Dear UCEA Community Members,

Recently, Charlottesville, Virginia, home of UCEA and the University of Virginia (UVA), encountered our country’s legacy of violence, racism, and bigotry. Hundreds of neo-Nazis and White supremacists gathered in Charlottesville for a “Unite the Right” rally, using the removal of a Confederate statue as an excuse to spew messages of hate and incite violence. UVA, in preparation of the expected rally, planned a day of events (UVA Office of the President, 2017) focused on inclusion, diversity, and mutual respect. Together, the people of Charlottesville, allies from near and far, and UVA students, faculty, and staff planned to stand peacefully against hate.

Friday evening, alt-right protestors carrying torches marched on UVA’s grounds, attempting to intimidate bystanders and to spread their message of intolerance and hate. The torch-lit march was followed by violent altercations, the cancelation of the UVA events, mounting injuries, and a tragically violent death (Rosenberg, 2017). The effects of these terrible acts have impacted us all. On behalf of UCEA, we extend our sincere condolences to the families of the young woman and state trooper or psychologically.

As UVA President Teresa Sullivan noted, the behaviors witnessed over the weekend contradict the values of diversity, inclusion, and mutual respect—values the UCEA community holds dear. As we struggle to understand how people become so full of rage that they are willing to harm others, we should not forget that, in addition to the hate this weekend, we also witnessed acts of care and compassion. Those of us within the UVA community and our friends and partners appreciate the many people whose kindness and commitment to humanity has been expressed through brave deeds, charitable acts, social media posts, and participation in vigils across the U.S. and abroad.

As we all prepare to return to our students and classrooms, we recommend several resources:

- a report from the Southern Poverty Law Center (2017a) on how best to respond when controversial speakers or groups come to campus: The Alt-Right on Campus: What Students Need to Know;
- another report from the Southern Poverty Law Center (2017b), Ten Ways to Fight Hate: A Community Response Guide;
- a collection of resources for integrating social justice in the curriculum (Gonzalez, 2016); and
- the Developing Leaders to Support Diverse Learners curriculum models, developed by and for educational leadership preparation programs (UCEA, 2017).
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We encourage our UCEA colleagues to reflect deeply on their most closely held beliefs and values, and how those beliefs and values are put into practice in daily life and work. As a community of professionals and educators, we embrace a code of ethics (UCEA, 2011) and a set of core values (UCEA, 2013) that respect and appreciate human difference and potential for good and we have a responsibility to use our knowledge and skill to promote these values. Please know that through your teaching, research, service and clinical care, you make a difference.

Your work in the preparation of future school leaders is a responsibility whose weight is present today more than ever. We ask that everyone make an extra effort to reach out with care and compassion as we build and nurture the UCEA community.

Sincerely,

Mónica Byrne Jiménez
UCEA Past President

April Peters Hawkins
UCEA President

Mariéla Rodriguez
UCEA President Elect

Michelle D. Young
UCEA Executive Director
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UCEA Code of Ethics for the Preparation of Educational Leaders

As educators and scholars within the field of educational we strive individually and collegially to:

- Foster the capacity to critique and challenge the status quo within the field of educational leadership.
- Cultivate critique and challenge trends in policy and governance, such as national, state, organizational, professional and accreditation standards of practice and market-driven forces.
- Enable access to quality education, taking into account not just academic attainment but also the development of the whole student.
- Value and respect the intrinsic worth of individuals both personally and within multiple communities.
- Value and respect diversity of person, practice and thought.
- Practice, with integrity, teaching, research, service, and advising.
- Embrace responsibility for improving the profession.
- Engage in critical reflection for professional growth.
- Develop and improve scholarly competence.
- Model the ethical behaviors we advocate above.

UCEA Values

- Learning and social development for ALL children
- Contributions of educational leaders to the success of all children
- Systematic inquiry that is relevant, integral, and essential to the success of children, schools, and school leaders
- Quality and excellence in the preparation of school leaders and professors
- Collaboration with schools, other educational and service agencies, and professional organizations
- Professional community, collegiality and respect for diverse perspectives
- Educational and social policy that positively support the learning and development of all children
- Diversity, equity, and social justice in all educational organizations

Preparing Leaders to Support Diverse Learners: FIPSE LSDL Modules

Available for use at http://www.ucea.org/fipse/overview-and-introduction/
department chairs hold one of the most critical roles in academe and are key to the academic success of their institutions. The development and support of chairs cannot be left to chance, as they also can contribute to mediocrity and failure in colleges and universities (Rubin, De Lisi, & Gigliotti, 2017). The time of “amateur administration”—where faculty play musical chairs, stepping occasionally into the role of department chair—is over (or at least should be).

Despite the important role chairs play, there is limited research about the position. The department chair is among the least studied and most misunderstood management positions in the United States. In fact, one of the most glaring shortcomings in the leadership area is the scarcity of sound research on the training and development of leaders (Gmelch & Buller, 2015). With the exception of a few empirically based books in the last few years, the attention chairs receive in the literature is primarily anecdotal. In response to this limited research on department chairs, the UCEA Center for the Study of Academic Leadership has engaged in studying academic leaders over the past 25 years. In 2016 the UCEA Center launched a survey to collect updated information related to department chairs’ motivations, job functions, training, and stress. The survey was sent to 984 department chairs stratified by region, type of institution, and discipline, with a response rate of 31% (N = 305 department chairs). The 2016 study took a retrospective look at the 1991 UCEA study of department chairs (Gmelch, Burns, Carroll, Harris, & Wentz, 1991) and offers insights into the ways the department chair role has evolved over the past 25 years. This article addresses the following questions: Who are department chairs? Has their profile changed over time? Why do chairs serve? How are they prepared and trained? What causes chairs the greatest stress? Is there “life after chairing”? And, if they had to do it over, would they serve as chair?

The Changing Profile of Department Chairs Over the Decades

In light of demographic shifts that have taken place in higher education, it is interesting to look at a comparative data set from the perspective of background and personal information. Findings from the data sets in 1991 and in 2016 suggest some shifts in background information but no substantive changes. In terms of ethnicity, in the 1991 study, 96% of chairs were White, compared with 85% in 2016 (see Table 1). The number of chairs from non-White backgrounds was and continues to be low. A review of these findings suggests a homogenous group of chairs in 1991 and in 2016.

Gender profiles, however, have changed dramatically. In 1991 the majority of chairs were male (90%), and in 2016 majority female (55%). Clearly, there have been shifts in the gender makeup of chairs and in higher education in general in the past 25 years.

Table 1
Percentage of Chairs by Demographic in 2016 and 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>1991</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>96.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With regard to changes in rank of department chairs, in 1991 92.5% of chairs were tenured and 80% were full professors. In 2016 that number had shifted to include 80% of chairs with tenure and 59% serving as full professors. This precipitously alarming trend sheds light on a growing burden being placed on vulnerable faculty who are still seeking tenure and full promotion.

Why Be a Department Chair?

Given the challenges, complications, and ambiguities of the chair position, why do faculty choose to serve? What are faculty’s real motives for accepting the position, and does their motivation affect their willingness to be a leader? The most important reason faculty accepted the challenge to serve remained the same today (2016) as in 1991: to advance either themselves or their departments. Thus, they basically accepted the position for intrinsic reasons. However, secondarily some faculty felt pressured to serve, citing “drafted by the dean” or “out of necessity, no one else to do it.” Does the initial motivation affect the chair’s willingness to serve a second term? In 1991, only 25% of those motivated by extrinsic reasons (drafted by the dean or no other choice but to accept the position) were willing to serve a second term. In contrast, 75% of the chairs motivated by advancing themselves or their departments were willing to serve again. Today, the time of amateur administration and taking one’s turn is over. Given the current leadership crisis in higher education, it is critical for department chairs to answer the leadership call to advance themselves and the institution.
Professional Identity

When asked about their identity (do chairs view themselves as faculty, administrator, or both?), it is clear that over time, chairs have grown to view themselves as academics and administrators. As Table 2 demonstrates, an even greater number self-identified their role as both faculty and administration (70% in 2016 compared to 53% in 1991), and few still identified themselves as strictly “an administrator” (3% and 4%, respectively).

Table 2
Percentage of Chairs Viewing Themselves as Faculty, Administrators, or Both

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>1991</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preparation and Competency as a Department Chair

Department chairs typically come to their positions without leadership training, without prior executive experience, without a clear undertaking of the ambiguity and complexity of their roles, without recognition of the metamorphic changes that occur as one transforms from an academic to an academic leader, and without an awareness of the cost to their academic and personal lives. The 2016 study revealed that two thirds of new department chairs did not receive any training once they were appointed. Of the 33% who did receive training, 40% received only 1–4 hours. Overall 72% of those who received training completed 10 hours or less.

Training. What is needed? According to the 1991 study, department chairs testified they needed more training in faculty evaluation, how to maintain a conducive work climate, managing external funds, preparing budgets, developing long-range plans, and managing the department staff and equipment. When the 2016 chairs were asked what factors would help them feel more competent, they answered similarly, with requests for training in budget and finance, conflict resolution, time management, and institutional procedures.

Chair competence. How long does it take to become an expert—competent in your profession? To become an expert takes time—10,000 hours of practice noted by some scholars (e.g., Gladwell, 2008). Studies of experts in the corporate world who attain international levels of performance point to the 10-year rule of preparation. What is the average term of a department chair? Four years—so once chairs start to become competent, they typically return to faculty. Even faculty are granted a 7-year threshold to attain their expertise and become tenured. In the 2016 study, 41% of the chairs felt competent by 9 months, but 40% did not feel competent until the end of the 1st or 2nd year. Ultimately, 19% took longer or did not yet feel competent. However, to the question, “How competent do you feel as chair?” 87% of respondents identified as feeling highly competent. Specifically, among chairs in their 1st year of service, only 76.9% reported feeling confident, jumping to 89% among respondents who had served 1–3 years. Of equal importance is the fact that 1 out of 10 chairs reported never feeling highly competent in their role. Whether we accept the 10,000-hour rule, the 10-year rule, or the 7-year faculty rule, why do institutions of higher education assume we can “build” a department chair with a 4- to 10-hour seminar?

Department Chair Stress Over Time

What stresses department chairs today? How have stressors changed in the past 25 years? When comparing the top department chair stressors from 2016 with similar items from the 1991 study, several observations are worth noting. A top stressor of the 2016 department chairs (66%) was “trying to balance their administrative and scholarly responsibilities,” and in the 1991 study the top was “having too heavy a workload,” as indicated by 59% of the chairs. Workload is still challenging in 2016, with 58% indicating high stress.

A second observation is that five job conditions created excessive stress for over 60% of the department chairs: (a) balancing administration and scholarship (66%), (b) maintaining scholarship (64%), (c) balancing work-life pressures (64%), (d) keeping current in the discipline (63%), and (e) e-mail communication (62%). As demonstrated in Table 3, these responsibilities indicate a growing source of stress as compared to responses in the 1991 study. Are chairs experiencing more stress today than 25 years ago? How is this stress shaped by larger contexts?

Third, the nature of the stress seems to be changing. More stress emanates from chairs trying to balance scholarship and leadership, as well as work–life balance. Clearly chairs seem to suffer more from finding balance in the professional and personal lives. Has the nature of the position changed over the decades? Are there significant differences in these trends for men versus women? Does the nature of stress vary by rank, discipline, age, experience, or role identity? These questions will be explored in further publications.

Table 3
Top 10 Stressors: Percentage of Chairs Reporting Excessive Stress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stressor</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>1991</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Balancing administrative &amp; scholarly demands</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Maintaining scholarly productivity</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Balancing work-life demands</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Keeping current</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Keeping up with email</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Heavy workload</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Attending meetings</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Evaluating faculty</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Excessive self-expectations</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Job interfering with personal time</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Final Advice: Top 10 Lessons Learned

To chair, or not to chair? For many, there are no easy answers concerning which way to turn. However, when asked, “If you had to do it over again, would you become a department chair?” 89% of department chairs in 2016 answered affirmatively. It is our hope that the research reported here and continued analysis in future publications will help chairs, and those who appoint them, decipher and illuminate the way. We conclude with some sage advice gleaned from the research findings.
1. Wait until you have been promoted to full professor before you accept the chair position. The trend is alarming: whereas 80% of chairs were full professors in 1991, only 59% are today.

2. Be careful not to accept the chair position before you are tenured. In 1991, only 7.5% accepted the position without being tenured, however, today 1 in 5 (19.5%) faculty serve in administrative capacity before being tenured, possibly putting their tenure in jeopardy.

3. Accept the position for intrinsic reasons (to advance yourself and department) early enough to keep your options open if you want to move up in university administration.

4. On the other hand, accept your position late enough so you have time to establish your academic credentials and credibility.

5. Since stress from balancing work–life demands plagues 64% of department chairs, remember to separate work and nonwork activities so you maintain personal and professional balance.

6. Take time to learn the position. Only 41% of department chairs felt competent after the first 9 months, and it took up to 2 years for another 40% to reach their level of competency. Unfortunately, 19% took longer or never felt competent in their administrative position. Becoming a department chair is a journey—a journey many chairs fail to complete.

7. Develop a network of confidants outside your department and inside your profession for operational guidance and future professional direction.

8. Seek a mentor chair to guide you through the initial white waters of leadership.

9. Consult your family and significant others in your decision as having children at home to care for adds additional personal stress to the challenges of the job.

10. Create a golden parachute—negotiate an automatic sabbatical to regain currency in your discipline at the end of your administrative term.

Innovative Programs: University of Maryland’s Newly Formed Department of Teaching and Learning, Policy and Leadership

Grace J. Liang
Kansas State University

Department of Teaching and Learning, Policy and Leadership

The newly formed Department of Teaching and Learning, Policy and Leadership at the College of Education, University of Maryland, is the merger of the Department of Curriculum and Instruction, the Department of Education Policy Studies, and the program in Organizational Leadership and Policy Studies, formerly in the Department of Leadership, International, and Higher Education. Interrelated program areas currently include Art Integration, Curriculum Theory and Development, Education Policy, Elementary Education, English Education, Literacy Education, Mathematics Education, Middle School Education, Minority and Urban Education, Organizational Leadership, Reading Education, Science Education, Second Language/TESOL, Social Studies Education, Professional Development/Teacher Education, and Sociocultural Foundations of Education. The variety of specializations offers undergraduate and graduate students an array of courses to develop programs tailored to their interests, leading to the BA, BS, MA, MEd, and PhD.

The department is structured around three divisions housing the programmatic areas: Science and Mathematics; Language, Literacy, Culture and Social Inquiry; and Education Policy and Leadership. The department promotes critical and discipline-based studies of education policies and practices, encourages thoughtful and responsive explorations of education and related social issues, and fosters innovative and collaborative efforts to inform education policy at all levels of government. Graduates pursue professional roles in university teaching and research, fill policy and leadership positions in public and private educational institutions, and work as specialists and advocates in governmental and nongovernmental agencies.

New PhD Program in Teaching and Learning, Policy and Leadership

The Department of Teaching and Learning, Policy and Leadership offers a newly approved PhD program that combines two previously existing doctoral programs. Implemented in the fall of 2014, major revisions include the creation of an Integrative Departmental Core of six credits for all students and the reorganization of programs of study into six areas of specialization: (a) Educational Policy and Leadership; (b) Language, Literacy and Social Inquiry; (c) Mathematics and Science Education; (d) Minority and Urban Education; (e) Teacher Education and Professional Development; and (f) Technology, Learning and Leadership.

The PhD program requires 60 credit hours beyond the master’s degree, including six credit hours of the Integrative Departmental Core, 12 of intermediate and advanced methods, 30 of specialization, and 12 credit hours of dissertation research. The two departmental core courses are to be completed in the fall and spring of the first year in the program. No specific methods course is required as students will work with their advisors to select the ones appropriate for them. However, students must take at least one qualitative methods course and one quantitative methods course as part of their preparation for dissertation research. Specializations courses include 6 – 12 required courses, but with sufficient electives to permit students to tailor their program to individual interests.

Educational Policy and Leadership Specialization

The Education Policy and Leadership specialization is designed to prepare students in careers as education policy makers, policy analysts, curriculum specialists, advocates for children and youth, and leadership positions in a variety of education-related organizations. Hosted within the Division of Educational Policy and Leadership, the specialization contains the following areas: (a) Educational Policy, (b) Curriculum Theory and Development, (c) Socio-Cultural Foundations of Education, and (d) Teacher Education/Professional Development. Students indicate the specific program area when applying.

The specialization situates the study of education in the broader social context and brings an array of discipline-based perspectives and research methodologies to the examination of education issues, policies, and practices. The curriculum capitalizes on diverse theoretical and methodological perspectives drawn from the social sciences and humanities, integrates formal coursework with a variety of more individualized internship and enrichment experiences, and provides opportunities for students to carry out research that contributes to the development of more equitable and effective educational institutions. Students are encouraged to include in their program of study relevant courses in other specializations and programs outside the department. Graduates have the theoretical breadth and depth required to investigate compelling educational problems, to create and critique policy and practice alternatives, and to generate knowledge that informs action.

More information about University of Maryland’s Teaching and Learning, Policy and Leadership programs can be found at http://www.education.umd.edu/TLPL/academics/overview.html. More information about the PhD program can be found at http://www.education.umd.edu/TLPL/academics/newProgram2013.html. Please contact Joy Jones, Coordinator of Graduate Studies (jonesj@umd.edu), or Robert Croninger, Director of Graduate Studies (croninge@umd.edu), for further inquiries.

http://www.education.umd.edu/TLPL
Recently, I was stuck in traffic on my afternoon commute home when I heard a story on National Public Radio that discussed the continuing use of corporal punishment in schools (Clark, 2017). This report caused me to think more broadly about discipline policies in schools as well as my own experiences as a student and practitioner. I recalled the fear and shame of being paddled in first grade: once for lying quietly on a mat with my eyes open during nap time and another time for counting on my fingers to complete addition problems. As you can guess, first grade was, at best, memorable for me—traumatic at worst. In the latter role, corporal punishment was present in my old school district in Mississippi. Parents were given the option of approving the use of corporal punishment for their children. A majority of parents at the time approved of its use. If the parent did not approve, other punishments would be utilized instead. These consisted of detentions, in-school suspensions, or out-of-school suspensions, depending on the nature of the infraction.

Like many schools and districts, we had zero-tolerance policies for acts of violence, drugs, and weapons infractions. Zero-tolerance policies emerged in the 1980s and early 1990s as a response to increasing incidences of drugs, weapons, and student-on-student violence (Tajalli & Garba, 2014). These policies were attractive to schools, as they were perceived as a means of removing subjective influences in the administration of discipline to all students, regardless of race (Casella, 2003). However, reality proved quite different. The adoption of zero-tolerance policies resulted in the widespread use of suspensions and expulsions for a wide-ranging number of trivial infractions (Skiba & Peterson, 1999) and the overrepresentation of students of color and poverty (Ferguson, 2001). Alternative schools emerged also, seeking to provide an option for students with academic and behavioral difficulties (Lehr, Tan, & Ysseldyke, 2009). Here again, research suggests that African American youth are more likely than any other racial subpopulation to be removed from traditional, general-education settings (Losen 2014; Losen, Martinez, & Gillespie, 2012; Skiba et al., 2011; Tajalli & Garba, 2014). Furthermore, the American Psychological Association Zero Tolerance Task Force (2008) stated:

Zero tolerance has not been shown to improve school climate or school safety. Its application in suspension and expulsion has not proven an effective means of improving student behavior. It has not resolved, and indeed may have exacerbated, minority overrepresentation in school punishments. Zero-tolerance policies as applied appear to run counter to our best knowledge of child development. (p. 860)

In the Summer 2017 edition of UCEA Review, the Point/Counterpoint contributors (Wayne Lewis and Andrew Bailey) provided two perspectives on legislative efforts to establish charter schools in Kentucky, one of the last holdout states to adopt charter school legislation. This topic was chosen, in part, due to the Trump administration’s support for the expansion of school choice options through charter schools, school voucher programs, and tax credit scholarship. In this edition of UCEA Review, our Point/Counterpoint continues to delve into issues surrounding charter schools, an educational issue that will continue remain salient in the face of the current administration’s emphasis on choice and a reduced federal role in education.

Here, the contributors focus on discipline policies, an ongoing concern in K-12 schools regardless of whether a school is a traditional public, charter, or parochial school. Specifically, our Point/Counterpoint contributors focus on the no-excuses charter schools movement, which mandates, among other things, high behavioral expectations through formal discipline systems (Angrist et al., 2013; Dobbie & Fryer, 2013). While there is some published evidence that the adoption of no-excuses models of discipline are associated with increased student achievement (Angrist et al., 2013; Dobbie & Fryer, 2013), our two contributing authors contend that the discipline policies at no-excuses charter schools are problematic due to their exacerbation of problems that Black students face in K-12 education already when other alternatives remain available and underutilized. I thank them both for contributing their perspectives to this issue.

- **Maury Nation** (PhD, Clinical/Community Psychology, University of South Carolina) is Associate Professor in the Department of Human & Organizational Development at Peabody College, Vanderbilt University. Dr. Nation’s clinical research focuses on understanding and preventing violence and bullying among school-aged children. His specific interests are bully and victim typologies, and the short- and long-term consequences of peer harassment. His community research is focused on understanding community and neighborhood qualities and characteristics that promote positive health and mental health outcomes.

- **Joanne Golann** (PhD, Sociology, Princeton University) is Assistant Professor of Public Policy and Education and an Assistant Professor of Sociology (secondary appointment) at Peabody College, Vanderbilt University. Dr. Golann seeks to understand the everyday experiences of students, teachers, and families in urban communities and the broader societal structures that shape their lives. Dr. Golann’s research has taken a critical view of urban charter school reforms, such as KIPP, Achievement First, and Uncommon Schools. She is a recipient of the National Academy of Education/Spencer Dissertation Fellowship.
No-Excuses Charter Schools: A Simplistic Reform for a Complex Problem

Maury Nation
Vanderbilt University

In the context of education, no-excuses has a variety of meanings. Milner (2007) used the term to refer to schools committed to the belief that all children are able to learn and that excuses for failing to educate children of color in urban schools are unacceptable. In contrast, Golann (2015) highlighted an association between no-excuses and highly regimented authoritarian schools that accept no excuses from students as relates to conduct and discipline. These concepts are often paired together or used interchangeably when describing a type of charter school that has proliferated in many urban centers. However, they are predicated on some fundamentally different beliefs about the goals of education and child development that make it unlikely that schools can successfully balance or blend the approaches.

Most obviously they are distinct in placing the responsibility for overcome excuses on teachers versus students. Milner (2007) captured the core narrative of no-excuses education as it relates to teaching Black males, stating, “Black males have a wide range of potential and teachers can and must teach and empower these students and stop making excuses” (p. 240). Embedded in his plea is a belief that education should provide students an opportunity to learn and explore, and that when urban schools fail, it is usually the result of educational practices that fail to connect with the developmental and social-contextual issues impacting the child. Further, this narrative requires that educators pay close attention to students’ developmental and contextual strengths and challenges, and modify their pedagogical practices accordingly.

No-excuses discipline, in contrast, is grounded in a narrative that the failure of urban education is the result of chaotic schools driven by students, particularly children of color, who are “out of control” and who fail because they lack the structure and self-control they need to function in a formal education environment. This narrative justifies an educational environment focused on no-nonsense education and discipline practices designed to produce academic and behavioral compliance. Carr (2014) described one such school where high school students were required to walk single file along a path marked with orange tape and could receive demerits for closing their eyes. The implicit (and sometimes explicit) message both to educators and children is that all children must conform to the regimented, rules-focused environment with little regard for their developmental differences and contextual challenges. Everyone receives the same intervention, and variation comes in how harsh the educators will have to be to get students to comply with the expectations.

Supporters of the no-excuses approach argue that these are complementary strategies that operate as opposite sides of the same coin. However, because of the philosophical tensions, when put into practice, implementation with the motto “discipline before learning” allows schools to privilege disciplinary interventions with students without a commensurate pedagogical intervention with educators, often resulting in discipline policies that might be described as abusive (Carr, 2014). Further, charter schools are more likely to be located in cities and serve larger proportions of African American students than traditional public schools (National Center for Education Statistics, 2014). In fact, the three cities with the largest percentage of students attending charter schools (New Orleans, Louisiana; Detroit, Michigan; and Flint, Michigan) were also among the top 10 U.S. cities in terms of percentage of the population that is African American (National Alliance for Public Charter Schools, 2014; Rastogi, 2011). This suggests that the approach tends to be directed toward Black children and that the accompanying policies and practices, whether consciously intended or not, are likely affected by cultural and educational narratives associated with Black children (Monroe, 2005). In light of these facts, I argue that no-excuses discipline policies ultimately fail because they exacerbate problems for Black students while obscuring effective alternatives.

Discipline and Discipline Disparities

Managing student behavior is one of the most complex aspects of managing a school. In relation to a specific behavior problem, the system educators use to make decisions regarding how to handle a behavior problem is deeply embedded in their own beliefs and perceptions, including these types of decisions:

1. Is the behavior really a problem? If it is, is it an objective problem (a behavior that is problem regardless of context) or a contextual problem (a behavior that is a problem only because of the situation or the person with whom it occurred)?

2. If it is a problem, why did the child engage in the behavior? How culpable is the child for the infraction?

3. If the child is culpable, is the behavior a reflection of a skills deficit or a challenge to authority?

4. If behavior is a challenge to authority, what type of sanction is warranted? Is this sanction designed primarily to punish or to educate and rehabilitate?

A comprehensive review of discipline practices is beyond the scope of this essay. However, a large body of empirical research has suggested that each of the decisions results in Black children being disproportionately penalized with harsher treatment than their White peers (Diamond & Louis, 2016; Rocque, 2010; Skiba et al., 2011). Generally the goal of discipline reform efforts has been reduce student entry into the system or to reduce the opportunities for bias to influence decision making. However, discipline policies have seen little or no success, in part because they have tended to focus on only one part of the discipline system. Zero-tolerance policies, for example, removed discretion in sanctioning, while failing to address any of the other parts of the system.

In contrast, no-excuses approaches to discipline respond to this complexity by reducing the threshold for students to enter a discipline system with no accompanying intervention to address the racial biases. Sweating the small stuff increases the likelihood that students will receive referrals and harsh discipline, as evidenced by Johnson et al.’s (2017) finding that charter school students are “25 percentage points more likely to receive at least one in-school suspension and 17 percentage points more likely to receive at least one out-of-school suspension than were
comparison students” (p. 20). It is also consistent with Taylor’s (2015) description of a school with a “got to go” policy, where school personnel used disciplinary sanctions to encourage students to withdraw. The evidence is clear that suspension exacerbates academic difficulties and increases the risk of dropout and entering the criminal justice system (Arcia, 2006; Shollenberger, 2015). Therefore, we must question any “reform” that creates large increases in risk among a subgroup of students who are already disproportionately at risk.

**Alternative Approaches**

The proliferation of no-excuses approaches along with risks might be warranted if there were no other effective options. No one believes that chaotic schools provide a good context for education or development. However, less radical and less racialized interventions hold at least as much promise if implemented on a large scale.

Positive behavior interventions and supports (PBIS) addresses student behavior by clearly defining acceptable behaviors, communicating and promoting them consistently with students, and using data to provide targeted intervention for students who are struggling. Multiple large-scale evaluations of PBIS have found that the program reduces the number of discipline referrals and suspensions (Bradshaw, Mitchell, & Leaf, 2010; Muscott, Mann, & LeBrun, 2008).

Social and emotional learning interventions include dozens of programs that help students develop key competencies, such as self-awareness, self-management, and relation skills that allow students to cope with environmental stressors and navigate relationships with peers and teachers. Reviews suggest that these programs have behavior and academic benefits and can be implemented at scale (Domitrovich, Durlack, Staley, & Weissberg, 2017).

Restorative practices involve a set of approaches to discipline that emphasize resolution of conflict solving, restitution for emotional and material harm, and restoration of relationships. Although there are fewer studies of the approach, existing studies have found lower rates of discipline referrals and few suspensions (e.g., Gregory, Clawson, Davis, & Gerewitz, 2016).

Despite these effective interventions, political and social interests driving the charter movement make it seem that no-excuses schools are the only effective option. When offered this option or a chaotic zone school, it is not surprising that parents might opt in, especially parents who themselves adopt a no-excuses ideology (Lareau, 2011).

Ultimately, no-excuses charters schools are a failed solution to a much larger social problem. How does a society address systemic marginalization and related economic inequalities? How do schools mitigate the effects of a system of White supremacy within which schools themselves are embedded? These are the education problems to which we must attend. As with so many school reforms, no-excuses discipline is an attempt to address the complexities of these problems with a cheap, simplistic, mass-producible, “market-based” solution. Unfortunately, we will not solve this problem “on the cheap,” and attempts to do so will only result in another generation of urban young people who have been ill served by their schools.

---

**Sweating the Small Stuff at No-Excuses Charter Schools**

Joanne W. Golann
Vanderbilt University

“You need to seat them to teach them.” Such were the words of the principal at a high-performing, “no-excuses” urban charter school where I conducted a year and a half of fieldwork. He was explaining to me “the why” behind his school’s controversial disciplinary practices. Having taught in a struggling school in the South Bronx, he urged me to see his school’s practices in light of the counterfactual—the chaotic traditional urban school where the kids seemed to be running the show.

In his book, *Sweating the Small Stuff: Inner-City Schools and the New Paternalism*, David Whitman (2008) argued that the key to the success of a group of high-performing, high-poverty urban schools is their obsession with keeping order. These schools do not simply state their high expectations for students; they demand that students follow very prescriptive behavioral codes that focus on regulating the small stuff—how a student walks through the hallway, enters and exits a classroom, sits at attention, passes in papers, looks at a teacher, and shows enthusiasm (Golann, 2015; Goodman, 2013). Whitman, with admiration for these schools, called this approach paternalistic for its efforts to teach and enforce White, middle-class norms. Others, for the same reasons, have decried these practices as racist (White, 2015). The principal with whom I was speaking simply referred to these practices as “what works.”

I had set out to study no-excuses schools because, like many, I had heard about their remarkable success. In the last decade, no-excuses charter schools like KIPP, Achievement First, Uncommon Schools, Success Academies, Mastery, Democracy Prep, Match, and YES Prep have risen to national prominence for their success in improving the academic outcomes of low-income, Black and Latino students (Cheng, Hitt, Kisida, & Mills, 2017). Yet, while foundations have poured millions of dollars into expanding these schools (Farrell, Wohlstetter, & Smith, 2012; Scott, 2009), it is far from clear what actually drives the success of these schools. Through my own research, I have come to believe, contrary to Whitman, that these school’s disciplinary practices are not the key ingredient in these schools’ magic formula. Instead, I argue that there are better ways that urban schools can attain order without compromising achievement or student well-being.

**A New Disciplinary Paradigm?**

From one perspective, one can view sweating-the-small-stuff practices used by no-excuses schools as an alternative to zero-tolerance policies that have proliferated in urban schools since the 1990s. Instead of immediately suspending or expelling students for flagrant offenses like drug or weapon possession, no-excuses schools concentrate on monitoring minor behaviors so that serious ones do not occur. Such an approach has a parallel in “broken windows” policing strategies that focus on targeting misdemeanors like littering, loitering, prostitution, graffiti, and panhandling in the belief that reducing signs of disorder will reduce crime (Wilson & Kelling, 1982). In the 1990s, several large cities adopted these practices, New York City being one of the most visible. Mayor
Rudolph Giuliani, famous for cracking down on squeegee men, attributed the reduction in crime during his tenure to the broken windows strategy (see Harcourt & Ludwig, 2006 for a different interpretation).

In no-excuses schools, “broken windows” include such things as heads on desk, side conversations, and messy transitions. At the no-excuses middle school where I conducted my fieldwork, teachers assigned a total of 15,445 infractions in one school year, over a quarter of these for not following directions and talking at inappropriate times. On average, students received approximately 1 infraction every 3 days (Golann, 2016). When I shared these numbers with a colleague, he remarked that I must have been in a really bad school. On the contrary, I noted, the school was very orderly. During my time there, I witnessed only one fight.

Certainly one advantage of no-excuses disciplinary practices is the order they create. Yet this order comes at a cost. For one, little seems to have changed in terms of these schools’ heavy reliance on suspensions (Golann & Torres, 2017). Zero-tolerance policies have been widely criticized for increasing suspension and expulsion rates, especially among Black males, yet no-excuses schools have been found to produce even higher suspension rates than traditional public schools (Decker, Snyder, & Darville, 2015). Moreover, in no-excuses schools, students are routinely suspended for minor behaviors—too much “talking at inappropriate times” can add up to in-school and out-of-school suspensions—raising red flags that such policies violate state laws by permitting suspension or expulsion for any infraction, no matter how minor (Advocates for Children of New York, 2015).

Measuring Success

Supporters of these schools might dismiss high suspension rates as a necessary byproduct of success in an urban school, even though there is strong research consensus that suspensions and expulsions do not work—they hurt the students suspended as well as their peers and do little to promote order or learning in the school as a whole (Losen, 2014). Yet it is hard to convince supporters that what seems to be working so well is not really working.

To bring research to bear on this issue, I joined forces with Chris Torres, my colleague at Michigan State University who also studies no-excuses schools, to systematically review research on the impact of no-excuses disciplinary practices (i.e., not the no-excuses model, which is often studied as a black box). We wanted to see how no-excuses disciplinary practices related not only to students’ academic achievement but also to broader measures of success like social and behavioral skills, students’ perceptions of fairness, teacher turnover, and parental choice (Golann & Torres, 2017).

Our first important finding was that no-excuses disciplinary practices were not clearly responsible for these schools’ test score results. Instead, we found that other practices in these schools were more directly related to student achievement: things like data-driven instruction, extended instructional time, high-dosage tutoring, intensive professional development, and high expectations (Chabrier, Cohodes, & Oreopoulos, 2016; Dobbie & Fryer, 2013). For all the attention paid to no-excuses discipline, it may, in fact, be their other practices that are worth investigating and replicating, not their sweating-the-small-stuff approach.

A second interesting finding was in part familiar and in part surprising. I had written previously about the “paradox of success” in no-excuses schools, pointing out how such a regimented disciplinary system left students little room to develop the skills and behaviors that help middle-class students succeed in college: skills like speaking up, taking initiative, negotiating with authority, and feeling entitled to help (Golann, 2015). Such skills are important for college and citizenship and fostered by middle-class parents and schools (Ben-Porath, 2013; Lareau, 2011).

It was not surprising that no-excuses schools were not promoting initiative, but neither did they seem to be teaching self-control, nor a number of other skills and behaviors that they aimed to instill in students. Several studies we reviewed found that no-excuses schools had little to no impact on a variety of behaviors related to college success, including self-control, grit, school engagement, effort/persistence in school, academic confidence, educational aspirations, and good behaviors (Dobbie & Fryer, 2015; Tuttle et al., 2015; West et al., 2016). Given the importance of these nonacademic skills for students’ future success, we worried that these disciplinary practices might undermine the very goals these schools worked so hard to achieve.

Lessons Learned

The academic accomplishments of no-excuses charter schools are worth celebrating. As these schools continue to expand through public and philanthropic support, we must, however, be attentive to the disciplinary practices inside these schools, especially when others are decrying these practices as ethically, legally, and pedagogically unsound (Advocates for Children of New York, 2015; Goodman, 2013; Lamboy & Lu, 2017).

Sweating-the-small-stuff practices may work to reduce some of the serious behavioral problems that urban schools confront. At the same time, these practices do little to close the racial discipline gap, as Black males continue to face high suspension rates in these schools, and they do little to foster other important social and behavioral skills. Furthermore, there are many outcomes researchers have not measured that matter for student well-being. To the extent that no-excuses disciplinary practices increase student anxiety, lack cultural relevance, hinder positive student–teacher relationships, or fail to recognize that many students arrive with traumatic childhood experiences that shape their behavior (Golann, 2015; Golann & Torres, 2017; White, 2015), they may be doing more to undermine than to foster a safe, supportive learning environment where all students can thrive.

In conclusion, I argue that those looking to reform urban school discipline should look towards other models. It is encouraging that several prominent no-excuses networks themselves are also moving in the direction of adopting research-based disciplinary approaches like restorative justice (Zappa, 2015). Yet, as those working to make these changes know all too well, selecting a new disciplinary approach is only the first step towards making the much harder changes in school culture and faculty and student mindsets necessary to successfully implement these models.
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Frank Hernandez, PhD, is faculty at Southern Methodist University, where he holds the Annette and Harold Simmons Centennial Chair in Education Policy and Leadership and serves as the Associate Dean in the Simmons School of Education & Human Development. Dr. Hernandez has published two books on Latino leadership and currently has four lines of inquiry that have guided most of his research: Latinos and school leadership, Latino racial identity development, inclusive leadership for LGBTQ students, and leadership for social justice. Aside from his books, Dr. Hernandez has published extensively in top-tier journals such as Education Administration Quarterly, Journal of School Leadership, Education and Urban Society, Teachers College Record, and Journal of Latinos and Education. Additionally, Dr. Hernandez is a graduate of the 2016 class of Presidential Leadership Scholars and a 2014 graduate of the Millennium Leadership Initiative. Frank Hernandez received his PhD in Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis from the University of Wisconsin–Madison.

JMN: Dr. Hernandez, I want to thank you for setting some time and talking with me. I know the summer can be a challenging time as an administrator. I want to start off our plática by asking you to share some your experience in public school before joining the academy. What roles did you experience in practice before becoming a faculty member?

FH: Hi, Juan. Sure, I can begin by stating that I started my professional career teaching third grade at Oaklawn Elementary in Wichita, Kansas. The school was part of the Derby Public Schools, but it was located in the city limits of Wichita. I was a teacher within the same school system that I attended as a student. Like many of the schools in cities, it was highly diverse, low income, minimal English language learners, but a lot of students of color and economically disadvantaged. Many of the parents were not college graduates. I taught there for 3 years.

JMN: After Year 3, where did you go?

FH: I moved to Saint Paul, Minnesota, where I started my career again as a first-grade teacher at a magnet school, the World Cultures and Languages Magnet. The mission of the school was to help students understand the diversity within the U.S., but also within the world. Incidentally, students were able to learn multiple languages so they could engage with different people in their neighborhoods, across the country, and in the world. Our students were taught Spanish, Japanese, Chinese, Russian, and Hmong. I loved working at that school. I had a unique experience while working there. I was able to move with my first graders and I became their second-grade teacher. This opportunity afforded me the ability to build great relationships with parents and students.

After that school, I had the opportunity to become a faculty member of a brand-new voluntary desegregation elementary school that partnered with one urban school and two suburban school communities. The two suburban school districts were Roseville Area Public Schools and North St. Paul-Maplewood-Oakdale Independent School District. Saint Paul Public Schools had been labeled as a racially isolated school district. Based on the state laws, we had to create some integrated learning opportunities for students, particularly for the districts that were contiguous to Saint Paul. So, we started the Tri-District Community Culture and Environmental Science magnet school. I was a Grade 1–2 multitage teacher. I was in this school for 2 years; then I was promoted to the director of multicultural programming. In this role, I did all the professional development for all the teachers in all three of those districts around creating integrated learning opportunities for their students and their families. I did that for a couple of years.

JMN: What opportunities did the district position have?

FH: During that time, I was able to get my master's and my administrative license. In 1999, I became the assistant principal of Adams Spanish Immersion Magnet School in the Saint Paul Public Schools. It was a Spanish-immersion elementary school. The school was not a dual-language school. It was a 90/10 school, so 90% of the instruction was in Spanish and 10% was in English. By January of their first grade, students could no longer speak English. They had to communicate all in Spanish. It was a wonderful experience for me, and it helped me better understand language immersion schools and the different models that existed.

After that I went back to the Tri-District School as the principal. It was around the summer of my 1st year of being principal when I started thinking about a doctorate. Ultimately, my goal was to be an urban superintendent. At that time, that's what I really wanted to do; that was my passion. I wanted to take everything that I had learned as a teacher, and a principal, and as a district coordinator, and take all of the things I learned from my mentors and people I admired, and apply those to the job of a superintendent. Therefore, I applied for a doctorate. I was accepted to the University of Wisconsin in their PhD program.

JMN: Your experience in multiple contexts helped you better understand the complexities of school systems. For example, Saint Paul gave you an opportunity to work with multiple districts to desegregate the issues the larger school district was having.

FH: Yes, that school became pretty diverse. We had 60% students of color. About 65% were on free or reduced-price lunch,
JMN: How was your PhD program experience? Was this issue of diversity heightened? Did it support your understanding of the issues of inequity in diversity?

FH: Juan, it’s a very interesting notion. As a teacher, I remember very vividly reading articles about different things that I was interested in. For example, I remember reading about immersion programs to know more about what practitioners were doing and learn new strategies to use as a leader. I remember very clearly as a principal I would be reading Educational Leadership and Phi Delta Kappa to see if I could learn what other kind of schools were doing or how other schools were creating integrated opportunities for learning to engage students. I could see what was happening in my school, what was needed to move forward, and what needed to change.

Interestingly, when I took all that practical experience and I went to the university setting, I began to look closer at the kind of academic research that was being written. I was able to reflect in a deeper way on my experiences as a teacher and school leader and deconstruct practice in a much more effective way.

What being in my doctoral program did was give me the language to look back and recognize the way in which we were marginalizing poor students and students of color by creating programs that were not for them. We were institutionalizing certain kinds of practices and protocols that were perpetuating these racist and privileged notions of what schooling is for and for whom. I also was able to recognize the ways certain parents monopolized decisions about schools and programs and the ways they were supported. Additionally, being in graduate school really helped me develop a vocabulary and language to be able to talk about the positive work that was happening but also the work that was negatively impacting students.

JMN: I think that many of us come into a leadership program with this understanding that we see issues but we don’t know exactly how to pinpoint them. We are needing the language and vocabulary to address issues. From your experiences, how did you then decide to move from the pathway of urban school superintendent into the professorate?

FH: I believe it was the beginning of 2004 when I had conducted a preliminary study on Latino school principals. I remember my advisor telling me that we were going to submit a proposal to a UCEA conference so that I could share some of the preliminary findings and get a sense of what happens at these conferences. During that process of collecting the preliminary data, coding, and writing up the paper and presenting the findings, I shifted my interest into higher education. I’ll never forget that when I finished my presentation, other Latino leaders asked questions and told me they were so proud of the work I was doing and looked forward to reading it.

After this experience, I found a sense of satisfaction in doing this work. I came to the realization that I could impact change by researching, writing, and presenting my work and teaching future leaders—principals—about leadership and about what’s in the literature. At that point, Juan, I decided to be a professor.

I became more involved with reading some of the work of professors I admired. My lead advisor [Dr. Colleen Capper] got me more deeply involved with her scholarship and research and writing. I started collecting data with principals related to different projects that she was working on. I think at the beginning of my 2nd year of my PhD program I started working and preparing myself for my first professional job.

JMN: How did your mentor support your work once you decided you enjoyed the experience of presenting at an academic conference?

FH: When I made her aware that I found academic research very satisfying, my advisor became very supportive of my work. She was supportive before, but knowing now that I was interested in the professorship, she provided with different types of experiences. She would invite me to her projects and introduce me to people who could help support my career as a professor. She helped me be involved in experiences that would make me a much stronger researcher and had me take additional courses with some of the top qualitative researchers in the country. Her advocacy helped me understand the role expectations of this profession. She did everything within her reach to make sure I was prepared to be the very best researcher.

JMN: Now, as a professor, do you still collaborate with your mentor?

FH: Yes, I am really close with my advisor today. We haven’t worked on a project together in some time, but I’m very familiar with her research work and she is with mine. She
has made me aware of collaborations with other people that have resulted in publications. What is impressive, Juan, is that she introduces me with her current graduate student through my articles in her teaching. I am so excited when I get to meet her PhD students and see how her mentorship is continuing. What she did with me years ago, she is doing now with them. The only difference is now I’m the senior professor she is introducing them to. It is extremely rewarding and exciting to see that she is continuing that work.

JMN: The mentorship continues and is evolving as it becomes more complex because it becomes a networking opportunity. She is saying this is a student I mentored in the past and now he is a professor. These are lessons learned from him and lessons from his work. So now that you are in this privileged position of being a senior professor, how does that look in your world? Do you engage in the similar practice of your mentor?

FH: Currently, in my role as the associate dean here at Simmons School of Education & Human Development I have a full-time PhD student I am advising. We work on school leadership and the impact of school principals on student achievement and student learning outcomes. One of the ways I am continuing that mentorship that I learned from my advisor is by advising PhD students. We also have an EdD program here that is research based but not at the same level as the PhD program. I teach in this program. Also, I sit on dissertation committees for two students who are in that program. I am giving back and I am mentoring. I think the role of dean and associate dean have helped me not only connect with students but also mentor junior faculty. I have taken some of those same lessons and applied it to the ways I can support new assistant professors. The mentorship looks very different. Whether it is establishing their research agenda, connecting them with senior scholars in the field, connecting them to publication possibilities, or talking to them about their publication plan for the next 2 years, it is very rewarding. I find the administrator role has given me much bigger responsibility in mentoring junior faculty that as a full-time faculty I might not have gotten. I try to keep my efforts in both working with students and junior faculty. I find both of them really rewarding and satisfying.

JMN: I can personally relate to your mentorship and support, thank you. How do you bring some of your own research into the classrooms? Or as an administrator, how do you support in creating a space to prepare social justice leaders?

FH: There are a couple of ways one can advance and support social justice leadership. One way, as an endowed chair and professor, has been by sharing my work with multiple audiences across the country. I share my learning and research with others mainly because of the position I hold now, where I can travel and discuss what I’ve learned with different organizations and groups across the country. For example, last year I was invited to New York University to talk about the research work I’ve been doing on Latino school leaders for social justice. Two weeks ago, I was in Guatemala to talk with principals and school leaders in Antigua about the role of shaping school culture, a positive school culture for students and teachers. My position has given me opportunities to share my work.

At my university, as an administrator, I am involved with developing curriculum. For example, this fall I am teaching a course called Leading for Equity and Diversity. Not only will my work find its way into that course, but also other scholars are utilizing my work in their courses related to equity and inclusion. As an administrator, I can influence the strategic direction of the school. Now I have the opportunity to do it on multiple levels: at the national level, at the university level, at a school-wide level, at the classroom and teaching level. Those are some of the ways my work has been able to engage practitioners and other researchers.

JMN: How do you envision social justice leadership to look?

FH: I think that leadership for social justice, or leadership for equity, has been something I’m committed to have a deeper understanding of. I have studied it through a lens of creating inclusive environments for LGBTQ students. I’ve also studied it through the lens of Latino school principals and the ways they lead and make sense of their leadership. But for me, social justice leadership is really about balancing this idea of having a critical consciousness about what is happening as leaders at your school, why it’s happening, whether the school systems is allowing it to happen, and being critically conscious about the ways you can impact those systems and challenge those systems.

It’s the relentless commitment to high expectations and high-quality teaching for every single student. For me, it’s not enough to teach someone to read and to do math at high levels if they are going to go out and just perpetuate the status quo that works against social justice. It’s also not enough to be critically conscious and be connected to their identity and their language and to understand what they believe or what they value. They need to be able to solve problems, societal and community problems, but also be critically conscious. So, to me leadership for social justice is someone who can balance both of those things, high academic achievement and high critical consciousness, and understand the importance of both of them and not let one get ahead of the other.

JMN: How do we develop a critical consciousness for leaders to engage in conversations where they can challenge the status quo? We can call it school improvement, but school improvement for whom and for what purpose?

FH: Remember when I was talking about being a principal and I could look back and see some of the ways the school system was not working for all students? Even though I recognized the problems and challenges, I didn’t have this idea of being a leader for social justice. I felt like I was a good leader and I had awareness of issues around equity and social justice.
It wasn’t until my doctoral program that I realized, “Oh my goodness, this is the way I should have challenged the system; this is the way I should have pushed back on the system; this is the way I should have used data to drive equitable decision making.” That’s why our job as professors in educational leadership is to help students understand that as the leader this is not the time to shy away from these things. Here is the language, the tools, the data, the literature that can support you in doing this kind of work. Sometimes our leaders do not have the tools to be able to do it. That’s why our work is so critical and important.

JMN: Interestingly, many who are in doctoral programs can experience the awakening of the critical consciousness. However, most principals who are currently in practice hold master’s degrees and may face similar experiences we did as principals. If they don’t seek a doctoral degree, many may continue the practice with a status quo mindset. How do we inculcate social justice in the way we prepare school leaders so they do have the language, the knowledge, and the mindsets to be critical and at the same time push for high academic standards? It seems like a lot to expect from school leaders when high-stakes testing seems to dominate the practice of schools. What additional practices can we still generate to share at UCEA as we continue to better prepare aspiring school leaders and work with current leaders for equitable learning environments?

FH: So many different things come to mind. One is to be able to present to our students where the biggest challenges are. For example, the data that say students of color and other historically marginalized students aren’t going to graduate on the same level. We need to be able to present the data and show pressing issues we are facing in our school system today. Now, how can we focus what we do in our coursework to make sure we are addressing how we solve these problems? Sometimes what I think happens is we talk about problems and then set them aside. Then we talk about law, finance, distributive leadership and about being an instructional leader. What we need to be able to do is to integrate some of the most pressing issues we have in our schools today across an entire program. A single course is not enough.

Another strategy is for professors to move beyond their own comfort level. Some professors only take the conversation to the level they feel comfortable talking about. So, if we don’t have professors who have the confidence to talk about issues of systemic and institutional racism and how it relates to educational organizations, then the conversation is never going to reach that level. So, one of the things that I think as an organization that we need to be able to do is constantly and consistently give professors who are involved with UCEA the tools they need to be able to have those conversations with students across multiple topics. We cannot let it fall on professor who teaches a diversity course, the person who is interested in race in social class, or the queer professor who is interested in making LGBTQ issues a part of their professorship and research. As a consortium, we can provide resources to give professors the tools to be able to integrate some of the most pressing issues in today’s public schools in their content and help them feel comfortable enough talking about these things openly and freely.
JMN: In the spring I taught administration and special programs. I extended the equity audit to include LGBTQ, religion, undocumented students, and assets mapping. Students were engaged in rich discussions with all aspects of the audit. However, there was a discomfort when we were talking about LGBTQ issues. Some students had a problem engaging in conversations or reading articles about how school districts are marginalizing LGBTQ students or faculty.

FH: Unfortunately, sometimes students fear the unknown. These are students who get their principalship license and then go back to be a principal of their school. A student comes up to them and says, “I would like to start a GSA [gay student association] at our school.” They’re not going to do it. They are just not going to be comfortable doing that. Part of what we have to do is state up front the things that our programs value. If these are not the things you or the institution value, then you know it up front. However, if you are a social justice program, such values are non-negotiable. Perhaps we need to be much more selective in the way we recruit our potential principals. I think we need to have a much more rigorous selection process to get at what their mindsets are in terms of how they think about difference and how they understand difference.

We need to have some set way of gauging the propensity to want to lead for social justice and be involved in equitable work and be willing to take risks. For example, at Southern Methodist University, we have interviews with some of our principal candidates. One of the questions we ask them during the daylong interview is, “Tell us about the time when you took a risk.” This questions helps us understand what people are willing to do and if they willing to take risks and challenge. Hopefully the candidates can speak to how they are willing to be isolated and alone to benefit students or is this the kind of person who really is focused on compliance and rule following and is not willing to bend or challenge the rules or policies. As an organization, we need to think about recruitment and selection in terms of placement and practice for these leaders.

JMN: Over the summer I had this same group for the Introduction to School Administration course. Again, the topics were about inclusivity. The second time around, students were more welcoming about class discussions. I reminded them that as school leaders our role is to provide equitable opportunities for each individual student, regardless of religion, ability, race, or any difference. That’s what students need to understand, and we need to create an awareness.

FH: As school leaders, we don’t get to decide on our own what’s good enough. You make sure there are certain support systems in place for your athletes; why not have support systems in place for your gay and Muslim students? It shouldn’t be a question of “if we should do this or not.”

JMN: Is there anything else you would like to share or add?

FH: Sure, what I really appreciate about UCEA is the opportunity I had to be a Barbara Jackson Scholar. I was a Barbara Jackson Scholar in its inaugural cohort. I very much remember the kind of support and excitement that I had being part of that group. Since then, I have been able to address the scholars in several meetings. UCEA was good to me as a student, and it was a valuable experience; I could never ever thank them enough for that. Being a senior scholar now at UCEA, I feel like part of my responsibility is to be an active member of the organization and become a leader in the organization. Not just in my scholarship, but become a more visible leader in UCEA and help influence the kind of support systems that we put in place for junior faculty or students who are in the professorship pipeline. UCEA was one of my very first conferences I attended as a graduate student, so it means a lot to me. I am thankful for having that opportunity as a graduate student, but also now as a professor. I hope that I can continue to contribute to the organization and the mission of the organization.

JMN: Well I hope one day, in the very near future, you become UCEA president. I thank you for your time.

FH: You are welcome.
UCEA Graduate Student Council

The UCEA Graduate Student Council is pleased to announce our three newest members, who will serve a 2-year term from 2017 to 2019: Andrene Jones Castro (University of Texas at Austin), Shannon Holder (University of Connecticut), and Matthew Stier (University of Iowa). This coming November, they will replace outgoing GSC members Da’vid Aguayo (University of Missouri), Elizabeth Gil (St. John’s University), and Rachel White (University of Southern California). They will join continuing GSC members Kevin Clay (Rutgers University), Nakia Gray-Nicolas (New York University), Chandler Patton Miranda (New York University), Meredith Wronowski (University of Oklahoma), and Bryan VanGronigen (UCEA/University of Virginia). UCEA Executive Director Michelle D. Young extended VanGronigen’s term by 1 year until November 2018.

Andrene Jones Castro is a PhD student in Educational Policy and Planning with a concentration in African & African Diaspora Studies at the University of Texas at Austin. Her research interests include the cultural politics of race and gender in teacher labor markets and the intersections of schools and communities. Prior to pursuing a doctoral degree, Andrene served as an educator in Miami-Dade County Public Schools and instructor at Miami Dade College. A recipient of the University of Texas Archer Fellowship, Andrene also served as a policy intern at the White House Initiative on Educational Excellence for African Americans. As a graduate scholar in the Barbara L. Jackson and David L. Clark programs, Andrene is proud to be a member of the Graduate Student Council.

Shannon Holder is a doctoral student in the Learning, Leadership, and Education Policy PhD program in the Educational Leadership Department at the University of Connecticut. She serves as a graduate student to Dr. Jennie Weiner. Her research focuses on desegregation court cases, urban education, formerly-tracked K-12 schools, and professional development for K-12 educators. She is originally from Hartford, Connecticut. Prior to starting her doctoral work, Shannon taught 10th grade government for 8 years at an interdistrict magnet school in Bloomfield, Connecticut. Shannon and a colleague have begun producing a new podcast, Edu Culture, for K-12 educators and researchers. They are releasing new, free podcasts every other week focusing on various topics in education that connect to social justice, research-based strategies, and real-life experiences. Shannon received a BA in history and an MT in Secondary Education from Hampton University.

Matt Stier is a doctoral student and a graduate research assistant at the University of Iowa in the Educational Policy and Leadership Studies Department. His research interests include teacher leadership, professional development, and organizational change. Prior to his graduate work at the University of Iowa, Matt was a high school science educator for over 10 years. Matt earned his BA in biology from Saint Mary’s University of Minnesota and his MA in science education from the University of Northern Iowa.

Grad Student Column & Blog: Submissions Welcome

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.

www.ucea.org/graduate-student-blog/
Review of the 2017 David L. Clark National Graduate Student Research Seminar in Educational Administration

Bryan A. VanGronigen
University of Virginia

SAN ANTONIO – This past April, 42 graduate students and 14 mentor faculty members descended upon the Grand Hyatt Hotel in San Antonio, Texas to participate in the 38th annual David L. Clark National Graduate Student Research Seminar in Educational Administration. During the two-day seminar, Clark Scholars heard from an array of panelists about life as a faculty member, presented their research during poster sessions, and participated in small group discussions.

The small group sessions—the core of the Clark Seminar—organized students by dissertation topic and research methodology and paired a group of six students with two to three distinguished faculty members in educational leadership and policy. The faculty mentors, who were selected by the Clark Seminar Planning Committee, read and commented upon executive summaries of students’ work before arriving in Washington, DC, and during the seminar, asked students to lead a conversation about their dissertations within their small groups. Faculty members then offered targeted feedback and invited other students to comment upon each student’s work. Clark Scholars’ research presentations ranged from studying superintendent trustworthiness and the conceptualization of principal support of teacher psychological needs to exploring the narratives of Black teacher commitments and online learning as a remedy for course failure.

To qualify for one of the seminar’s 42 slots, aspiring Clark Scholars submitted a brief summary of their dissertation research along with a letter of recommendation from a faculty member. This year, the seminar received over 90 applications, which were carefully evaluated by a committee of faculty members in educational leadership and policy. Mentor faculty members were selected by the Clark Seminar Planning Committee, which consists of one representative from AERA Division A, one representative from AERA Division L, the UCEA executive director, a UCEA graduate assistant, and the UCEA project and events coordinator.

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

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

The seminar is held each year before the start of the AERA Annual Meeting and is coordinated by AERA Division A, AERA Division L, and the University Council for Educational Administration. Named in honor of the late Professor David L. Clark, the seminar seeks to bring together emerging scholars and accomplished faculty members to better hone research projects and prepare the future of the educational leadership and policy professoriate. For more information about the Clark Seminar and how to apply to become a Clark Scholar, visit: http://clarkseminar.ucea.org. Faculty members interested in being considered for one of the 12 mentor faculty slots should email Bryan A. VanGronigen at bav9wb@virginia.edu

2017-19 Jackson Scholars

UCEA and the Jackson Scholars Network are proud to announce the 2017-19 cohort.

Tiffany Aaron, University of Georgia
Omotayo Adeeko, Ohio State University
Brandon Allen, Purdue University
Bodunrin Banwo, University of Minnesota
Diana Barrera, Texas State University
Courtney Bell, University of Minnesota
Lashia Bowers, Clemson University
Dwuana Bradley, University of Texas at Austin
Brandon Clark, Iowa State University
Ashton Cooper, University of Tennessee at Knoxville
Bryan Duarte, University of Texas at San Antonio
Briseida Elenes, University of San Diego
Hamada Elfarargy, Texas A&M University
Jacqueline Forbes, University of Wisconsin–Madison
Ivory Gabriely, Florida State University
Chaddrick Gallaway, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Alonso Gilzene, Michigan State University
José Gonzalez, University of Arizona
Maricela Guzman, University of Texas at San Antonio
Lamarus Hall, Purdue University
Darrell Harris, University of North Carolina at Greensboro
Stephanie Hawkes, Wayne State University
Krystal Huff, Loyola Marymount University
Arcasia James, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Kimberley Jenkins, Miami University
Yang Jiang, University of San Diego
Shantalea Johns, Wayne State University
Tanika Jones, Auburn University
Nattawan Junboonta, Rutgers University
Justine Lee, University of Maryland
Kofi LeNiles, Howard University
Natalie Lewis, University of Denver
Courtney Mauldin, Michigan State University
Rolando Merchán, Sam Houston State University
LaTeasha Meyers, Miami University
Jeong-Mi Moon, University of Missouri
Dana Nickson, University of Michigan
Isela Pena, University of Texas at El Paso
Ruqayyah Perkins-Williams, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Chanika Perry, Georgia State University
Lam Pham, Vanderbilt University
Ransford Pinto, University of Missouri
Fawziah Qadir, New York University
Lixia Qin, Texas A & M University
Juan Salinas, University of Texas Rio Grande Valley
Jerrell Sherman, Sam Houston State University
Elizabeth Silva, University of Texas Rio Grande Valley
Angelica Sleiman, University of San Diego
Travis Smith, Clemson University
Jason Swisher, Texas State University
Edgar Torres, University of Texas at Austin
Tessie Williams, Auburn University
Minseok Yang, University of Wisconsin–Madison
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 New York City, New York (tentatively scheduled for April 12-13, 2018).

Nominations for the David L. Clark National Graduate Student Research Seminar in Educational Administration & Policy are due Friday, November 3, 2017.

Nominees should be outstanding doctoral students in PK-12 educational leadership and administration and/or PK-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 and an overview of the Clark Seminar process can be found on the “David Clark Seminar” page of the UCEA website: http://clarkseminar.ucea.org/

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/affiliation, mailing address, email address, and phone number), (b) nomination statement, (c) student information (name; institution/affiliation; 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.

The student’s statement of proposed research should be no more than two (2) single-spaced pages, not including the references 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 (a) abstract, (b) statement of proposed research, and (c) file name should be devoid of any reference to the nominee's name and/or institution/affiliation. Student proposals are blind reviewed by three prominent scholars. Invitations will be issued to 42 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 the UCEA website: http://clarkseminar.ucea.org/). We expect to extend invitations in December 2017. If you have any questions, please call (434) 243-1041.

http://clarkseminar.ucea.org

Deadline: Friday, November 3, 2017
International Summit: Indigenous Perspectives on Educational Leadership

Unlike in years past, this year’s UCEA International Summit will be comprised of two sessions held during the conference, as opposed to a half-day session at the end. The theme of this year’s summit is Indigenous Perspectives on Educational Leadership. The first session will be held Friday Nov. 17 (7:00 am) and will feature our keynote presenters Dr. Chris Sarra and Rosemary Campbell-Stephens MBE (bios below). Our second session will be held Saturday Nov. 18 (4:20 pm) at the invitation of the International Successful School Leadership Center and will continue our discussion of Indigenous Perspectives on Educational Leadership, featuring an indigenous school leader from the Denver area, with Dr. Sarra and Mrs. Campbell-Stephens as discussants.

Dr. Chris Sarra is an internationally recognized Indigenous education specialist and the founder and Chairman of the Stronger Smarter Institute. He grew up in Bundaberg in Queensland and is the youngest of 10 children. As an Aboriginal student, he experienced firsthand many of the issues faced by Indigenous students in schools. Since becoming a teacher in 1988, he has dedicated his career to sticking up for his people and his profession. In the late 1990s, Chris took on the challenges of Indigenous education when he became the first Aboriginal Principal of Cherbourg State School in South East Queensland. Under his leadership, the school became nationally acclaimed for its pursuit of the Stronger Smarter philosophy, which significantly improved the educational and life outcomes of its students. His work has been recognized with many prestigious awards including Queensland’s nomination for Australian of the Year in 2004, and in 2011, he was Queensland’s nomination for Australian of the Year. Dr. Sarra has a Master of Education and a PhD in Psychology from Murdoch University. His thesis, Strong and Smart—Towards a Pedagogy for Emancipation Education for First Peoples, was published in a book in 2011 and his memoir, Good Morning Mr. Sarra, was published in 2012. Dr. Sarra is passionate about effecting sustainable change through positive leadership and mentoring with high expectations for a strong and smart Indigenous population. He embraces a proud cultural identity and a holistic sense of what it means to be Aboriginal in contemporary Australian society. By sharing his own journey, Chris encourages other leaders to accept the Stronger Smarter challenge.

Rosemary Campbell-Stephens (MBE) received her professional training in England, but her breadth of experience is international. Having started as a teacher of English, she has since served as a Visiting Fellow at the Institute of Education, University College London; OFSTED Inspector; a Local Authority Officer; Senior School Principal; Consultant Adviser to Her Majesty’s Government in the Department of Education; and Lead Associate to the National College for Teaching and Leadership. In 2015, Mrs. Campbell-Stephens was awarded an MBE, an honor bestowed by the Queen of England for outstanding service to education for over 35 years. Mrs. Campbell-Stephens designed and led a groundbreaking leadership preparation program, Investing in Diversity, for the Institute of Education, University of London that subsequently extended across England and, in 2009, to the Institute of Education at the University of Toronto. The program moves beyond leadership theory and generic managerial competences to the deliberate exploration of creating differently enabled leadership spaces, within which those from underrepresented backgrounds can practice leadership differently. As a leader of African Caribbean descent, she is particularly interested in educational leadership focused on enabling leaders from diverse backgrounds to find their authentic voice and change the spaces in which they lead. As part of the Global Majority, particularly at this juncture in history when the axis of global power is shifting, she continues to encourage leaders to develop their own lens through which to create reimagined notions of service, provide humanizing experiences for educators and students, and to be unequivocal activists in pursuit of leadership for equity and social justice through education. More recently, as the Director Principal of the National College for Educational Leadership in Jamaica, she developed her thinking further about leadership in postcolonial spaces, especially through the concept of transformational leadership by disrupting deficit narratives.

Other International Activities at the Convention

• UCEA-BELMAS work session (Thu. 8:00 am)
• The International Congress (Fri. 10:50 am)
• ISSL Program Center Business meeting (Sat. 7:00 am)
• The Non-Affirmative Theory of Education workshop (Sun. 8am)

Eight International Community-Building Sessions will be held:

• Contextualizing Leadership in High-Need Schools: An International Perspective
• Neighbors on Different Paths—On Trust and Policymaking Within Education in Finland and Sweden
• Democratic Leadership Practices in the Enactment of Social Justice in Schools: Cases From Four Countries
• How do Different Education Professionals do Social Justice Work? Preliminary Findings From a Two-Country Study
• Emotional Experiences of Principals During Political Organizational Changes: An International Comparative Perspective
• Improving Low-Performing Schools: An International Perspective
• Re-imaging the School as Crucible of Engagement and Learning for All
• The Professional Identities of School Leaders: An International Perspective

NOTE: All days/times subject to change. Please consult the Convention Program for any updates.
The 31st Annual UCEA Convention

_Echando Pa’lante:_
School Leaders (Up)_rising_ as Advocates and (Up)_lifting_ Student Voices

The 31st annual UCEA Convention will be held November 15-19, 2017 at the Sheraton Denver Downtown Hotel in Denver, CO. The purpose of the 2017 UCEA Convention is to engage participants in discussions about research, policy, practice and preparation in the field of education with a specific focus on educational leadership.

Members of the 2017 Convention Program Committee are Mariela A. Rodriguez (University of Texas at San Antonio), Erin Anderson (University of Denver), Miriam Ezzani (University of North Texas), Cristobal Rodriguez (Howard University), Karl Gildner (UCEA), and Michelle D. Young (UCEA). The 31st Annual UCEA Convention theme, _Echando Pa’lante: School Leaders (Up)_rising_ as Advocates and (Up)_lifting_ Student Voices, is intended to encourage opportunities for reflective dialogue regarding the educational contexts that students, teachers, principals, and superintendents will be facing within a changing national climate and its impact on educational policy.

Nov. 15-19, 2017
Sheraton Denver Downtown, Denver, CO
www.ucea.org

Special Thanks to our Sponsors:

- The Wallace Foundation
- University of Denver
- University of Colorado - Denver
- University of North Texas
- Brock International Prize
KEYNOTE SPEAKERS

Social Justice Keynote featuring Dr. Cecilia Fierro

Dr. Cecilia Fierro is a national research professor at Universidad Iberoamericana Leon. Her greatest academic concern for over three decades has been to strengthen teachers’ endeavor and power of action. Her books, adopted by the Public Educational System in Mexico, have been used in every public school since 1990 reaching over 130,000 teachers in every corner of Mexico. Dr. Fierro was named the 2016 Brock International Prize in Education Laureate for her significant contributions to the field of education, including work alongside teachers and school leaders to develop practices that address needs of marginalized children and build democratic schools in rural and impoverished neighborhoods across Mexico. She has been a relentless advocate for marginalized children and the teachers and school directors who work on their behalf.

Mitstifer Lecture featuring Will Richardson

Will Richardson has spent the last dozen years developing an international reputation as a leading thinker and writer about the intersection of social online learning networks and education. Richardson is one of a handful of original education bloggers, and his work has appeared in numerous journals, newspapers, and magazines such as Ed Leadership, District Administration, Education Week, New York Times, and English Journal. Richardson was recognized by the New York Times as a “trendsetter in education” for his use of blogs in the classroom. Having spent 22 years as a public school teacher and technology administrator, Richardson is an outspoken advocate for change in schools and classrooms in the context of the diverse new learning opportunities that the web and other technologies offer. In 2017, he was named one of 100 global “Changemakers in Education” by the Finnish site HundrED. Richardson’s guiding focus has been to help schools and educators make sense of what’s happening in terms of technology and learning, and to help them forge a path forward.

Leading in a Time of Challenge: What’s An Educational Leader to Do?
A UCEA-Wallace Town Hall

School leaders are facing financial and ethical dilemmas with increasing frequency and complexity. With cuts to Medicaid, uncertainty around DACA, increasing hate speech, and other such challenges, it is imperative that school leaders exercise strong judgment anchored to professional norms of care, compassion and social justice. What then is the responsibility of leadership preparation, professional development and state policy to ensure that leaders are adequately prepared to meet these challenges and to serve as educational advocates?
The 31st Annual UCEA Convention  
Sheraton Denver Downtown, Denver, CO, Nov. 15-19, 2017

REGISTRATION

http://www.ucea.org/registration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registrant</th>
<th>Advance (ends Sept. 3, 11:59 pm EST)</th>
<th>Regular (ends Oct. 8, 11:59 pm EST)</th>
<th>Late (ends Nov. 1, 11:59 pm EST)</th>
<th>On site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UCEA Member Faculty</td>
<td>$ 230</td>
<td>$ 270</td>
<td>$ 310</td>
<td>$ 350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-UCEA Faculty</td>
<td>$ 280</td>
<td>$ 310</td>
<td>$ 340</td>
<td>$ 380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCEA Member Graduate Student</td>
<td>$ 75</td>
<td>$ 95</td>
<td>$ 130</td>
<td>$ 160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-UCEA Graduate Student</td>
<td>$ 95</td>
<td>$ 120</td>
<td>$ 150</td>
<td>$ 160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practitioner</td>
<td>$ 250</td>
<td>$ 300</td>
<td>$ 320</td>
<td>$ 350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibitor</td>
<td>$ 60</td>
<td>$ 60</td>
<td>$ 60</td>
<td>$ 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELMAS</td>
<td>$ 230</td>
<td>$ 270</td>
<td>$ 310</td>
<td>$ 350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$ 240</td>
<td>$ 290</td>
<td>$ 310</td>
<td>$ 330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Student Summit*</td>
<td>$ 35</td>
<td>$ 35</td>
<td>$ 35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In addition to applicable Graduate Student registration rate listed above

Graduate Student Summit (Nov 15th and 16th) will be an additional $35 after cost of registration.
If you are a BELMAS member, please email UCEA at uceaconvention@gmail.com for your discount code.

We encourage all potential attendees to register early to avoid rate increases AND ensure that your name badge is ready at registration. For all attendees who register on site (starting November 2, 2017), we cannot guarantee that your name badge will be ready upon arrival due to processing; however, UCEA will get it to you promptly.

It is the policy of UCEA that all persons in attendance at the 2017 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 2017 Annual Convention. If you require a letter of invitation to travel to the UCEA Convention, please e-mail your request by November 1, 2017, to uceaconvention@gmail.com
Room Rates: Single/Double: $165.00  Club Level: $189.00

The 2017 UCEA Annual Convention hotel is the Sheraton Denver Downtown Hotel, in Denver, Colorado. We encourage you to make your reservation early as space is tight. All reservations must be made by October 23, 2017 in order to receive rates listed above. For the UCEA room rates, please use the online passkey to make your reservations online, or call (866) 932-7269.

http://www.ucea.org/2017/01/01/hotel-reservations-2/

Need a roommate? UCEA provides separate forums for Convention and Graduate Student Summit attendees to submit room share requests to the larger UCEA faculty and graduate student communities. It is important that you read the terms of use/disclaimer before proceeding to a Room Share Forum. Please note that by using these forums, you are agreeing to the terms of use/disclaimer. Also, make sure the dates you listed for arrival and departure are present and accurate. The room sharing forum list is currently organized by gender, then arrival and departure dates to make scanning for a potential roommate easier.

For more information on the hotel and Denver, please see
http://www.ucea.org/2017/01/01/convention-location/
# 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-Hawkins (University of Houston)
apeters-hawkins@uh.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:
Grace J. Liang (Kansas State University)
ghiang15@ksu.edu

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

---

# 2017 Calendar

**Sept. 2017**
- National Policy Board for Educational Administration meeting, Sept. 12, Washington, DC
- AERA Council of University Research Institutions, Sept. 17-18, Washington, DC

**Oct. 2017**
- CSLEE Values & Leadership Conference, Oct. 5-8, Los Angeles, CA
- Regular Registration for the convention ends Oct. 8; Late Registration rates begin

**Nov. 2017**
- David Clark Graduate Student Research Seminar 2018 nominations due Nov. 3
- Late Registration for the convention ends Nov. 1; On-Site Registration begins Nov. 2
- Executive Committee meeting, Nov. 13-14, Denver, CO
- UCEA Plenary Session, Nov. 15-16, Denver, CO
- UCEA Graduate Student Summit, Nov. 15-16, Denver, CO
- UCEA Plenum, Nov. 15-16, Denver, CO
- UCEA Convention, Nov. 16-19, Denver, CO
- UCEA International Summit, Nov. 17-18, Denver, CO