline.

Additional information concerning the seminar is available on the “David Clark Seminar” page of UCEA website (http://www.ucea.org/graduate-student-opportunities/david-clark-seminar/). We expect to extend invitations in December 2015. If you have any questions, please call (434) 243-1041.
The 29th annual Convention will be held at the Manchester Grand Hyatt, San Diego, California, November 20-23, 2015. The convention theme highlights the location near the California-Mexico border and intends to draw attention to the border spaces that exist within our field, between both scholars and practitioners and among communities present in and around schools. Collectively, we can identify new ways to engage in research and dialogue and to recognize the strength of the multiple—often disparate—voices contributing to the future of education. Our focus on transnational and transcultural spaces emphasizes the fluid nature of leadership and the multiple identities that shape leaders and the populations they serve. Transnational spaces reflect the interconnected external dimensions that traverse social, geographic, economic, and political borders. Transcultural spaces comprise the internal connections among race, ethnicity, gender, religion, language, ability, and sexual orientation.

We invited submissions that (a) offered analyses of leadership and education in transnational and transcultural settings; (b) examined how we define and prepare school and district leaders to support justice, equity and quality in PK-12 schools; (c) identified policy priorities and leadership practices that prioritize developing socially just leaders; and (d) supported advocacy work with/in communities marginalized by existing research and policy paradigms.

UCEA International Summit
Monday, November 23, 2015

Save the Date! The 2015 International Summit will be held Monday, November 23rd at the Manchester Grand Hyatt, 8:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. Join us for presentations, breakout sessions, and moderated discussions with a variety of scholars and practitioners involved in international research and development projects.
2015 UCEA Keynotes

UCEA Opening General Session featuring
Antonia Darder

Dr. Antonia Darder is a distinguished international Freirian scholar. She holds the Leavey Presidential Endowed Chair of Ethics and Moral Leadership at Loyola Marymount University, Los Angeles and is Professor Emerita of Education Policy, Organization, and Leadership at the University of Illinois Urbana Champaign. Her scholarship focuses on issues of racism, political economy, social justice, and education.

-11/30/14 at 5:15 PM at the Manchester Grand Hyatt Seaport DE-

UCEA Presidential Address featuring Current
President Noelle Witherspoon Arnold

Dr. Arnold is a professor at The Ohio State, and received her degree from the University of Alabama in Educational Administration, with minors in Social Foundations and Qualitative Research. Her research agenda includes analyses of life history and spiritual narratives documenting and analyzing how individuals integrate and negotiate personal religious and spiritual belief(s) in schooling practices.

-11/21/14 at 9:20 AM at the Manchester Grand Hyatt Seaport DE-

UCEA General Session featuring
Marcellus McRae

Marcellus Antonio McRae is a partner in the Los Angeles office of Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher. California Lawyer featured him as one of its honorees in its 2014 California Lawyer Attorney of the Year Awards. He is a member of the firm’s White Collar Defense and Investigations, Government Contracts, Media, Entertainment and Technology, and International Trade and Regulation Compliance Practice Groups.

-11/22/14 at 1:40 PM at the Manchester Grand Hyatt Seaport DE-
Thank you to our early 2015 UCEA Convention sponsors! UCEA appreciates your support and looks forward to creating a wonderful experience for all Convention attendees. If you are interested in being a 2015 Convention sponsor, please email uceaconvention@gmail.com or check out our online sponsorship form https://members.ucea.org/sponsor/events. Every sponsor makes a difference!

University of San Diego - Host Sponsor
The Wallace Foundation - Host Sponsor
Pennsylvania State University - Partner
San Diego State University - Partner
Texas A&M University - Partner
University of Connecticut - Partner
High Tech High Graduate School of Education - Partner
University of Iowa - Contributor
Loyola Marymount University - Contributor
At the 2015 UCEA Convention

ED TALKS research worth spreading

PANELIST
Olympia Kyriakidis: Olympia consults with districts and states on immersion language learning and 21st century skills. Her focus is on working with principals to implement specialized programs. Olympia has presented at national and international conferences on language immersion. For the past seven years, she has served as principal of Riverview International Academy. During her tenure at Riverview, Olympia implemented a unique trilingual program, tripled student enrollment, and improved test scores by 110 API points to the highest in the district. This year Olympia is working with the San Diego County Office of Education's Superintendent's Task force on Closing the Achievement Gap.

PANELIST
Miguel & Francisco Guajardo: Guajardo's work has been informed by the local ecology and the values of equity, dignity, and democracy in cross-cultural settings. He has traveled to five continents and has engaged in conversations with indigenous leaders, teachers, and citizens on issues of education, development, citizenship and identity formation. His teaching, research and service agenda is grounded in a micro-macro integrative theory that is informed by practice. His work and life long commitment to Latino youth and communities informs his research and community development agenda. The work with the Llano Grande Center in South Texas has yield a number of innovative and effective strategies for educating Latino youth and families and has received national recognition.

MODERATOR
Lee Francis: Lee is an educator, activist and poet with over fifteen years of experience teaching and conducting workshops with minority populations, especially in and around Indigenous and Native American communities in North America. His primary focus has always been on positive youth development and student success, with an eye towards the arts and exploring creativity in all aspects of education. He currently serves as the National Director of a Native American community-youth development organization, Wordcraft Circle, Inc., that focuses on promoting stories as a means of local development and cultural sustainability.

PANELIST
Natalie Tran: Natalie is an associate professor of educational leadership at California State University, Fullerton. Dr. Tran’s research focuses on evaluating the effectiveness of curriculum and services related to science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) education and examining factors that affect students' learning experiences both in the classroom and out-of-school settings. She also has been active in developing the National Resource Center for Asian Languages, supported by the Department of Education.
This year’s UCEA meeting in San Diego will play host to several exciting International Community-Building sessions culminating with the fourth annual International Summit on Monday November 23, from 8:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.

This year’s Summit borrows from the conference theme by offering “Conversations on Transcultural and Transnational Leadership Practice and Preparation.” Specifically, Ross Notman from the University of Otago, New Zealand, will discuss “Transcultural Spaces Within New Zealand’s Education System,” a look at the role of New Zealand school leaders in a developing transcultural context, often associated with high-needs schools, with particular reference to Maori bilingualism and indigenous language features in primary and secondary schools, as well as the place of special character schools.

Next, David Gurr, Lawrie Drysdale, and Helen Goode from the University of Melbourne, Australia, will consider “Leading for Success in Challenging Australian Educational Contexts,” a session that will highlight the work of Australian school leaders working in contexts characterized by low family income, high cultural diversity, indigenous communities, and transient populations, often in rural and remote locations. While the focus of this presentation is on principals who come from different cultural backgrounds and include indigenous and religious leaders, the stories are really about communities galvanized into collective action.

Finally, the last presentation, led by Corinne Brion, Paula Cordeiro, Lea Hubbard, and Joi Spencer from the University of San Diego, USA, will focus on “School Leadership in Developing Countries: Context Matters.” This session will present their research findings from the implementation of school leadership programs in three developing countries over the last 4 years. Breakout groups will be formed to discuss several key questions that emerged from the case studies, including but not limited to these: Are country contexts sufficiently different that leadership development should differ in each context? What should the content of leadership training be? What role can mobile technology play? What kinds of mistakes have we as researchers made in these different contexts?

If you find international community-building presentations of interest, I would strongly encourage you to check the UCEA conference program for the time, location and presenters at the following sessions:

- From Fronteras to Borders in Transcultural Spaces: Research on Educational Leadership in Multiple Binational Settings
- Leaders for Equity: Aligning Culturally Progressive Belief Systems With Progressive Educational Strategies in International Settings
- Leadership in and Preparation for High-Needs Schools: An International Perspective
- Leading Low-Performing Schools
- Social Justice Leadership in China, Costa Rica, Mexico, New Zealand, Spain, Sweden, and the U.S.
- Successful Practices and Enduring Beliefs of Leaders in High-Needs Schools: Evidence From International Studies
- The Professional Identities of School Leaders in Transnational Contexts
- UCEA Center for the International Study of School Leadership: Expanding School Improvement Across Frontiers of Education

I hope to see many of you in San Diego. If you have ideas for future UCEA international initiatives, sessions and/or events, don’t hesitate to share your ideas.
2015 UCEA Annual Banquet on the Bay

Join us for the 2015 Banquet aboard the Admiral Hornblower! Cruise around the San Diego Bay while enjoying a complimentary glass of champagne, and then head below-deck for a sumptuous sunset dinner. Admiral sails from 5:30 PM until 8:30 PM on Sunday, 11/22.

Tickets are $60/person, and available on Registration.
The 29th Annual UCEA Convention
Manchester Grand Hyatt, San Diego, CA, Nov. 20-23, 2015

REGISTRATION
http://www.ucea.org

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regrand</th>
<th>Advance (ends Oct. 20)</th>
<th>Regular (ends Nov. 5)</th>
<th>Late/on site (beg. Nov. 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UCEA Member Faculty</td>
<td>$260</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-UCEA Faculty</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$330</td>
<td>$330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCEA Graduate Student</td>
<td>$95</td>
<td>$130</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-UCEA Graduate Student</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practitioner</td>
<td>$290</td>
<td>$310</td>
<td>$330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$290</td>
<td>$310</td>
<td>$330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Student Summit*</td>
<td></td>
<td>$35</td>
<td>$35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In addition to applicable Graduate Student registration rate listed above

It is the policy of UCEA that all persons in attendance at the 2015 UCEA Annual Convention, including participants who plan to attend one or more sessions, are required to register. Registration is not transferable.

International Scholars

In keeping with UCEA’s longstanding tradition of an international focus and collaboration with aligned organizations worldwide, we welcome international attendees to the 2015 Annual Convention. If you require a letter of invitation to travel to the UCEA Convention, please e-mail your request by November 1, 2015, to uceaconvention@gmail.com
LODGING DETAILS

Manchester Grand Hyatt San Diego
1 Market Place
San Diego, California, USA, 92101
Tel: +1 619 232 1234

Rates
We encourage you to make your reservation early as space is tight. All reservations must be made by October 26, 2015 in order to receive rates listed above. Please visit the UCEA website and make your reservation through our online passkey. Room rates are as follows:

    Single/Double: $ 160.00
    Triple/Quad:  $ 185.00

Complimentary basic Internet will be provided in both the meeting spaces and guest rooms.

UCEA Graduate Student Summit
Thursday, November 19, 2015

The fourth annual UCEA Graduate Student Summit (GSS) will be held at the Manchester Grand Hyatt hotel, San Diego, California. The summit will take place beginning at noon on Thursday, November 19, 2015, and ending at noon on Friday, November 20. The purpose of the 2015 UCEA GSS 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 and receive feedback on your research. New session formats will create more opportunities for graduate students at UCEA to be announced in early spring. Watch for updates regarding the GSS by regularly visiting

http://www.ucea.org/graduate-student-opportunities/graduate-student-summit/
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.nino@utsa.edu

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

Innovative Programs Editor:
Kristin Huggins (Washington State University)
k.huggins@vancouver.wsu.edu

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

2015-16 Calendar

October 2015
CSLEE Values & Leadership Conference, Oct. 15-17, University Park, PA
Advance registration rates end; late registration for UCEA Convention begins Oct. 20

November 2015
Clark Seminar nominations due Nov. 6
UCEA Convention on-site registration begins, San Diego, CA
UCEA Executive Committee meeting Nov. 17-18
UCEA Plenary Session Nov. 19
Graduate Student Summit Nov. 19-20, San Diego
UCEA Convention, Nov. 20-23, San Diego
UCEA Awards Luncheon, Nov. 21, San Diego
Jackson Scholars Network 5K, Nov. 21, San Diego
UCEA Convention Banquet on the Bay, Nov. 22, San Diego
UCEA International Summit, Nov. 23, San Diego

January 2016
Call for Proposals for UCEA 2016 Convention released

April 2016
David L. Clark Seminar, Apr. 7-8, Washington, DC
Jackson Scholars Spring Workshop, Apr. 8, Washington, DC
William L. Boyd National Educational Politics Workshop, Apr. 8, Washington, DC
Joint UCEA, AERA Division A & I, SAGE Reception, TBD, Washington, DC