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Every Presidential election provides Americans a time to revisit federal education policy. This election season is no different, as President Barak Obama and former Massachusetts Governor Mitt Romney offer different agendas for U.S. educational policy. We present an overview of these two candidates’ educational agendas, starting with President Obama’s, and then we provide an analysis of these agendas in light of the current political and economic contexts.

Obama

At present there is no published “educational agenda” on the Obama Campaign website, so we turned to what has and has not been accomplished during the first term. President Obama’s most striking achievement in K-12 educational policy is the Race to the Top initiative, which has provided $4.35 billion in competitive grants to states that are graded on a 500-point scale according to the rigor of the reforms proposed and their compatibility with four administration priorities: developing common standards and assessments; improving teacher training, evaluation, and retention policies; creating better data systems; and adopting preferred school-turnaround strategies. (McGuinn, 2012, p. 139)

This is a major departure from late 20th-century federal educational initiatives, which distributed and distributed federal funds along categorical needs (DeBray-Pelot & McGuinn, 2009; Koppich & Esch, 2012; McGuinn, 2012). That said, Race to the Top was but a small part of the much larger, $700+ billion economic stimulus bill, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (Koppich & Esch, 2012; McGuinn, 2012). This bill also contained funds to keep public school teachers employed—until the funding ran out (see Krugman, 2012).

Although it is too early to assess the lasting affects of Race to the Top on educational policy and practice, clearly the majority of states have applied for funding (McGuinn, 2012). In particular, many states have also moved to more tightly link teacher and principal evaluations with student academic achievement, which includes achievement measured by standardized test scores—regardless of the insurmountable technical challenges in doing so (see Baker, 2012). Additionally, the ongoing failure since 2007 to reauthorize the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) has opened the door for some novel policy approaches by the Executive Branch. Consequently, the Obama Administration has dangled waivers from increasingly impossible (and unrevised) NCLB achievement mandates instead, states pursue the policy agenda put forth in Race to the Top (Obama, 2012).
In the area of postsecondary education, the Obama Administration has focused its energies on making higher education more affordable and accessible. First, it displaced private lenders in providing guaranteed student loans, moving the federal government back into its historic role. Furthermore, starting in 2014, student loan repayments will be indexed to income, capping the loan repayments of new borrowers at 10% of their annual income. Those graduates who are engaged in public service will have any remaining debt cancelled after 10 years, and everyone else who has lingering debt will have it cancelled after 20 years. Additionally, the number of students receiving Pell Grants—which target low-income college attenders and are not repayable—increased from 6 million students to 9 million students since 2008. And finally, the American Opportunity Tax Credit was extended, which provides $10,000 in tax credits to 9 million students since 2008. And finally, the American Opportunity Tax Credit was extended, which provides $10,000 in tax credits to 9 million students since 2008. And finally, the American Opportunity Tax Credit was extended, which provides $10,000 in tax credits to 9 million students since 2008.

Yet, there have been some notable failures in federal education policy initiatives, most strikingly the ongoing inability to reauthorize NCLB, a failure that now flows across two Presidential administrations. Furthermore, the Obama Administration ran afoul of the courts by requiring that postsecondary institutions meet a threshold of “gainful employment” for their graduates (Stratford, 2012). Although the administration has made great use of symbolic politics—hosting an antibullying summit and occasionally intervening when public school practices fall beyond the pale—when it comes to equity issues on matters of substance, it follows more closely to the former Bush Administration than one would have expected. We’ll have more on this interesting development in a bit.

Romney

Republican Presidential nominee Mitt Romney has released a fairly comprehensive (as these things go) educational platform entitled A Chance for Every Child, which would reshape the major educational initiatives not only of sitting President Barack Obama, but those of former President George W. Bush. To some extent it is a return to traditional GOP Presidential platforms that have called for either eliminating or dramatically reducing the role of the U.S. Department of Education, expanding options for school choice including vouchers (moving towards marketization of a public good), and increasing educational standards for both students and public school educators. The most salient proposal in the Romney education plan is to refocus President Bush’s most prominent domestic policy initiative, NCLB (A Chance for Every Child, 2012). This is not as surprising as it would seem, as NCLB is very unpopular in many GOP circles (see Klein, 2012). That said, Governor Romney’s proposal offers very little guidance regarding holding states accountable for student success and achievement—the centerpiece of NCLB originally. Although the plan makes specific references to the inequitable distribution of educational opportunities of high-quality educational opportunities of many minority and poor children, the proposal does not specifically provide any remedy to this imbalance. Most notably nonexistent in the proposal is any mention or suggested remedy for disproportionate school-level disciplinary consequences for minority and poor children that lead to the school-to-prison pipeline (see Losen & Gillespie, 2012).

The proposal calls for the individual states to administer standardized tests and make results available to parents through “score cards.” Parents then can use these score cards to select the school of their choice. Similarly, the plan calls for supporting expanded educational choice for parents by expanding the current voucher plan for the Washington, DC, schools to national scale, which would include online educational vendors (A Chance for Every Child, 2012). It is a classic market-based approach to public policy.

The agenda also calls for increasing standards for educators and students, though it is generally vague about how to achieve these increases. It does mention moving away from teacher certification, in its place using generically described qualified individuals. Additionally, it calls for the elimination of the “highly qualified” standard that is currently in NCLB, instituting merit pay plans for
Discussion

Whereas Governor Romney basically has served up some long-standing GOP talking points, when it comes to federal education policy and market-based educational reform, the Obama Administration has generally not strayed too far from the Bush Administration’s stances regarding student academic achievement and system accountability. Perhaps the most creative piece of policy making that has come from the current administration is the Race to the Top initiative, which was folded into the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. With the reauthorization of No Child Left Behind stalled at least until after the November election, Race to the Top has been the principal device the Obama Administration has had to implement its policy preferences in primary and secondary education (McGunn, 2012).

That said, the ongoing fallout from the “Great Recession” means that, for this Presidential election, education will not be a priority for either candidate. Much of the political campaign focus will remain on the stubbornly high rates of unemployment and the weak economy. Additionally, after the election, regardless of whom is elected, much will depend upon the results of the Congressional elections. If Obama wins, it is likely that the Congress will remain politically divided, with the House under Republican control and the Senate under Democratic control. If that is the case, we can expect more of what we have seen over the last 4 years: political deadlock on the key educational legislation (NCLB/ESSA) and creative policy making on the part of the Obama Administration to circumnavigate this political impasse.

If Romney wins the Presidential election, the House will probably have a more dominant Republican majority, thanks to the electoral coat tails of the victor, and the Senate membership may or may not tilt towards a GOP majority. Nevertheless, there are deep divisions within the current Republican Party, divisions that are barely papered over. We would expect these differences to become more open and pointed the longer Romney remained in office. Romney’s own political preferences are that of a moderate Republican from New England—preferences that are not congruent with the majority of his own party. It is instructive that the Romney campaign’s white paper, A Chance for Every Child, throws not a single obvious political bone to the Protestant Right, a key component of the national Republican base since 1980. Although the political tension would not be as great as it would be with an Obama Administration, the initial honeymoon could be quite short lived.

Educators and educational scholars who are hoping to return to the “salad days” of Election 2000, when public education was one of the defining issues of the presidential campaign, are surely to be disappointed by Election 2012. But the “education election” was an outlier. Over the course of U.S. history, while presidential aspirants have made promises regarding public education, it has been a tiny concern of the federal government. There are too many national concerns, like the economy and national defense, which must displace it. With hope, the winner of this Presidential election will recognize that without a sustainable plan to provide high-quality education to all children to ensure an educated citizenry, these greater national interests will remain compromised.
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From the Director:
Heightened Attention Placed on Evaluating Educator Preparation

Michelle D. Young

In 2010, the National Research Council released a report, "Preparing Teachers: Building Evidence for Sound Policy," which highlighted the lack of a national data system on educator preparation. Such a lack, the report argued, prevented a significant examination of preparation. Since that time, states and the federal government have been working to develop robust data systems to address this lack, at least in part.

Unlike the National Research Council, the lack of data has not slowed down the pace of regulatory and legislative change concerning educator preparation, licensure, and evaluation. For example, the Race to the Top grant program requires grant winners to create linkages between K-12 students' achievement outcomes, teacher performance, and preparation programs. More recently, the U.S. Department of Education proposed to use the test scores of preparation program graduates to evaluate preparation programs. The suggestion, which was offered during a negotiated rule-making exercise hosted by the U.S. Department of Education, was made with knowledge of the validity challenges involved (Baker et al., 2012). Such a suggestion is consistent with the administration's interest in extending the Race to the Top program from K-12 to higher education (Viadero, 2009; Young & Rorrer, in press).

These proposed initiatives, which have no basis in empirical research (Nelson, Leffler, & Hansen, 2009), are similar to state-level policy directions. Unsurprisingly, diminished state appropriations to higher education have not constrained state officials' demands for performance-based models, which have had limited success so far, are popular with state and federal lawmakers alike (Young & Rorrer, in press). Although the bulk of state policy work has focused on developing teacher and leader evaluation systems, reform efforts are also ramping up around the evaluation and improvement of preparation. The majority of these reform efforts focus on performance and its measurement through more robust data. In support of such efforts, the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) has initiated the Task Force on Educator Preparation. This taskforce, led by current CCSSO President Tom Luna, the state superintendent of Idaho, is supporting CCSSO's efforts in developing a new policy framework for educator preparation that focuses on preparing classroom-ready and leadership-ready teachers and principals. In its current state, the proposal includes a state program approval system that will do the following:

1. Hold programs accountable by exercising the authority invested in the state to determine which programs operate in the state and to identify high-performing programs, low-performing programs, and programs that should no longer admit and graduate students.

2. Assure that educator preparation programs produce quality candidates who are capable of positively impacting student achievement through the development and implementation of standards for teachers and leaders.

3. Ensure the adherence to standards for teachers and leaders.

4. Provide feedback, data, and support to programs to assist them with continuous improvement of their curriculum, clinical practice (which provides the link between theory and practice), and preparation of candidates for lifelong learning and effectiveness in classroom and leadership positions (CCSSO, 2012).

Meanwhile, many states are in the process of developing (or have already developed) longitudinal data systems that track K-12 students' performance and linking those systems to preparation programs. Additionally, some states (e.g., Ohio) are developing and including graduate and employer surveys in their data systems. An important resource entering the arena is the School Leadership Preparation and Practice Surveys (SLPPS). The SLPPS is the result of a collaboration among leading scholars in the field of educational administration. The SLPPS suite of instruments is designed for leadership preparation programs seeking to evaluate their program features, graduate experiences, outcomes, efficacy of their instruction, and the preparedness of their graduates working in educational leadership roles. As such, it would complement the efforts of both preparation programs and states to improve the education and development of school leaders.

Each survey in the SLPPS suite is intended for different respondents and provides a new dimension of information for educational leadership programs. There are four versions of the SLPPS:

1. SLPPS-P gathers information about your educational leadership preparation programs.

2. SLPPS-G gathers information from graduates of your educational leadership programs.

3. SLPPS-PPE gathers information from practicing principals of your educational leadership preparation programs.

4. SLPPS-T gathers information from teachers who currently work for practicing principals of your educational leadership preparation programs.

Responses to these surveys are combined and analyzed to produce a comprehensive and customized report that you can use for program development, improvement, evaluation, and accreditation. Participation in the SLPPS is a great benefit to programs and the educational leadership field generally.

Another recent development with important potential for the field is the new Teacher Performance Assessment (TPA). The TPA, to which there is no counterpart in educational leadership, is currently being piloted in over half the states in the United States (Darling-Hammond, 2012). The TPA is considered a robust assessment of teaching performance. Its results, which have been proven to predict candidate capacity to support student achievement, can be used by preparation programs to strengthen prepara-
tion and by states to strengthen their policies on program approval and licensing. Without question, UCEA and its member faculty must increase efforts around the development of performance assessments. According to Darling-Hammond (2012), it “puts aside the tired arguments about which pathways to teaching are better and, instead, evaluates candidates on whether they can meet a common standard of effective practice.”
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Developing Leaders for Educational Equity and Social Justice:
The Education and Community Leadership Program at Texas State University–San Marcos

Hans W. Klar
Clemson University

This Innovative Programs column features the Education and Community Leadership Program at Texas State University–San Marcos. Texas State was recently promoted to full UCEA membership and was commended for its strong focus on educational equity and social justice in its Master of Education and doctoral programs. Faculty in Texas State’s Department of Counseling, Leadership, Adult Education and School Psychology began redeveloping these programs in 1999, when state standards for principal certification were revised. With regular faculty input, these courses have continued to evolve since then. Today, they are characterized by several guiding principles, namely understanding self, developing school–community connections, maintaining a student-intensive focus, and regular faculty collaboration. These guiding principles are woven into the curriculum and are apparent in the admissions and advising processes.

Admissions

Though admissions processes for the master's and doctoral programs differ, both programs feature a strong emphasis on selecting and developing leaders who are committed to working collaboratively to build healthy schools, communities, and families. Faculty members describe the admissions process for the 36-hour Master of Education with principal certification as “relatively open.” Although students must meet admissions criteria to enter the program, faculty have decided to “err on the side of inclusiveness” rather than screening potential candidates too closely. By admitting those whose priorities are equity and cultural responsiveness, as well as aspiring leaders who “don’t yet know to look for that,” faculty hope to develop as many social justice leaders as possible.

Admission to the PhD program is more selective. However, the emphasis remains on identifying students who demonstrate an awareness of equity issues and an ability to initiate conversations about them. To determine whether potential students have these characteristics, faculty have developed a rigorous, multistep admissions process. After an initial screening based on academic qualifications, promising candidates are invited to campus where they first work in small groups to resolve equity issues in school and community-based case studies. Next, candidates are asked to respond to an article related to equity in schools and communities. Finally, students participate in a series of short interviews with three faculty members. Though this is a time-intensive process, faculty members feel it is a worthwhile practice for both students and faculty. Through the process, students recognize that the program will be intensive, but they also understand that their entrance into the program is being seriously considered.

Student-Intensive Advising

Education and Community Leadership faculty teach and work closely with students in both programs, providing support in class-related activities as well as interacting with students outside the classroom in various ways. Some of these activities include visiting students at their schools, conducting research together, coauthoring papers and copresenting at conferences. Students recognize and appreciate this level of collaboration and regularly seek advice from faculty, even after they have completed their program. A willingness on the part of faculty to closely interact with students is an important factor when hiring new faculty for the program, and candidates for tenure-track positions are asked to include a teaching demonstration as part of their interview process.

Understanding Self First

Students in both the master's and doctoral programs begin their studies by developing a political, cultural, historical, and even physical understanding of themselves and moving outward to an understanding of organizations, people, and environments. In the master's program, students take a course in which they are introduced to the ideas and language of social justice by studying forms of oppression, hegemony, and White privilege. In the doctoral program, students take a similar course in which they are exposed to philosophical frameworks. They use these frameworks to understand their own histories and society. Students in both courses complete an auto ethnography as a demonstration of learning.

Through these beginning courses, all students learn who they are as educators and what their leadership goals are. Both sections of the course have a strong orientation toward understanding educational equity. Though there are many discussions about issues of equity, inclusion, and collaboration in the course, and the program in general, the term “social justice” is not used often. Rather, the focus is more on “doing the right thing.” In this way, faculty believe students consider issues of equity more broadly than the typical distinctions of race, ethnicity, and income class. Faculty also believe taking this course at the beginning of their program allows students to better examine issues of equity in society.
Developing School–Community Connections

In the program, schools are seen as a component of the community, and students are asked to consider the role of the school in supporting the community, rather than what the school needs from the community. As such, another guiding principle of the program is developing the knowledge and skills to foster strong school–community connections. The notion of community also applies to developing positive relationships within schools and is something faculty model for students in the program through their interactions with other faculty.

Assessment Processes

The master’s program consists of a number of points at which students receive formative feedback in the lead up to a culminating project. After completing 12 credit hours, students present a portfolio of work to faculty and their peers. Faculty members then meet together to consider the presentations and determine whether there are any concerns. Following this, faculty meet with students individually to provide constructive feedback. At times, these “honest conversations” may include making arrangements to provide students with intensive support or even counseling students out of the program.

Students in the master’s program also complete a culminating action-research project in their schools during the two-semester internship. In the first half of the project, students identify a problem, gather preliminary data, and conduct a literature review. In the second half of the project, students take responsibility for collaborating with others in the school to implement changes. Students have conversations with their school leaders throughout the process as they learn to negotiate school contexts, gather and share data, work collaboratively, and keep people informed. In completing the project, students also learn how to raise equity issues, even when others may not want to discuss them. The result of the project is a substantive academic paper, which some students have developed into manuscripts and presented at UCEA conferences. Students also often describe this experience when interviewing for administrative positions.

Faculty Collaboration

Faculty suggest that one reason their programs have been sustained for so long is that they have different personalities but work well together because they have a common goal. The faculty is also diverse in terms of members’ perspectives. However, this was intentional, as existing faculty developed job descriptions and recruited other faculty based on the skill sets and perspectives they felt were needed to advance their programs. The goal was not to develop a unified perspective of social justice, but to reach a common goal of developing leaders who can make schools more equitable for children.

For more information about the Education and Community Leadership Program at Texas State University–San Marcos, please contact Dr. Michael O’Malley (mo20@txstate.edu) or Dr. Sarah Nelson (swnelson@txstate.edu) or visit www.txstate.educlas/Educational-Leadership.html
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Point/Counterpoint
Local School Boards: Democracy and Control

Mónica Byrne-Jiménez, Hofstra University

There is nothing more personal than local politics, and none more so than when it comes to our neighborhood schools. Despite national attention on the presidential race, educational mandates and reforms are implemented at the local level with school boards making many of the decisions that affect principals, teachers, and children every day. Yet, in general, little is known about how school boards work, who school board members are, their levels of preparation, or even their purpose. The little media attention given to school boards often focuses on instances of board conflict or corruption. Increasing adoption of parent “trigger” laws, which allow parents to petition the district to overhaul chronically low-performing schools or create a charter school, further highlights issues of local control and pits parents against local boards. The national educational agenda continues to centralize policy and curriculum and, in many respects, to undermine the roles of districts and schools while expecting those same entities to do more with less. In the cacophony that is school control and improvement, school boards are at the center.

To help us understand these issues, we invited Dr. Cooper, Professor at Fordham University, and his colleagues, Drs. Fusarelli and Muth, as well as Drs. Mountford and Alsbury, directors of the UCEA Center for Research on the Superintendency and District Governance, to share their perspectives on the current role of school boards and implications for the future. Drs. Cooper, Fusarelli, and Muth explain some of the challenges that face school boards and some potential “reimaginings” of their role. Drs. Mountford and Alsbury share their findings from the most recent survey of school boards to highlight the importance of maintaining power at the local level. Whether we agree with the need or role of school boards or not, our contributors urge us to become more knowledgeable about them and to foster a critical dialogue in our classrooms and among aspiring leaders. And while we actively engage in the national democratic process this year, we must remember that local democratic processes are, arguably, more important when it comes to shaping teaching and learning in schools.

School Board Members: Democracy and Control

School board members, furthermore, confront these major problem areas with important limitations, some of which are legal-structural, whereas others are more operational and cultural. For school boards are laypeople, elected or selected locally to serve as representatives of their communities, citizens, and neighborhoods and subgroups. Yet local school boards also have “little to no constitutional authority or responsibility over education” (Ryan, 2004, p. 43). When seeking to understand what board members value, a survey of board members for the National School Boards Association asked,

What issues do local board members view as most pressing? Respondents universally report that questions of funding and student achievement are topics of “significant” or “moderate” local concerns. . . . Board members’ emphasis [on] student achievement, in particular, appears to have grown significantly during the 1990s. (Hess, 2002, p. 11)

Thus, often without much preparation or personal expertise, school board members must address the problems discussed below, some of which have been around since citizen school boards were created and some emerging in the recent years.

Current Problems

Being laypersons among lawmakers and other professionals. First, school board members represent their constituents. Doing so, they operate with authority over a team of professionals (Mountford, 2004), including the local school superintendent, principals, teachers, and a range of other full-time educators and civil servants. These differences in expertise and authority can create natural and continuous conflict over processes, procedures, and outcomes.

Sometimes, board members use their positions (particularly in larger districts) as a stepping stone to run for higher office, as has been common in New York City, Boston, and many other large metropolitan areas, plus larger county school districts. For example, in Wake County in Raleigh, North Carolina, an outspoken board member with no significant educational background is running for state school superintendent.

Dividing democratic representation and expertise. Second, school boards try vainly to work as representatives of a segment or all of the community when voting and acting on highly technical and often legal issues. These include annual budgets, contracts for work, and job descriptions for a range of people to hire and fire. Boards are often evaluating and supporting programs that may have lifelong effects on children but about which the members may have only limited knowledge. Sarason (1995) asserted that he has “never known a board member, however bright, motivated and well-intentioned, who sought actively to acquire knowledge about the substance of the important educational issues” (p. 10). Thus, the gap between expertise and lay control is compounded, as in most governmental settings.

Changing time and ability of local citizens. Traditionally, school board members were chosen as high-status members of the community. Historically, men were more likely to be board members than women, but that has changed. Now, everyone is so busy
that all board members are overburdened and tempted not to run for office more than once. In other settings such as Congress or state legislatures, representatives are paid salaries and often work as congressmen or senators full time. Thus, school board members may seek office when they have special issues to address or serve in retirement—or are truly committed to the welfare of their local school community.

Perhaps future school board members will be “electronic members,” working with one another and their superintendent and teachers increasingly online. Such “virtual school boards” might make it easier to communicate and “get together,” but virtual meetings are unlikely to reduce meeting time; the real pressures of doing business, often defined as crises; or the sense that volunteerism occupies more and more evenings each week.

Joining city government. School boards have been central to local, democratic, public schools since Colonial days, when communities created the so-called “village school” for children in their area (Campbell, Cunningham, Nystrand, & Usdan, 1990). True, the world is much more complex—and teachers and administrators have much more to do now to make schools work—but “representativeness” is still important to most communities.

We could see these boards disappearing occasionally, as public schooling becomes part of the local government, under the auspices of the mayor, city councils, county councils, or other appropriate decision-making groups. This shift has already happened in some major cities. New York City, for example, closed down its 31 local community school boards, each with its own appointed local superintendents, to provide more power to the locals. But the costs were high, so the school board became part of the mayor’s office, and 31 school-governing bureaucracies became one single (somewhat smaller) system. The mayor now appoints the school chancellor to run the city’s school system, and democratic control has shifted upward to City Hall. Money was saved, and lines of control have become clearer. The nation’s largest teachers’ and administrators’ unions, for example, now appeal directly to the chancellor and the mayor for money and programs. Was the “voice of the people” lost in the reorganization? Did democracy take a dive as education was gobbled up by city government? Does or will this make a difference in outcomes for students? We don’t know.

Having one state system. Currently, Hawai’i is the nation’s most centralized state school district, run by one state board. All decisions are made by the governor, the state school board, and the state superintendent in Honolulu and passed downward (and outward) to the local schools throughout the state’s islands. The Hawaii State Teachers Association negotiates contracts and handles contractual problems affecting all its membership across the state.

So, the American school system, with over 16,000 local district school units and 100,000 school board members (Land & Stringfield, 2005), ranges from a single statewide system in Hawai’i to county-wide, regional, and local districts in the other states. Each district has its own elected or appointed board to ensure some voice for the people. As educational funding has moved from local to the state levels (except in states like New Hampshire that mainly depend on local property taxes with a small state budget), the amount from states generally is larger now than the local inputs, with only about 10% of funding coming from federal sources.

More Alternatives

Alternatives to current patterns do exist. Some, such as appointed boards, are growing, as is interest in more local control, as demonstrated by charter-school governance. Others, such as “professional” boards, are untested.

Appointing school boards, not electing them. Growing interest has arisen in simply appointing members of the school board, much as corporations select their boards of directors from outstanding candidates in their field. Today, nevertheless, about 95% of school boards are locally elected, differences mostly depending on district size (the larger the district, the more likely the board members are to be appointed to office). Appointing board members has the patina of ensuring expertise, but appointed boards, too, have their partisan differences. And expertise may come at the cost of diminished representation. School boards, even appointed, still must work closely with the management team, as the American Association of School Administrators has urged in a study of board–superintendent relations (see Cooper, Fusarelli, & Carella, 2000).

Moving boards to the school level. Another step, which would remove the board mostly from dealing with the superintendent, would be to push control to the school-site level, as do our nation’s growing numbers of charter schools and private schools. Each school would be a self-governing entity, responsive to its children, teachers, administrators, and parents. Thus, a school board would work in a school, looking out for its needs and applying for resources to the local funding agency.

Building a professional model. Another approach might be to use governance similar to that of professional societies and groups. Medical delivery systems, such as hospitals, elect or appoint specialists to their boards and often are governed by doctors and other experts. In a more professional model, school decision makers could select their best leaders to run the school district, putting the most knowledgeable people in charge.

Conclusion

It certainly is not so clear at this point in our history what the future may hold. The days of the village school and the local board of education may be waning in our new, highly mobile, interconnected world with education critically at its center.

In conclusion, a couple of things are clear. First, school boards are not going anywhere, and mayoral control of schools will be limited to larger school districts. Second, some suggest following the charter school model, whereby each school has its own governing board. But can each school “make it on its own,” or do we still need a well-organized system with a strong school board–superintendent relationship? If so, what compels the continuation of this model besides inertia?

For nothing is simple in the United States, as our education system is as diverse as our nation, with the roles of and relationships among, the board of education, the local superintendent, city or county council, and state all being so different. Emerging may be new models of school board function, location, and relations with the management of the school—but it’s not clear which system will prevail and work at this point in our history. The com-
plexities of funding, coupled with the sheer size of our educational system (unlike, for example, Finland, which is roughly the size of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg, North Carolina, school district), make such suggestions wildly impractical.

Finally, most superintendents get along well with their locally elected school boards. Repeated American Association of School Administrator studies, as well as other national surveys (Cooper et al., 2000), consistently have found that the vast majority of superintendents report “good” to “very good” relations with their school board members. Why change something that probably works from a governance perspective? Even so, trying other governance models, as is happening already, may lead us to better ways to ensure that all children learn well.
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School Boards: Nobody Does it Better

Meredith Mountford, Florida Atlantic University
Thomas Alsbury, Seattle Pacific University

School board governance, a unique and complex form of local control over educational policy, historically has been one of the most envied systems of educational governance in the world. Ironically, beginning in the early 1980s, as other countries began to emulate the American system of educational governance, moving their educational policy decisions closer to the local level and further from their central governments, the United States began doing just the opposite, moving the control of educational policy from local level to state and federal levels (Gweertz, 2012). This shift toward centralization of educational governance in the United States is easily evidenced by large-scale reforms such as the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), Common Core Standards, and standardized statewide assessments. Despite the fact the federal government all but outright admitted the abysmal failure of NCLB, rather than repealing some its mandates and programs, states were made to apply for waivers that required a commitment to develop and implement the same policies and programs NCLB pushed in the first place (Common Core, Teacher and Leader Value Added Evaluation Systems, etc.). This subsequently maintained (or strengthened) the federal government’s authority over educational policy, thereby staking final claim to where power over educational policy in America currently resides. Despite the Founding Fathers’ intent to maintain power over educational policy at the local level and despite the fact that local control over education is written in the Bill of Rights, the federal government clearly controls educational policy today, while the highest performing countries in the world continue their shift away from it. Is yet another “manufactured crisis” leading educational reform?

Simply the Best

Data from the most recent national and international surveys (see Alsbury & Mountford, 2011, 2012) have shown that school board members represent an excellent cross-section of Americans who have all but completely disappeared from the policy arena. With support from the Wallace Foundation, our UCEA Research Center collaborated with the National School Boards Association, Iowa School Boards Association, and the Fordham Foundation and surveyed all school board members from across the United States during the spring of 2010 (see Alsbury & Mountford, 2011; Alsbury, Mountford, & Dellegardelle, forthcoming; Hess & Meeks, 2010). Demographically speaking, we were able to produce a snapshot of who sits in school board seats today, although some figures may vary due to varying state statutes. Generally, 75% of board members are elected and the other 25% are appointed. About 81% of board members are White, 12% Black, and 3% Hispanic. The percentages of minority members serving in large urban districts are much higher than in nonurban contexts. Women on school boards have not yet quite reached the 50% mark, but their numbers are growing; now at 44% from 38% ten years ago. Men occupy roughly 56% of the board. Politically, 32% of board members identify themselves as conservatives, 21% as liberals, and the remaining half as moderates.

Board members are generally much more highly educated than the general population of Americans, with 75% holding bachelor’s degrees, exceeding the only 30% of adults holding bachelor’s degrees in the general population. Further, over half report holding advanced degrees. The two most common professions among those surveyed are business and education, composing 60% of all member occupations.

The findings belie rhetoric that board members today are uneducated, are inexperienced, and do not represent a pluralistic cross-section of the American population. School board governance is a unique and complex system of educational governance: a system of governance that requires concerned, well-educated citizens to act as a check-and-balance system over the superintendent, state, and federal policy agents. However, the recent shift of control over educational decisions from the local level to the federal level, most often brokered by state agencies, threatens to strip the public school boards and community members of their democratic right to participate in community-driven educational policy development. As a result, many board members report a diminished decision-making
Taking it Back: What Will it Take?

Interestingly, the research we conducted with school board members and superintendents from across the United States indicated that the biggest obstacles to improving student achievement in their local districts were the normally underfunded reform mandates being mandated from the state and federal government (Alsbury et al., forthcoming). Similarly, many board members expressed extreme frustration with the underresearched and narrow list of specific programs, handpicked by the state, to achieve new federal policies.

Negative and misleading media coverage of school boards and sound bites from the business sector complaining that educators have not prepared students for the workforce further undermine the work of school boards. In reality, the mission of public schools and universities in America has never been to train students for “the workforce.” That is simply impossible, given the vast skill set that would need to be taught to meet that objective effectively.

Instead, the mission of schools is to produce citizens capable of being involved participants of a democratic and self-governing society. Ironically, as control of education has shifted to the federal level, assessments outside of rote-recall state assessments, particularly those of students who were kindergarteners when NCLB was implemented, consistently demonstrate products of America’s education system are actually moving further and further away from that objective, due to a lack of critical thinking skills that would, in fact, allow them to be involved participants of a democracy.

School boards are intended to be nonpartisan and apolitical, yet this, too, is in jeopardy. Much of what is written on school boards (see, for example, Chester Finn or Rick Hess) may lead one to believe that most school board members serve on school boards mainly to advance or push single or hidden agendas, to profit from corporate contract bids, or to advance politically. However, research has shown that the biggest obstacles to improving student achievement are urgent priorities.

The time has come to focus on wider reaching issues. Rather than nit-picking over occasional functionality problems that can hamper some school boards, we should be concerned over the diminishing of democratic rights to govern our schools at the community or state level. Certainly, new training and professional accountability measures are needed to improve ineffective boards, including revisioning the role and responsibilities of school board members. However, improved governance cannot be realized without less apathy, less compliance, and much more support from the community at large, who first must honestly decide if they believe educational governance belongs at the local level.
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Call for Nominees
2013 Excellence in Educational Leadership Award
Deadline: March 1, 2013

The Award
The UCEA Executive Committee is asking for nominees for the 17th Annual Educational Leadership Award, in recognition of practicing school administrators who have made significant contributions to the improvement of administrator preparation. This distinguished school administrator should demonstrate an exemplary record of supporting school administrator preparation efforts. This award, one of national recognition, provides a unique mechanism for UCEA universities to build goodwill and recognize the contributions of practitioners to the preparation of educational leaders. Funds to establish the Educational Leadership Award were originally donated to UCEA by the Network of University Community School Districts, a consortium of school districts in university towns. However, UCEA now fully funds this important initiative.

The Procedure
The UCEA Plenum Representative (PSR) at each participating university should consult with colleagues and other constituencies designated by faculty to identify a worthy recipient. The PSR (or a designee) should plan to make the award presentation at an annual departmental, college, or university ceremony. The nomination deadline is March 1, 2013.

After that time, UCEA will provide official certificates of recognition to universities who have designated a recipient and publish the names of the award recipients and their sponsoring university in the UCEA Review. Additionally, recipients’ names will be placed on the UCEA mailing list for 1 year. If desired, UCEA also will provide a boilerplate press release for announcing the award recipient to news agencies; however, the university may choose to coordinate this announcement through its public relations office in order to include additional information about the award presentation. To nominate a candidate, please complete the Nomination Form found on our website: http://www.ucea.org/the-excellence-in-educational/
Conquering Problems in U.S. Education

LB: When discussing the state of education in the United States, researchers cite many problems with the U.S. education system that prevent us from achieving our goals. In your opinion, what are the main problems in education that we should be focusing on as centers for leadership preparation?

CR: There is a wide range of problems cited by researchers and others. In my opinion, many of these items can be diversions that take our attention away from what is really important, and we need to be cautious about falling into this way of thinking. I want to be clear so that this comment is not misconstrued. I am definitely not saying that there are not real problems that need to be “outed” and addressed, such as educational inequities, racism and lack of tolerance for others, limited learning opportunities due to test-focused curriculum and inadequate funding, loss of public trust in our educational enterprise, poor working and learning conditions for students and educators, and an overemphasis on competition rather than cognitively challenging and meaningful learning. What I am saying is that as a nation, we seem to have forgotten the importance of being responsible for others beyond our own self-interests and the need (and obligation) to contribute to a greater good.

LB: So what would you list as the major impediments to us reaching our educational goals?

CR: If I had to narrow the list down to one major underlying problem that keeps us from attaining our goals as a nation, I would say that we have lost our focus on the purpose of public education as the great equalizer. Public education is a civil right and it is the bedrock of a strong nation. We need public education to be less focused on preparing young people for competitive, market-driven outlets and spend more time focusing on preparing well-rounded, engaged, socially responsible, critical-thinking citizens. In my view, the purpose of education is to produce an educated, democratic, caring, and compassionate citizenry. We need to instill a sense of responsibility to and for each other rather than focusing on satisfying self-interests alone.

LB: How do you believe our focus on competition impacts the way we approach problems in education?

CR: When discussing education, policy makers and many researchers often take a deficit perspective and focus on what they claim we are not doing. As a nation, we have become adept at pointing the finger at others so that problems are the fault of big business, parents, society, the schools, the teachers, or the students. We definitely have our issues. We struggle with inequities, and there are some poor teachers and leaders, but we also have positive things happening in many public schools. I know this probably sounds overly simplistic, but I believe we need to learn to balance the competing tensions of addressing important issues while not losing sight of the very positive aspects of our educational systems. Being overly critical and forgetting to celebrate successes furthers deficit-oriented, reactionary, stop-gap thinking and policy making. We need to remember why our public schools are important to us as a nation and that the proper functioning of our educational systems is essential to our ability to reach our goal of having an educated, democratic, caring, and compassionate citizenry who can also be globally competitive.

We need to reclaim our role and value as educators, and especially as educational leaders.

LB: In consideration of current educational policies (including Race to the Top, NCLB reform, or others you’d like to include), what do you view to be the country’s educational goals?

CR: Again, I believe that most of our recent policies and are birthed out of big-business interests and fear.

LB: Which would naturally create an environment of inequality and leave some children behind.

CR: Right! International comparisons are looking at math and science scores. What they are portraying is unrealistic, much like comparing apples and oranges. We are often compared to Finland, which is a homogeneous population that does not have the diversity we do. They are a much smaller nation with pretty much a one-race people and a common focus. Another overlooked factor when we are compared with Finland is that the focus of their policies is on building people up, rather than tearing them down like so many of our policies tend to do. Finland has a strong focus on providing professional development to help people grow professionally. We also need to focus on building capacity at all levels—teachers, leaders, and professors—rather than devaluing these professions by allowing undereducated, unqualified people to play these roles. Our current policy climate seems to devalue intellect while simul-
people in place. are not competitive because they don’t have those structures and would need the infusion of funding the most. Yet, their proposals resource adequacy are often the very states and communities that agendas were beneficial, which is questionable, it is still a reality specific policy agendas. If one were to assume that these policy tion. States compete against each other for funding to address very country. Race to the Top is one such policy premised on competi- tion tend to create greater divides and inequities within our own state or even international levels. I think we need to work together on our problems rather than compete against each other. I don’t mean to sound Pollyanna or like there are not real issues with our education system, but policies should be focused on the original central goals of education: the development of a democratic, educated, caring, and compassionate citizenry. We’ll be more productive as a country if we do this.

Our nation’s Number 1 priority seems to be remaining globally competitive, yet the ways we address this emphasis on competition tend to create greater divides and inequities within our own country. Race to the Top is one such policy premised on competition. States compete against each other for funding to address very specific policy agendas. If one were to assume that these policy agendas were beneficial, which is questionable, it is still a reality that the states and communities lacking in infrastructure and human resource adequacy are often the very states and communities that would need the infusion of funding the most. Yet, their proposals are not competitive because they don’t have those structures and people in place.

Acknowledging and Accepting Responsibility

LB: As UCEA president, what do you view as the responsibility of our organization in achieving these educational goals and toward improving education in general?

CR: As an organization we have a responsibility to remind policy makers and others about the true purposes of public education; the importance of high-quality teachers and leaders; and the need for equitable, ethical, and just policies that enhance opportunities for all children rather than furthering inequities and divides. We also have a responsibility to conduct and share powerful, meaningful research about what works and to do so in ways in which our efforts are directly applied in real-life situations that can serve as examples of the positive difference that can be made. Further, it is our responsibility to identify commonality of purpose with others and forge alliances and coalitions with these groups and individuals in order to increase our capacity to advocate for what is needed. Strong educational leaders are essential. As an organization focused on quality leadership preparation, we need to do all we can to hold others and ourselves accountable for “knowing and doing” quality leadership. We need to engage in meaningful research; make that research accessible; and become strong, well-organized, well-informed, and collaborative advocates.

LB: How can educational leadership programs get us back to education's original purposes?

CR: We need to get folks to think about what our purposes for public education really are. Yes, getting folks to look at goals related to global competitiveness is also important, but we must encour-

age our students to engage in research that has practical applications for schools now and in the immediate future, looking at “what works.” We already do plenty of this type of research, but we need to put rigorous “what works research” out there in less traditional venues—publishing in places that not only we see, but in places where other stakeholders and parents might come across our work. In addition to research journals, we need to publish in magazines, newspapers, and in blogs that educators, policy makers, and citizens in general would read.

LB: What should be the goals of the leaders in our leadership preparation programs (practicing administrators) in these efforts?

CR: We, and the leaders we prepare, need to be more proactive about the messages we send regarding the importance and quality of public education and the roles of strong leaders. We live in a sound-bite world, and we need to be ever mindful of the message our various audiences will take away from our interactions and publications. This is certainly not to say that we should not tackle difficulties. Where there are issues and inequities, we need to identify those and work to resolve them. But, where there are strengths, we need to be equally vigilant about proactively touting those strengths and the importance of public educators and public education.

LB: How can UCEA professors support leaders and other stakeholders in U.S. education in achieving these goals?

CR: We can continue to produce and share our publications, such as the UCEA Utilization Briefs. We can also make sure we’re educated on policies ourselves in order to provide students and others with information that is accurate and current. We also need to be mindful as an organization and to continue to be clear about what our goals are as an organization.

We need to emphasize to our school or district-based leaders that they need to be spokespersons and advocates for education or schools. They need to remind people of how important their jobs are, rather than bemoaning the teachers who are not doing their job. Yes, principals can and should advocate for themselves and rally resources, but they need to be careful and consider who our audiences are in different situations. Sometimes we are our own worst enemies when we complain about things but don’t offer solutions. We have to be careful to offer hope about the strengths of our educational systems while balancing that hopefulness with a realistic view of what areas and structures still need to be challenged and addressed.

The Impact of the U.S. Presidential Election on Education Policy

LB: In which direction do you see education policy going if President Obama is re-elected? If Mitt Romney is elected, do you anticipate differences?

CR: The Romney-Ryan education agenda appears to be strongly pro-business and based on market principles of competition. It calls for tying federal monies to reforms that would expand parental choice, eliminating some certification requirements so that noneducators could become teachers, and promoting "innovations" such as charter and digital schools. For example, there is strong emphasis on overhauling the teaching profession and "choice" to the point where Title I and IDEA funds could be used to pay for private schooling options. Jeb Bush wrote an introduction to Romney’s education plan. In this introduction, Bush talked about the
need to shift from Washington-mandated reforms to state-driven efforts where “states [will be] serving as laboratories of democracy in competition with one another.” Additionally, higher education would be competing more with the private sector, and financial aid would be less available for those who need it most. Ryan’s budget plan would decimate public and PK-12 and higher education as we know it. Many of the proposals in this plan are in close alignment with similar calls being made by the American Legislative Exchange Council, and that concerns me greatly.

Obama’s policies, such as Race to the Top, Educate to Innovate (STEM), and NCLB Flexibility plans, are competitive and require states to already have human resources and infrastructure in place in order to be competitive for funding, so it is likely that the states and communities most in need of assistance are least likely to receive it through these types of programs. I do agree that we need a stronger alignment along the PK-20 pipeline and that as educators we need to assume some responsibility for ensuring that our graduates are well prepared both as citizens and for careers. Both the Romney-Ryan and Obama-Biden plans focus on preparing people for careers and emphasize the need for our country to be globally competitive. The primary differences that I see between the two plans are the underlying assumptions and understandings about why education is important. Our current Vice-President’s wife, Jill Biden, is a community college English teacher and as such likely has a deeper understanding about the value and importance of education. In my opinion, although I disagree with some initiatives, the Obama-Biden team tends to be more supportive of teachers and school leaders and recognizes the need to address inequities in our educational systems. The Romney-Ryan focus appears to be more individualistic and “winner oriented,” assuming that capitalism will facilitate access for those who are interested, that “winners” will rise to the occasion, and that not everyone needs to have access to the same types of opportunities.

Educational Leaders as Translators, Transducers, and Transmitters

LB: Politics is a sensitive subject, and the programs suggested by candidates President Obama and Mitt Romney can be confusing. What role should we play in correctly disseminating the messages put out regarding the candidate’s plans for education?

CR: We need to pay attention to what politicians are saying, what they are not saying, and the underlying assumptions behind their statements. Politicians from both sides of the political landscape are using the same language to say very different things. We are in a position to help translate this language—language that can be confusing to parents and other laypeople. We need to look beyond the words and the rhetoric to actions and where the funding to support initiatives is coming from. Super PACS make tracking funding more of a challenge, but it can still be done. In general, the Romney-Ryan campaign is funded by big corporations and right-wing organizations, whereas the Obama-Biden campaign tends to be funded by “average” citizens, unions, and others. This funding flow is reflective of the basic philosophical underpinnings and future actions of each platform.

LB: What can we (members of UCEA) be doing to position ourselves to aid in the improvement of U.S. education by way of implementing improved policies—regardless of whom is elected?

CR: We can produce more engaged research, which means applying the research in authentic settings, publishing and disseminating important findings in nontraditional venues, and getting the work to those who can best use it. We need to raise our voices. Rigorous, careful analyses of policy proposals before they become mandated may help to reframe some mandates and policies. We can also continue to engage in quality teaching and to do a better job of publicizing our positive influence. We need to hold each other accountable, and serving as critical friends to each other’s programs may help us to strengthen university programs as we learn best practices from each other and then implement those practices. We also need to work on building relationships and alliances focused on advocacy and proactive efforts within UCEA and with organizations whose missions are complementary to that of our organization. And, we need to build and nurture relationships with others, even when we don’t need something from them. Volunteering to serve on task forces and commissions is a potential avenue for increasing our influence. Our responsibility as an organization includes digging into the assumptions behind proposed policies, and I think our two new Associate Directors for Policy will help to lead this charge. Most importantly, we all need to remain actively engaged and vigilant.

Additionally, we need to watch our language and our messages. We need to speak positively about our programs to anyone who will listen: the community, state departments of education, our deans and upper level administrators, and other departments in the university. Our proactive messages about why we are necessary and relevant in today’s policy climate should be broadcast widely, using multiple media approaches.

Hope for the Future Through Strategic Networks

LB: Do you believe we at UCEA can influence future policy? What do you believe would be necessary for us to positively impact U.S. education?

Explore UCEA Online

Quality Leadership Matters: www.ucea.org/
Webinar Series: www.ucea.org/webinar/
Publications: www.ucea.org/publications/
UCEA Review Archive: www.ucea.org/ucea-review1/
UCEA Membership Directory: http://curry.virginia.edu/uccamembership/
Graduate Student Resources & Development: www.ucea.org/graduate-student-development/

www.ucea.org
CR: Absolutely!

- First, we need a focused effort on developing and disseminating policy briefs and policy statements.
- Second, increased effort to develop and nurture collaborations focused on common concerns will help to increase our influence potential.
- Third, having increased emphasis on areas of commonality with other groups that allow us to build alliances and compacts will develop a stronger base for advocacy.
- Fourth, we need to invest in having an increased visibility in Washington, DC, and state-level policy circles as well as taking on leadership roles in organizing policy-related conferences. If we set agendas rather than only react to others’ agendas, I believe we can accomplish so much more than we are currently able to do.

LB: What immediate goals do you have for our organization during this politically charged year?

CR: I am excited about offering my full support to UCEA’s two new Associate Directors for Education Policy (Shaneka Williams, University of Georgia, and Ed Fuller, Penn State University) and UCEA’s collective efforts to increase our influence on policy and leadership. I see this as an opportunity to increase the bandwidth and power of our voice as an organization. An election year opens windows of opportunity for us to contribute to the dialogues taking place and to begin new dialogues.

I am also excited about our focused efforts on developing leadership capacity. We are taking a pipeline approach toward empowering the organization by having special sessions arranged for new faculty, graduate students, program coordinators, and current or aspiring deans.

Another exciting effort is our organization’s increased activity related to developing international research, learning opportunities, and collaborative ventures. Associate Director Bruce Barnett continues to be a driving force in this effort, and there are exciting opportunities and sessions planned for our 2012 convention that will help to expand this important work.

We are also taking steps to develop collaborations with other organizations with common concerns, such as the Council of Academic Deans from Research Education Institutions (CADREI), and the American Association of Colleges of Teacher (and Leader) Education (AACTE), and others. You should notice evidence of these efforts, along with opportunities to become involved, at the 2012 UCEA Convention.

LB: If you could make any requests of member UCEA institutions or leadership preparation programs, what would they be?

CR: As discussed in the last question, I would like us to be even more intentional about developing leadership capacity within our organizational ranks—for example, having role-alike sessions at the 2012 conference for program coordinators and sitting and aspiring deans. These types of sessions are also intended to increase participation rates of deans and department heads in UCEA’s work. This additional effort may help ensure their deeper understanding of our organization’s relevance and importance to their universities. We are also increasing graduate student opportunities in UCEA. To make these efforts successful, we need everyone to strongly encourage their dean, department head, program coordinator, faculty, and students to attend the conference and to get and remain involved in UCEA’s work. We, as UCEA member institutions, need to see ourselves as teammates rather than competitors. UCEA, through our efforts to involve others, can help to break down silos and walls. We need to step outside our comfort zones and to see our work as leaders within our own organizations but also within broader communities. Involve your university leadership when possible—keep them well informed and let them know how important your programs are and how talented your graduates are. Be proactive about collecting and using data to make informed decisions and be proactive about publicizing successes.

If I could make additional requests of our UCEA membership, I would ask that everyone be vigilant, engaged, and vocal, particularly during this election period and 1st year of the Presidency—no matter who is elected. As UCEA members, we all must pay attention to the emerging narratives—both espoused and silent—and be proactive. We must anticipate what is coming next and be prepared. For example, pay attention to the American Legislative Exchange Council’s “10 Questions Legislators Should Ask About Higher Education”—know how to answer these questions, but also be anticipating the next round of questions and addressing those issues even before the questions are posed. If we are prepared and proactive, then we will be empowered to be the trendsetters.

As Malu Gonzalez taught us [in a past UCEA Presidential Address], we must be boundary spanners. In today’s policy environment that means we must pay attention to the entire PK-20 agenda in education and be able to work in PK-12 and higher education environments. I hope that UCEA members will get and stay involved in UCEA policy, research, publications, and best-practice initiatives. There is a great deal of work to be done, and there is a place for everyone who wants to join these efforts!

---

1. If you are a UCEA faculty member and you plan to use articles from one of UCEA’s journals or any of the Sage Education journals in your courses, your students can download a pdf of each article for free through the UCEA members-only section of the website. Contact your Plenum Session Representative or UCEA headquarters for the members-only login information, then:

   1. Go to www.ucea.org
   2. On the left-hand side, click on “Members Only.”
   3. Type in the username and the password.
   4. Then, the student can select the journal or publisher collection to access individual article pdfs.

   www.ucea.org/publications

---

Using Publications From EAQ, JCEL, or JRLE in Your Courses?

If you are a UCEA faculty member and you plan to use articles from one of UCEA’s journals or any of the Sage Education journals in your courses, your students can:

1. Go to www.ucea.org
2. On the left-hand side, click on “Members Only.”
3. Type in the username and the password.
4. Then, the student can select the journal or publisher collection to access individual article pdfs.

www.ucea.org/publications
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1 See this Review, p. 34
Call for proposals to host the

Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership

Guidelines for Submitting Proposals

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

Proposals for this editorship must include the following materials:

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

Key Questions

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

UCEA Headquarters
University of Virginia College of Education
405 Emmett St.
Charlottesville, VA 22904
(434) 243-1041

Contributions Requested of Host Institution

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

Estimated Annual Costs for Hosting JCEL

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

The *Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership* publishes, in electronic format, peer-reviewed cases appropriate for use in programs that prepare educational leaders. Building on a long tradition, the University Council for Education Administration sponsors this journal in an ongoing effort to improve administrative preparation. The journal’s editorial staff seeks a wide range of cases that embody relevant and timely presentations of issues germane to the preparation of educational leaders.
Part 2: A Conversation on Political Imagination and Advocacy for Educational Leadership

Miguel Guajardo, Texas State University–San Marcos
Francisco Guajardo, University of Texas Pan American
John Oliver, Texas State University–San Marcos
Mónica M. Valadez, Texas State University–San Marcos
Karon Henderson, Texas State University–San Marcos
Lia O’Neill Keawe, University of Hawai‘i–Manoa

Framing the Conversation

This document, the second in a three-part series on advocacy and educational leadership, speaks to advocacy as a product of a broad-based awareness, well-developed skills, and action grounded in a political framework. The political framework is fueled by an established consciousness that informs our individual and collective political imagination. We ground this imagination not as a homogeneous phenomenon, but as one framed by personal ontology and local ecology (see M. Guajardo, 2012, in the Summer 2012 UCEA Review Point/Counterpoint). The development and construction of our political imagination requires awareness of self, a set of skills, and a willingness to take calculated risks encouraged by curiosity. For educational leaders these actions are not about being busy or the next issue on the checklist; these actions should be deliberate and purposefully identified to impact the public good and enhance the quality of life in schools and communities.

The educational development process of school and community leaders is one this team of educators has explored together during the past decade. It has been a sustained conversation nurtured as siblings, friends, mentors, colleagues, parents, educators, and community change agents. At its core the work is informed by the ontologies of the home, which for most meant unlearning and relearning ways of knowing as we traversed from the comforts of our private lives to dynamic public spheres as educators. The shift in mental and physical ecology is the space explored in this document. Becoming a public person and an advocate for children, families, and learning communities requires skills that bridge the personal ontologies with the historical, biological, cultural, political, and pedagogical realities of our schools and communities. Integral to this development is an understanding of the self as an educational leader. The leader then becomes the researcher, the instrument for measure, the learner, teacher, cultural worker, and political agent. Through a dialogical format we delve into stories we find instructive in the learning spaces of higher education—the stories highlight strategies we continuously field test in our personal work as teachers, community educators and builders, and agents for change. We use tools to mediate strategies between ourselves, our ways of knowing, and our histories. The relationships we have built create a framework for the development of educational leaders as public advocates. As we tell our stories, the stuff of organizations, schools, communities, relationships, and systems emerges.

The goal is to be descriptive, dialogical, provocative, and inviting to a process for developing the agency of educators. We employ the circle process to tell our stories, which we use as data sets. The analysis is collective, political, and grounded in a pedagogical framework. We go around the circle twice: first with introductory comments on how we came to this metaphorical space of the political imagination as educational leaders, then to tell a specific story describing an aspect of our advocacy work. One Latina, a White woman, an African American male, a Kanaka Maoli1 woman, and two Latinos bring their stories to this dialogical space to reflect on their own political imagination and the possibilities for developing the advocacy of educational leaders. See Figure 1.

Introduction of Selves: First Circle

Monica: Raising a Mexican immigrant family within a largely White and often unwelcoming community did not come without psychological and emotional turmoil for mis papás, my siblings, and me. Politically savvy in broader contexts within our homeland, the political imagination of mis papás became more concentrated within our local school and community settings. Absent of the physical presence of family, friends, and community, their agency shifted from raising awareness in collaboration with those whom we left behind, to raising a critical awareness within the minds and souls of their children. Mi mamá would frequently remind me that I should not squander away gifts and knowledge. Nor should I utilize these solely for personal advancement, but rather in communion with those of my siblings and of our community. It would be our charge to continue that mind and soul quest to uncover and challenge oppressive systems and practices. Years later, I continue

---

1 People whose ancestors were the first peoples of the Hawaiian archipelago.
to stand firmly in the presence of the commitment and promise kept by mis papás as a community teacher, learner, and leader.

Karon: Most of my life, I have been a rule follower. I obeyed my parents, teachers, husband, and administrators in schools where I taught. I aligned my beliefs to match a patriarch … no questions asked. When my life was rearranged due to divorce, I began to question things. I realized I was hanging on to what “others” in my life believed in and was trying to fit in by either agreeing or by having no opinion. I avoided conflict. The roots were deep. I was raised to be subservient. Living life as an independent woman and single mother shook me right out of my Stepford Wives mode and lead me down a path of self-renewal and continuous reflection on what I believed to be important. As I began to see the world through my own eyes informed by the social, political, and economic impact of schools, I started advocating for the rights of those whose voice may not be heard, peeling back the layers of the establishment in general and the institution of schooling in particular.

Francisco: We were raised by a father who went up to the fourth grade in rural Mexico and a mother also raised in rural Mexico but with no access to formal schooling. They’re close to 80 now, and my father has emerged during the past 25 years as one of my most able research partners, as he assisted me first when I taught high school and now in higher education with my college students in identifying the right kind of research topics, in finding the elders in the community to interview for pertinent research projects. My mother plays an equally important role, as she typically warms up interviewees through preinterview conversation that consistently sets just the right tone and feel.

Paying attention to my parents, to elders in the community, and to the lives of my students has helped me gain a keener awareness of my role as researcher. It is how I’ve understood my role as advocate, activist, and political player. My political imagination comes from my understanding that my upbringing as a Mexican immigrant and my training in higher education come together to engender a political imagination that shapes my consciousness in everything I do.

John: My sense of advocacy was established through my parents’ stories about their experiences growing up in the Jim Crow South. I remember asking, “Then what did you do?” I enjoyed hearing how they demonstrated calculated resistance and perpetual resiliency to survive and excel in a discriminatory and racist social system. Their stories frequently focused on action they took to overcome. Rarely did they give much breath to the antagonist of the story. Instead, their stories carried the prevailing themes centered on a belief in God and the importance of helping others. They shared that many times the things that happen will be unfair, unjust, and unexpected. They would tell me, “You can only control your own actions. Make sure you do, what you know is right.” This sense of advocacy was refined through interactions with my siblings, my school peers, and members in community.

Miguel: We hold our parents’ contribution to our development in high regard; from them, we learned about the good and the bad, and every experience became an opportunity to learn. Our parents do not speak English, yet they raised four Mexican boys who earned all kinds of higher education degrees. But the most powerful lessons they taught us are those of the heart, soul, and relationships. There is no rubric for measuring this knowledge, but when you arrive at a point of sense making, the test comes in the decisions one makes. These lessons are congruent with the guidance needed in school leadership, typically knowledge omitted from the traditional school leadership experience. That very knowledge has become a cornerstone of our political imagination.

Lia: I grew up in two households, one on the island on O‘ahu and after my parents divorced, I moved to Hawai‘i island and was raised in Hilo. My parents are Kanaka Maoli. Despite their divorce, one thing that remained constant was their desire that their children’s lives would be better than their own. So we were taught to value what I now know to be only bits and pieces of our culture and identity.

The process of value and designation continued in high school, when my counselor determined that I was not “college material.” I believed her, and so off I went into the workforce. But the curiosity of going to college never left me. Several years later, I successfully completed community college and then enrolled at the University of Hawai‘i at Manoa. There I encountered the gaping holes in my understanding about my culture and identity. But the engagement in higher education exposed me to courses that allowed me to reauthor who I am, embrace the language of my ancestors, and know the history of my people. Now as a university professor, I bring these collective experiences into the classroom. They serve as examples of the journey of self-discovery.

Debriefing First Circle
Each author in this article has both conducted an auto-ethnography of himself or herself as educational leader and helped others wade through their own auto-ethnographies. Each has understood the vital role of relationships in our lives as educators and leaders, and each anchors personal and professional work on those relationships. Stories also form the centrality of data in each of the auto-ethnographies, and those stories emerge as a result of self-reflection. Curiosity powers the imagination of each of our stories, just as the need to get involved in impacting change powers the need to be political. Relationships, stories, and curiosity provide a useful framework for our political imagination (see Figure 2). We make sense of our role as agents of change at the three levels of self, organization, and community (Figure 3).

Self
Monica: Having completed a PhD, I prepared to teach a summer course for bilingual educators. Almost 6 years to the day, I had resigned as an elementary bilingual educator amidst a battle waged in my mind and soul and within the classroom and school community. Then, I easily packaged the battle as a struggle between competing ideologies on bilingual education. What could not be easily packaged were the countless casualties, students and families alike, left to advocate for themselves without a clear understanding of the political climate contributing to the pedagogical ruptures in bilingual student learning. On the eve of that summer class, I texted a good friend, saying I felt like a kindergarten student with a new box of crayons, nervous and excited about the possibilities. I entered this space with a more profound sensibility about my role as advocate and activist in raising the critical capacity to understand bilingual education beyond the formulaic interpretations that reduce language development to instructional blocks of time. In communion, we created the space for dialogue, critique, debate, and imagining. We grounded our effort throughout the course as a living and breathing responsibility to continue building the capacity to think
critically beyond the walls of the classroom.

John: I felt a shift in my advocacy during my undergraduate years, as I participated in the legacy of volunteerism and social justice advocacy at Morehouse College. Much of my work was with individuals in communities that struggled against social ills present in many metropolitan communities. However, regardless of the circumstances people faced, there was a persistent hope and ever-present belief that if they worked harder, believed in God, and worked to help others, their personal and community conditions would improve. I realized that during our time together we shared our personal experiences through stories and built relationships and strong bonds. Since this moment, I have been intentional about creating avenues to connect family, community, and higher education. I embraced a newfound curiosity to discover the appropriate skills and capacities that link the local and collective wisdom I acquired from my parents and within community. I found this work with a network of resilient local communities, vibrant organizations, and active change agents who share their local wisdom and collective leadership approaches; this practice yields effective strategies to addressing critical social issues while also developing an interdependent and collective self (F. Guajardo & Guajardo, 2008).

Community

Lia: “Native Hawaiian” is usually the name people use when speaking of Hawaiians. This name comes from the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920. By definition this act defines “Native Hawaiian” as any descendant of not less than one-half part of the blood of the races inhabiting the Hawaiian Islands previous to 1778. This definition is problematic because there are fewer Hawaiians who can actually meet this definition. Therefore, the term Native Hawaiian is a label that acts as a divisive tool that splinters our...
community in contemporary time.

Thus, I choose to use the term “Kanaka Maoli” to reference Hawaiians, which includes those whose kupuna (ancestors) were the first peoples of the Hawaiian archipelago. Use of this term is intentional; I do not want to silence or diminish any of the voices within the Hawaiian community that utilize various terms (“Kanaka ‘Oiwi,” “‘Oiwi Maoli,” “Keiki Papa,” etc.) but want to recognize the diversity and celebrate the unique perspectives that Kanaka Maoli engage in our struggle for sovereignty.

The referent “Hawaiian” is inappropriately being used to refer to all residents in Hawai‘i. This casual “borrowing” follows a practice whereby the state you reside in becomes your identity, as in Texans, Oregonians, and Californians. In the context of strong political awareness, the use of “Hawaiian” should be carefully examined. It is an identity of a specific people whose ancestors were the first peoples of the Hawaiian archipelago. Therefore, this referent does not apply and should not be used by those who cannot make this ancestral claim. This concern also includes those who are immigrants to Hawai‘i.

Francisco: I live along the Texas–Mexico border in one of the fastest growing regions of North America. It used to be rural, but the demographic explosion has been dramatic during the past 25 years, and communities are challenged to keep up with the growth. In one local community the school district grew by more than 10,000 students within a decade. Schools are overpopulated, and new schools are needed. But fearing their taxes would be raised, local residents voted twice against bond issues. The inability to pass the bonds was the result of an anemic public-engagement campaign that failed to communicate that beyond the necessity of keeping up with student growth, the school district could even take advantage of a state reimbursement for financial reimbursement for school construction, a law intended for property-poor districts. The local district qualify to recapture more than 50% of its investment in school construction, but that message was not made clearly and convincingly enough to the public.

I got involved in building public support to construct $112 million worth of new schools partly because of my advantageous role as a university professor. By integrating the November 2008 bond issue into my graduate course syllabus on School Community Relations, we brought community members together to mount a public engagement campaign. I involved my elderly parents to energize the elderly constituency—an important group at election time. After months of strategic campaigning, the bond was placed before the voting public, and more than 72% of locals voted YES to build new schools. My students and I continue to build engagement campaigns every semester.

Making sense of our role as agents of change at the three levels of self, organization, and community requires a strong foundation. The force to do the work the way it has always been done is powerful and many times is grounded in colonizing organizational concepts of standards, policy, or discipline. These spaces are our training grounds for advocacy education with students, partners and faculty; this space requires a purposeful and curious political imagination

Debriefing Second Circle

In our educational leadership programs we scaffold students through this framework as a strategy to explore their being and who they have been as children, students, parents, educators, and citizens. Through a 360-degree look at themselves and through the reflective process and conversation, emerging educational leaders make the familiar strange. Some of these frames are more difficult to capture than others, but grounding the work in personal stories, the material becomes relevant. In short, the student becomes the unit of analysis and his or her story the material (Guajardo et al., 2011).

Connecting the Process

Our parents taught us to be good public people. They modeled community service, public and private advocacy, and effective human networking. They taught us to bring people and resources together to make ends meet or to build collective knowledge, capital, or power. This is how they practiced their politics of engagement and service. They taught the lessons of what McKnight and Block (2010) called community-connectors, citizen educators who identify personal and community stories as assets and who are critically important in practicing a public pedagogy. The practice of community connectors is essential for effective teaching, learning, and leading, particularly in an environment where the change process is in conflict with the traditional market system. Significant change takes place when we connect the dots between the personal selves and the local assets; building a bridge across differences that have historically kept marginalized people from participating in a development that changes their lives is also critical to formulating advocacy. This does not happen by accident—it requires a political imagination.
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“Publish or perish” has long been the watchword, if not the axiom, for survival in early life in the university. The chances of getting tenure and promotion to associate and full professorships decrease if younger professors fail to publish books, particularly in the humanities, and articles in peer-reviewed journals for scholars in the physical, natural, and social sciences. The number and quality of publications also may determine the size of salary raises almost annually. Thus, publishing significantly influences to what extent faculty can survive and prosper.

For older professors, moreover, “publish or perish” can take on a more personal meaning. Without real opportunities, even pressures, to keep reading, studying, writing and, yes, publishing, older professors may feel that they are “perishing”—declining mentally, socially, and physically. It seems that publishing has at least three life-promoting qualities important to professors as they grow older.

First, the steps to publication help to fill the long hours and numerous days as faculty lives slow down. Often, older faculty teach less and less frequently and attend fewer and fewer local, national, and international meetings and seminars in their field. But writing requires focus and discipline, as publishing must meet peer review and publishers’ standards. These steps (and demands) can give meaning, purpose, and focus to life. Then, seeing ideas and findings in print (and now online) can be rewarding and sustaining both for older and younger professors.

Second, as professors grow older, they may lose touch with colleagues, who themselves may be sick, retired, or deceased. Research, writing, and publishing thus can build new bridges to younger colleagues, where these senior professors can serve as experienced collaborators and coauthors, mentors, and friends to neophytes in the field. It’s a two-way street.

Hence, younger faculty can find it stimulating and enjoyable writing with senior colleagues, who can help them to do research and get published and promoted. Older professors often appreciate a fresh, new perspective and benefit from exposure to latest knowledge and research methods that younger faculty can bring to their conversation and collaboration.

Third, continued publishing as professors grow older not only may give their lives renewed meaning but also can contribute unique perspectives to their disciplines. These older minds have an advantage: a long-term view of their disciplines. With their lifetime perspectives, they can write about the history and development of their fields—thus informing their younger colleagues about the work and tribulations of their field’s founders and major developers. This viewpoint can both inspire and guide new scholars.

Even with death, the ideas and findings of professors need not perish, but can stay alive for years to inspire and guide the next generation of scholars and practitioners. Even when the old-timers ultimately perish, their contributions can live on. Thus, when we publish, we don’t necessarily perish, an idea that may also help us not to perish while living.
Preparation of school leaders to support the learning of diverse student populations: UCEA unveils high-quality set of curriculum modules

Nathern Okilwa
The University of Texas–Austin

Evidence indicates that school leadership is second to classroom instruction with regard to total effects on educational outcomes for students (Leithwood, Seashore Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004). Moreover, the role of school leaders is central to effective classroom instruction because they are “best positioned to ensure successive years of quality teaching for every child” through their responsibility to hire, support, and retain effective teachers (Briggs, Davis, & Cheney, 2012, p. 36). Without question, the role of school leaders in setting a school environment and culture of success for all students is critical.

Within high-needs schools serving predominantly diverse and low socioeconomic students, the importance of having an effective leader is clear. Many such schools experience pervasive academic disparities between disadvantaged students and their privileged peers. For instance, National Assessment of Education Progress scores (National Center for Education Statistics, 2012) have shown that economically disadvantaged students, racial minorities (i.e., Blacks and Hispanics), and English language learners (ELLs) perform significantly lower in both math and reading than their peers. National Assessment of Education Progress scores from 2000–2011 indicated that nonpoor students in Grades 4, 8, and 12 performed significantly higher than poor students in math, with a 22- to 30-point difference over the years. The gaps seem to be more significant in eighth grade, a 26- to 30-point difference over the selected years. Similarly, significant performance gaps are evident in reading scores. The scores indicated bigger gaps in fourth grade (a 26- to 33-point difference) compared to eighth grade (23–24 points) and 12th grade (19–21 points).

Furthermore, for ELLs, math and reading scores revealed significant performance gaps compared to their peers. Over the selected years, gaps seemed more significant in eighth grade in both math (a 37- to 42-point difference range) and reading (a 42- to 47-point difference range). Finally, Blacks and Hispanics were significantly outperformed by their White peers in both math and reading. The gaps were greater between Blacks and Whites, with the largest gaps in eighth-grade math and fourth-grade reading.

Role of School Leadership Preparation Programs

The pervasive achievement gaps described above make a strong argument for significant efforts to be made to understand and significantly change the opportunities and outcomes of diverse students, particularly those in high-needs schools. Given that student outcomes are mediated by a host of variables (Hallinger & Heck, 1996), a multifaceted approach to raise student achievement is necessary (Young, Petersen, & Short, 2002). One approach that is beginning to attract the attention of researchers is related to how college of education programs are preparing school leaders for the critical role of facilitating school success, particularly for historically marginalized student groups. In the past, the focus on the preparation of school leaders and their job performance in relation to student outcomes was limited due to the belief that administrators have an direct effect on student outcomes; additionally, no specific measures of administrator expertise were identified (Goldring, Spillane, Huff, Barnes, & Supovitz, 2006).

However, the new focus on school leadership preparation acknowledges that equipping school leaders with the right skill set is important in the effort of closing pervasive academic gaps. Goldring et al. (2006) suggested, “Principals are more likely to improve student achievement if they have the knowledge and expertise to engage in key leadership functions and roles related to improving student achievement” (p. 2). In part, school administrators acquire expertise by participating in comprehensive and high-quality leadership training programs. According to the UCEA, high-quality leadership development programs are designed around research-based content and program standards and prepare school leaders with the essential knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to support the learning of all students to high levels (Young, Orr, & Tucker, 2012). Mastery of the body of knowledge, consistent with effective school leadership, is critical before individuals step into leadership positions, particularly those assuming leadership roles in high-needs schools. In these schools, effective leadership is much more critical and its effects much more pronounced (Leithwood et al., 2004). Therefore, school leaders must be intentional in applying their leadership expertise and prioritizing closing achievement gaps (Hawley & James, 2010). However, many school leaders feel inadequately prepared to support the learning of historically marginalized student groups. For example, the 2011 UCEA survey of practicing school leaders indicated that their preparation programs could have done a better job of preparing them to address issues related to the learning environment, data use, instructional leadership, diversity, family and community engagement, and advocacy (Orr, 2010).

Suggested changes included the following:

- More emphasis should be made on real-life or practical administrative experiences such as extensive internship in diverse settings (e.g., urban, rural, community, elementary, middle, and high schools) and with strong mentors. Similarly, program students should have more interaction with current practitioners, such as teaching some of the courses.
- Collection of data and the effective use of the data should be taught.
- Programs should have less “theoretical busywork” and more instruction (preferably taught by current practitioners) focused on leadership and management knowledge and skills. Examining case studies was preferred.
- Managing diversity among teachers and students and creating a culture of collaboration should be included.
- Programs should promote understanding the needs of specific student groups such as those situated in poverty, those receiving special education services, and ELLs.
- Resource mobilization, utilization, and management should be taught.
• Other areas of concern include keeping families and communities involved, dealing with equity issues, politics and management of schools, program evaluation, and current trends and issues in education (Orr, 2010).

Responding to the Need

In recognizing the existing gaps in preparation programs for educational leaders, UCEA, in conjunction with the U.S. Department of Education’s Fund for Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) and six partner institutions, has responded by creating curriculum modules addressing a number of areas of need (UCEA, 2012). Distinguished scholars from educational leadership programs from six UCEA universities have collaboratively developed a curriculum geared toward preparing educational leaders to support diverse learners (LSDL). The six LSDL curriculum modules are (a) developing advocacy leadership, (b) organizing learning and the learning environment, (c) instructional leadership for ELL student populations, (d) family and community engagement, (e) building a community of trust through racial awareness of self, and (f) marshaling and using resources based on data and student needs. These curriculum modules are freely available to professors of educational administration preparation programs from the UCEA website and were designed to be flexible enough to be incorporated into the most commonly offered educational leadership courses. The table provides more detailed information about the modules, including description, Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards, assumptions, powerful learning experiences, theoretical framework, and implications for practice. It is also important to note that the LSDL curriculum modules build on the significant work of the Urban Leadership Curriculum Development Initiative led by UCEA faculty and practitioners from major urban areas from 2007–2009 (Young, 2011).

In conclusion, the complex challenges and needs of 21st-century schools require a comprehensive and multifaceted approach. Particularly, the historically persistent achievement gaps between disadvantaged student groups and their peers are worth a focused attention by all stakeholders. The preparation of school leaders is an important piece of the puzzle of achieving educational parity; thus, the recent attention on the status of school leadership preparation programs is well placed.

Table. Leaders Supporting Diverse Learners Modules

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module</th>
<th>Description, ISLLC standard</th>
<th>Assumptions &amp; powerful learning experiences (PLEs)</th>
<th>Framework or theory of action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Developing advocacy leadership              | The purpose of the module is to develop aspiring leaders’ capacity to advocate for or act on behalf of children, families, and caregivers, particularly those who are most marginalized in public schools and their communities. | Assumptions: School leadership advocacy is critical to support the educational success of historically marginalized student groups.  
PLEs: Surfacing assumptions about advocacy, identifying an issue and potential policy levers, analyzing the sources of influence and potential for coalition building, creating a persuasive argument, taking action through advocacy or change, and conducting an after-action review. | If participants work together to apply the concepts and steps of advocacy engagement around context specific issues or problems of concern, then they will gain an understanding of advocacy engagement, evaluate its application to a variety of issues, and develop an actionable advocacy plan for engaging others or acting on a problem or issue. |
| Developers: Terry Orr, Denise Prince, & Marcia Singer, Bank Street College | ISLLC Standard 6: An education leader promotes the success of every student by understanding, responding to and influencing the political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context. |                                                                                                             |                              |
| Organizing learning and the learning environment | The purpose of this module is to enable aspiring and practicing educational leaders to envision and develop professional learning environments that serve students of color and students situated in poverty. | Assumptions: A critical contribution of a school leader is to establish a culture of professional inquiry, one that is collaborative, sustainable, and focused on student success; the scholarship of teaching and learning is “a concept of moral action, aimed at cultural change”; and the school leader is the principal teacher and must facilitate the professional learning of the other teachers.  
PLEs: Teacher learning interviews, situating teacher learning in context, and identifying a high-leverage problem of practice. | If schools are to eliminate the disparities in learning opportunities and achievement from, then leadership preparation programs must prepare educational leaders who have the capacity to argue the following claims: Teacher learning is central to student learning, the school leader is the “principal teacher” in the school, and the social organization of the professional learning environment is critical. |
<p>| Developers: Gretchen Generett &amp; Rick McGown, Duquesne University | ISLLC Standard 2: An educational leader has the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students by promoting a positive school culture, providing an effective instructional program, applying best practice to student learning, and designing comprehensive professional growth plans for staff. |                                                                                                             |                              |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module</th>
<th>Description, ISLLC standard</th>
<th>Assumptions &amp; powerful learning experiences (PLEs)</th>
<th>Framework or theory of action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Instructional leadership for ELL student populations** Developers: Mónica Byrne-Jiménez & Eustace Thompson, Hofstra University | The purpose of this module is to help school leaders develop a preliminary knowledge base regarding English language learner (ELL) needs and acquire skills to organize and redistribute school resources and reconfigure school structures to meet those needs. ISLLC Standard 2: (see above) ISLLC Standard 4: An educational leader promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources. ISLLC Standard 6: (see above) | Assumptions: ELL students learn best when given opportunities to strengthen their native language while at the same time experiencing authentic interactions with the English language, the ELL population is a potential source of strength for school leaders, the ELL population is a cultural asset to schools, and schools do not address the needs of ELL populations in a systematic or system-wide manner. PLEs: Managing community change, leading ELL instruction, organizing for ELL success, cultural and linguistic competence, and leadership development. | 1. If participants understand effective programmatic interventions to address ELL instruction and learning, they will modify their instructional leadership practices to meet the needs of ELLs.  
2. If participants are exposed to high-quality ELL content knowledge and leadership strategies, they will modify the school environment to foster ELL success.  
3. If participants understand the process of second-language development, they will make effective decisions about organizing schools for ELL success.  
4. If participants develop cultural and linguistic competence, they will be able to strengthen community-school relationships. |
| **Family and community involvement** Developers: Floyd Beachum & George White, Lehigh University | The purpose of this module is to provide participants with opportunities, through readings, discussions, reflections, and powerful learning experiences, to develop their own cultural and racial identities in order to better serve diverse students and their families and to develop the skills to reach out to diverse families, organizations, and communities. ISLLC Standard 4: (see above) | Assumptions:  
1. Schools can commit to personal contact with families; educate staff on cultural values of families; plan for meaningful, two-way communication; intentionally reach out to the community; repeatedly invite families’ participation; create an intentionally welcoming environment for families in the school; and accommodate families’ needs for transportation, child care, translation, etc.  
2. School leaders can take time to build relationships and trust, reach out and proactively solicit input from families on the education of their children, teach families how to support students academically, and identify and utilize the assets that parents and the community possess. PLEs: Neighborhood walk, family engagement and involvement, and engaging a community organization | If participants are provided with learning experiences that allow them to reflect upon their own racial and cultural identities; explore the strengths and assets of diverse students, families, and neighborhoods; and develop the skills and abilities to reach out and build bridges to diverse families, then they will begin to identify and interrupt some of their own assumptions and biases, acquire the knowledge and skills to engage diverse families from a strengths-based perspective, and continue to develop as socially just leaders. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module</th>
<th>Description, ISLLC standard</th>
<th>Assumptions &amp; powerful learning experiences (PLEs)</th>
<th>Framework or theory of action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Building a community of trust through racial awareness** | This module provides an opportunity for participants to develop the racial awareness of students and others while exploring their own racial awareness. The module includes layered experiences and readings selected to encourage deep reflection and collaborative dialogue culminating in the composition of a racial autobiography.  
*ISLLC Standard 5:* An education leader promotes the success of every student by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner. | *Assumptions:* Race and racism permeate all facets of life, including leadership; racism impacts student achievement; leadership philosophy influences how one operates as a leader; reflection is important in addressing issues of racism; authentic practice develops confidence in leadership; professors and students are colearners; learners are empowered and responsible for their own learning; interrogating race and how it impacts schools can shift (cognitive) perspective.  
*PLEs:* Prelearning activity: What is this “thing” called race? Unpacking (White) privilege. Who am I? How does race impact me and others? Postlearning activity. | If participants are provided with multiple opportunities to reflect on how race plays a personal and professional role in their lives and in the lives of the students they serve, they will develop a keen awareness of inequities and beliefs that may enable them to actively fight institutional racism in schools and society. |
| **Marshaling and using resources based on data and student needs** | This module examines the ways that data are used to make decisions and distribute resources and the role of race/ethnicity, gender, and socioeconomic status influence distribution of resources. It also demonstrates ways to examine differences in achievement and responses to behavior by race/ethnicity, gender, and socioeconomic status.  
*ISLLC Standard 1:* An educational leader promotes the success of every student by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by all stakeholders.  
*ISLLC Standards 4, 5, & 6:* (see above) | *Assumptions:* Data identification, collection, and analysis influence decision making regarding distribution of resources.  
*PLEs:* Understanding diversity in the classroom/schools; building an ethical framework for schooling; what is an Equity Audit? Exploring student data; delving deeper into analysis and disaggregation; conducting an equity audit; framing the problem; developing a plan for improvement | This module is grounded in a constructivist, problem-based context. Using context-specific problems of practice and data, participants will gain an understanding of the equity issues through data identification, collection, analysis, and decision making. |
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UCEA Program Centers Graduate Student Fellowship

Kathryn Torres
University of Washington

As one of the recipients of the UCEA Program Center Graduate Student Fellowship for the summer of 2012, I was fortunate to have been able to work with Drs. Michelle Young and Pam Tucker along with the UCEA graduate student team, Erin Anderson and Amy Reynolds at the UCEA Headquarters at the University of Virginia. This highly collaborative and supportive research center environment allowed me to quickly insert myself in daily UCEA activities, in particular the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) grant concerning the development of preparation modules aimed at improving Leaders to Support Diverse Learners (LSDL) and the UCEA 2012 Convention.

The goal of the U.S. Department of Education 3-year FIPSE grant is to develop curriculum modules focused on preparing leaders to support diverse learners and integrate these modules into a core school leadership curriculum through partnerships within UCEA Headquarters and six participating universities: The University of Texas at Austin, Bank Street College, Virginia Commonwealth University, Duquesne University, Hofstra University, and Lehigh University. Faculty teams within these institutions have created instructional modules aimed at offering critical content knowledge and powerful learning experiences for leadership programs, such as advocacy leadership, organizing learning and learning environments, leadership for ELL success, family and community involvement, building a community of trust through racial awareness, and marshaling and using resources based on data and student needs.

Under the guidance and mentorship of Dr. Young, I was able to serve as a “critical friend” during module demonstrations and facilitation of group discussions surrounding development, refinement, dissemination, and sustainability of these important curricular tools. I was especially privileged to be able to participate and collaborate in LSDL module developer meetings with Drs. Mark Goode, Bradley Carpenter, Margaret Terry Orr, Denise Price, Eustace Thompson, Monica Byrne-Jimenez, Rick McCown, Whitney Sherman, and George White with Adalfo Austin and Ann Marie Fitzgerald. It was inspiring to see their conversations, debates, and sharing of ideas surrounding their personal journey as developers, and their vision for leadership programming inside and outside of postsecondary education was especially valuable in understanding the many levers necessary to create leaders for diverse learners. In partnership with Dr. Young, I was able to provide support for developing a plan of action regarding faculty development, funding, and module dissemination for the LSDL modules. In addition to this work, I was able to assist the UCEA 2012 convention planners in developing materials for the conference, as well as administrative support during my time at headquarters.

The UCEA Program Centers Graduate Fellowship has allowed me to support and assist in development of a national grant initiative and collaborate with an amazing group of scholars focused on changing the world of leadership preparation to support our rapidly diversifying world. My work and exchanges with the education leaders I have met here at UCEA have improved my ability to think critically about the mechanisms needed to shift the discourse around school leadership and diverse learners and has provided wonderful models of establishing and maintaining the cross-institutional involvement necessary for expanding
innovative grassroots curricular development. I hope to continue this work as it moves into the next stages of development and dissemination.

About Kathryn: Kathryn is a PhD student in the Educational Leadership and Policy Studies program at the University of Washington working under the guidance of Dr. Mike Knapp. As an IES-CREST Fellow and under the direction of Dr. Frances Contreras, Kathryn has analyzed student, teacher, and parent perceptions of Latino student experiences and outcomes in Washington state; explored a longitudinal dataset examining the transition to college and persistence among Running Start students; and provided support to a district case study that seeks to understand middle and high school data collection, monitoring, and assessment practices utilizing longitudinal data. Prior to enrolling at University of Washington, Kathryn was an AmeriCorps member at Communities in Schools in Austin, Texas, before earning her master's degree at the Harvard Graduate School of Education. Currently, she is working on her dissertation, tentatively titled *Instructional Leadership Teams Within Latino and ELL-Serving Schools: An Analysis of Leadership Team Discourse Around Accountability and ELL Student Learning.*

Bradley Davis
*University of Texas–Austin*

Along with Kathryn Torres, I was awarded the incredible opportunity of being a UCEA Program Center Graduate Student fellow for 2012. For me, selecting the National Center for the Evaluation of Leadership Preparation and Practice (NCELPP) was a no-brainer. Given that the research interests of the center aligned so well with my own, I eagerly and anxiously turned in my application with high hopes of joining Drs. Andrea Rorrer and Cori Groth at NCELPP. The central focus of my work over the summer was the School Leadership Preparation and Practice Survey (SLPPS) family of instruments. For those unfamiliar, these surveys, when used in concert, provide a profound, 360-degree view of participating leadership preparation programs by collecting responses from program administrators, program graduates, and even practicing administrators and the teachers for whom they are responsible (for those with K-12 leadership programs). Recognizing me as a “set of new eyes” on the research, Drs. Rorrer and Groth charged me with the responsibility of documenting changes reflected in the evolution of individual surveys within the SLPPS family. The reports that came out of this work will be helpful in ongoing and future efforts to further refine and align the various SLPPS surveys.

One of the greatest benefits to leadership preparation programs that elect to participate in the SLPPS is the creation of a unique report analyzing all data collected about the respondent preparation program. These reports provide invaluable information for leadership programs—especially those that seek to continually improve the quality of their instruction and the outcomes experienced by their graduates. Information from these reports can be used for accountability reporting at the college and university level, as well as in accreditation applications and reporting. Over the summer, I was given the opportunity to analyze SLPPS data collected from a leadership program housed in a West Coast university and author the final report, which will be sent to them.

I also worked with the center to develop their capacity to systematically reach out to the over 500 educational preparation programs identified and cataloged by Amanda Taggart, 2011 UCEA Program Center Graduate Student Fellow. Gaining new SLPPS participants from this very large pool of preparation programs will provide an astounding amount of data and research opportunities for UCEA. In particular, expanding participation in the SLPPS will allow further exploration into the relationship between the values of UCEA member institutions and the educational and organizational outcomes experienced and mediated by their graduates working in various research, policy, and administrative roles. Further, developing the ability to compare program features and outcomes both within and outside of UCEA will undoubtedly improve the state of the art in educational administration and leadership preparation. I have pledged my intentions to remain a part of this work, as I believe it holds great potential to further the mission and influence of UCEA.

About Bradley: The day after returning home from the fellowship, Bradley successfully defended his dissertation, *A Quantitative Analysis of the Production, Selection, and Career Paths of Texas Public School Administrators,* at The University of Texas at Austin. In the same week, Bradley was offered and accepted a position as internal researcher with the University of Texas Collaborative Urban Leadership Project (UTCULP) in the Department of Educational Administration at the University of Texas at Austin. Prior to being awarded the UCEA Program Center Graduate Student Fellowship, Bradley played a central role in the creation of UCEA’s Graduate Student Council as a graduate research assistant with UCEA. Before enrolling in the Educational Policy & Planning program at the University of Texas at Austin, Bradley taught public school for 4 years and earned his master’s degree in Educational Management from the University of Houston at Clear Lake.

Grad Student Column Online

Two new elements within the UCEA website are focused on issues and information relevant to the graduate students of UCEA. The Graduate Student Column contains features about the graduate student experience, news from the world of educational administration that is of particular relevance to graduate students, profiles of graduate students involved with UCEA, interviews with researchers in the field, and much more. The Graduate Student Blog contains similar information, but in a more discussion-oriented format encouraging conversation between graduate students via posts and comments. Additional topics we hope to cover in the blog include information about the Clark Seminar and Jackson Scholars, job opportunities, research tips, and more. Please submit any topics or ideas you have for either the Graduate Student Column or the Graduate Student Blog by e-mailing ucea@virginia.edu.

www.ucea.org/graduate-student-column/
www.ucea.org/graduate-student-blog/
At a Crossroads: The Educational Leadership Professoriate in the 21st Century

by Donald G. Hackmann & Martha M. McCarthy

This volume represents the results of a comprehensive study of educational leadership faculty and the departments and programs in which they work. It reports the characteristics, activities, and attitudes of educational leadership faculty involved in university-based educational leadership preparation programs in 2008 and provides longitudinal comparisons with data from studies conducted since 1972. Findings are compared by type of institution and with respondents grouped by sex, race, administrative experience, type of appointment (tenure-line or clinical), length of time in the professoriate, and affiliation with UCEA and the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration. While the number of university-based leadership preparation programs continues to grow, the average faculty size has declined. Among major trends are an increase in female faculty (from 2% in 1972 to 45% in 2008) and the reduction in gender differences in attitudes and activities since the mid-1980s. Also, over the past few decades, there has been a significant increase in faculty occupying non-tenure-line positions, having administrative experience, and focusing on leadership in general, in contrast to a content specialization. These and other developments have significant implications for leadership preparation programs and for knowledge production in our field.

Marzano Center for Teacher and Leadership Evaluation

The Learning Sciences Marzano Center for Teacher and Leadership Evaluation is very excited to announce a recent agreement made with Florida Atlantic University (FAU) to begin working with one of FAU’s College of Education research centers. The UCEA Joint Center for Research on the Superintendency and District Governance, hosted by FAU and Seattle Pacific University, has agreed to facilitate third-party research for the Learning Sciences International Marzano Center for Teacher and Leadership Evaluation. This agreement opens up exciting opportunities for research to be conducted on teaching and leadership evaluation. This new agreement will allow for FAU to collaboratively develop new research initiatives with the Marzano Center and then to facilitate the research by working through the UCEA Joint Center for Research on the Superintendency and District Governance to cull professors from all over the country and world to conduct the research. Outcomes of this new relationship are expected to improve what we know empirically about the teacher and leader evaluation models, how evaluations are linked to the common core standards, the impact of high-stakes accountability systems on the teaching and leadership profession, and the relationship between teacher and leader evaluation systems to improved student learning. It is anticipated that findings from the collaborations will be published and broadly disseminated and will serve as the basis for future educational policy.
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Workshops at UCEA’s Annual Convention

Four high-impact workshops are being offered this year in conjunction with the UCEA Annual Convention in Denver, Colorado, November 15-18, 2012. These workshops are offered free of charge with your convention registration. You can sign up for the workshops through the UCEA registration page: www.ucea.org/registration-2012/

Taking a Strengths-Based Focus: Using the Appreciative Inquiry for Planning and Evaluation in Schools

Thursday, 8:00 a.m.–noon
Denver City Marriott: Floor Lower Level 1 – Gold Coin

In this era of rapid change, daunting pressures, and eroding morale, school leaders need to be equipped with new methods to lead and manage change. Appreciative Inquiry (AI) provides school leaders with fresh toolkit of skills for facilitating productive conversations and planning for innovation in schools. The purpose of this workshop is to familiarize participants with both the philosophical underpinnings of this approach as well as the practical tools for applying it in educational settings.

Presenters:
Alan J. Daly, University of California–San Diego
Megan Tschannen-Moran, The College of William & Mary

School Discipline and African American Learners: Suspended Animation!

Thursday, 8:00 a.m.–noon
Denver City Marriott: Floor Lower Level 1 – Matchless

African American youth are persistently overrepresented in discipline referrals and suspension rates. This interactive workshop will share the results of a mixed-method study designed to analyze African American suspension and focus-group data from Florida and Texas. Participants will experience culturally respectful, relevant, and responsive teaching and discipline strategies to assist in reducing the overrepresentation of African American youth in discipline referral and consequences. Culturally responsive leaders can make the difference.

Presenters:
Gwendolyn Carol Webb-Hasan, Texas A&M University
Brenda Louise Townsend Walker, University of South Florida

Making Grants Work for You (Instead of Just Working for Grants)

Saturday, 8:00–9:20 a.m.
Denver City Marriott: Spruce

This interactive workshop is for early-career scholars focuses on the promises and pitfalls of external and internal funding opportunities. Includes discussion of sources of funding; various uses, such as research, program development, professional development; connecting with mentors and colleagues; and helping to ensure funding and funders are a positive impact on your tenure-track journey. Please bring a recent CV as well as your thoughtful goals for research and community partnership work.

Presenters:
Lyndsay J. Agans, University of Denver
Karen Riley, University of Denver

Chairs/Discussants:
Kent Seidel, University of Denver
Susan Korach, University of Denver

Influence Through Research Utilization

Sunday, 8:00 a.m.–noon
Denver City Marriott: Floor Lower Level 2 – Denver 5

The purpose of this workshop is to engage scholars in a discussion of how our research is being utilized by policy makers with an emphasis on the steps researchers and their organizations can take to strengthen the role of research in the policy process.

Presenters:
Sonya Douglass Horsford, University of Nevada–Las Vegas
Cori Groth, University of Utah
Irene H. Yoon, University of Utah
Andrea K. Rorrer, University of Utah
Michelle D. Young, UCEA
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Wallace Foundation Sponsored Sessions and Events at the UCEA Convention

Over the last 13 years, The Wallace Foundation has invested significant resources in educational leadership preparation, research, and policy. UCEA has been a partner to the Wallace Foundation, seeking ways to leverage important research and development activities within higher education. This year at the UCEA Convention, the Wallace Foundation is sponsoring four important events, including school visits, a town hall, and two sessions focused on district partnerships and mentoring programs. All UCEA Convention participants are welcome to join in these events.

School Visitations
Wednesday, 12:30–5:30 p.m.
UCEA Plenary Session Representatives (PSRs) and Executive Committee Members are visiting Denver Public Schools (DPS) where graduates of the DPS-UD (University of Denver) Ritchie Program are now serving as school leaders. PSRs will visit DPS schools led by graduates of the DPS-UD principal preparation partnership and have an opportunity to engage with school leaders about the UD-DPS program philosophy/purpose, learning experiences, the curriculum, the internship, and mentoring. PSRs will also have an opportunity to meet with current cohort members and members of the DPS Leadership Team to discuss the DPS-UD leadership development program.

Assessing the Effectiveness of University–School District Partnerships
Thursday, 3:20–4:40 p.m.
UCEA Convention attendees are welcome to join members of the Wallace Foundation pipeline initiative for a critical conversation on Thursday afternoon, Assessing Partnership Effectiveness: A Diagnostic Tool from the Wallace Foundation. As part of the Wallace Foundation Leadership Pipeline Project, a committee was formed to determine what counts as a high-quality partnership and how to assess whether a partnership was indeed poised for success. In response, committee members collaborated on the development of a tool that helps districts and university partners ensure that the “right” partnership elements are in place from the beginning. During this session, representatives of the committee, including Andy Cole (formerly the head of leadership development for Fairfax County), Tricia McMannus (Hillsboro ISD), and John Youngquist (DPS), will share this tool and invite feedback from the audience.

Evaluating and Promoting Educator Effectiveness Through National State and Local Policy Levers: A Town Hall
Friday, 1:50–3:10 p.m.
For the last few years, the Wallace Foundation has sponsored a town hall conversation during the UCEA Convention focused on critical issues related to leadership preparation, practice and policy. The focus of the 2012 town hall is educator effectiveness and how state-level policies (and national policy levers) are seeking to support educator effectiveness. The panel will include DPS Superintendent Tom Boasberg, Colorado Senator Michael Johnston, DPS leadership team member John Youngquist, Vanderbilt’s Joe Murphy, and representatives from the National Council of State Legislators and the National Governors Association. The panel will also focus on the implications of these trends for leadership preparation and professional development.

Developing Sustainable and Effective Mentoring Programs
Saturday, 9:20–10:40 p.m.
UCEA Convention attendees are welcome to join members of the Wallace Foundation pipeline initiative for a critical conversation on Saturday morning focused on developing high-quality and sustainable mentoring programs for novice leaders. As part of the Wallace Foundation Leadership Pipeline Project, a committee was formed to think through what counts as high-quality mentoring and induction programs, the role of such programs in supporting leadership development and readiness, and how to build programs for effectiveness and sustainability. During this session, representatives of the committee, including Fred Brown of Learning Forward, John Youngquist of DPS, and leadership development consultant Lynn Scott, will be joined by Megan Tschannen-Moran from the College of William and Mary for a generative conversation about mentoring, preparation, and program sustainability. UCEA participants are guaranteed to leave this critical conversation with expanded ideas, strategies, and resource networks.
Career Opportunities at 2012 UCEA Convention
Expanded Significantly

For many years the UCEA Convention has served as an excellent opportunity for universities to advertise positions and recruit candidates. UCEA is formalizing and extending these opportunities further this year. In addition to providing space for flyers near registration, UCEA has developed several additional opportunities for recruitment as well as for scholars seeking to enhance their careers or seek new positions:

- Career Connections Session
- Private Interview Room Sessions
- Sessions Demystifying the Job Search
- Role Alike Sessions

The Career Connections Job Fair will take place during two adjacent sessions on Thursday 2:00–5:00 p.m. in the Denver 3 room of the Denver City Marriott. The Career Connections Job Fair provides opportunities for university representatives to share information on position openings, job descriptions, and university cultures with potential job candidates. Universities can participate in this event by reserving a table during one of the two session slots. Participation is first come, first served, with UCEA institutions provided the opportunity to prereserve from now through October 1, 2012. After that date, all institutions are welcome to reserve a table. Please contact a UCEA representative for more information.

Private Interview Space will be available throughout the 2012 UCEA Convention. Universities can reserve the space in 30-minute intervals. Participation is first come, first served, with UCEA institutions provided the opportunity to prereserve from October 22, 2012 through November 2, 2012. All institutions are welcome to reserve this space on site at the UCEA registration desk. Please contact a UCEA representative for more information.

Two sessions, which seek to demystify the academic job search, are planned for junior professors and graduate students:

Demystifying the Academic Job Search: Tips and Resources for Those Considering the Professorship
Friday, 8:00–9:20 a.m.
Denver City Marriott: Spruce

Shoulda, Coulda, Woulda…: What We Wish We had Known Before Becoming a Professor
Friday, 12:20–1:40 p.m.
Denver City Marriott: Spruce

Finally, for those interested in moving up the ranks and/or taking on a leadership position within a college or department, UCEA is offering a nice set of sessions, including two “Role Alike” Sessions this year, one for deans and one for department and program chairs. These sessions provide an opportunity for attendees to learn more about the challenges and opportunities provided through such leadership positions and to gain insight into career opportunities.

Mentoring Session for Associate Professors Seeking to Become Full Professors
Friday, 3:10–4:30 p.m.
Denver City Marriott: Floor Lower Level 1 – Molly Brown

Mentoring Session for Assistant Professors Seeking Tenure and Promotion
Saturday, 5:10–6:10 p.m.
Denver City Marriott: Floor Lower Level 1 – Mattie Silks

Role-Alike Session for Sitting and Aspiring Department Chairs
Thursday, 4:40–6:00 p.m.
Denver City Marriott: Floor Lower Level 1 – Matchless

Role-Alike Session for Sitting and Aspiring Deans
Friday, 4:40–6:00 p.m.
Denver City Marriott: Floor Lower Level 1 – Mattie Silks
Leaders to Support Diverse Learners (LSDL) Workshops

During the 2012 UCEA Convention, participants will have an opportunity to participate in demonstrations of the Developing Leaders to Support Diverse Learners (LSDL) curriculum modules. The modules were designed for use in a variety of commonly offered educational leadership preparation courses and focus on advocacy, English language learners, professional learning, resource allocation, community engagement and racial awareness. The modules include teaching notes, powerful learning experiences, performance assessments and resources.

Modules will be presented during two sessions, the first on Friday morning and the second on Saturday morning. All faculty, graduate students and practicing leaders are welcome to attend.

Session 1: Developing LSDL Curriculum Module Demonstration
Friday, 7:00 – 9:20 a.m.
Denver City Marriott: Floor Lower Level 2 – Denver 5

Session 2: Developing LSDL Curriculum Module Demonstration
Saturday, 8:00 – 9:20 a.m.
Denver City Marriott: Floor Lower Level 2 – Denver 4

The Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) Development Team:

- Ann O’Doherty, University of Washington
- Mark A. Gooden, University of Texas at Austin
- Charol Shakeshaft, Virginia Commonwealth University
- Whitney H. Sherman, Virginia Commonwealth University
- Eustace George Thompson, Hofstra University
- Monica Byrne-Jimenez, Hofstra University
- George White, Lehigh University
- Floyd Beachum, Lehigh University
- Gretchen Givens Generett, Duquesne University
- Rick McCown, Duquesne University
- Margaret Terry Orr, Bank Street College
- Michelle D. Young, UCEA
- Willis D. Hawley, University of Maryland
- Matt Militello, North Carolina State University
- Chris Janson, University of North Florida

UCEA Employment Resource Center

UCEA Job Search Handbook

The UCEA Job Search Handbook, located on the UCEA website (www.ucea.org), is an online resource for aspiring educational leadership faculty members and the institutions that prepare them. Topics include preplanning, preparing an application, the interview, postinterview tactics, negotiations, and sample materials.

UCEA Job Posting Service

UCEA provides, free of charge on its website, links to job position announcements. To submit a posting for the website, please e-mail the URL for the position announcement (website address at your university where the position description has been posted) to ucea-list@virginia.edu. A link will be provided to the job announcement from the UCEA job posting page: www.ucea.org.
Graduate Student Council and
2012 UCEA Graduate Student Summit

The Graduate School Council (GSC) will kick off its first annual preconference summit on Wednesday, November 14, at 3:00 p.m. Over 50 proposals were submitted for consideration. We hope more students can join us next year! Along with presenting their work, summit participants will have the opportunity for peer networking and a summit publication. They will also have unique opportunities to engage in mentoring relationships with early scholars to better prepare them for professional growth. For more details, please go to the GSC link: www.ucea.org/ucea-gssummit/

Special Thanks to UCEA Convention Sponsors:

Stewart Foundation
University of Denver
Texas A&M University
The Wallace Foundation
Information Age Publishing
Pennsylvania State University
Emerald Group Publishing, Ltd.
Brock International Prize in Education

Follow us on Twitter!
@UCEA & UCEA Conference 2012 #UCEA12
UCEA 2012 KEYNOTE SPEAKERS
November 15-18, 2012  Denver, Colorado

ANDREA RORRER – Presidential Address
Andrea Rorrer is currently serving as University Council for Educational Administration President. She is an Associate Professor in the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at the University of Utah and the Director of the Utah Education Policy Center. Andrea’s scholarship focuses on districts and the state as actors in organizational and policy change, particularly those changes aimed at increasing equity in student access and outcomes. Andrea’s prior professional experiences include serving as a policy analyst and a research associate in Texas, and a school leader and a classroom teacher in Virginia.

ALLAN WALKER – PSU Mitstifer Keynote
Allan Walker is Joseph Lau Chair Professor of International Educational Leadership, Head of The Department of Education Policy and Leadership, and Co-Director of the Asia Pacific Centre for Leadership and Change at the Hong Kong Institute of Education. Allan has lived in Hong Kong since 1994. Before joining the HKIEd, he was Chair Professor of Educational Administration and Policy and Chair of the Department of Educational Administration and Policy at The Chinese University of Hong Kong. He also serves on the editorial board of top-rated educational administration journals in the U.S., England, Australia, Hong Kong, and China, such as Journal of Educational Administration.

SHELLEY STEWART – UCEA Banquet
Shelley Stewart is Founder and Board President of the Mattie C. Stewart Foundation, a national nonprofit organization creating tools and resources to help reduce the dropout rate and increase the graduation rate in communities across America. Shelley emerged from a childhood of poverty and neglect to become one of America’s most successful business leaders as well as a philanthropist and human rights activist. Beginning in the 1950s as a popular radio broadcaster, he helped launch the careers of artists like Aretha Franklin, Patti Labelle, and Otis Redding as well as address many of the racial issues of that time. Today, Shelley serves as President and CEO of o2ideas, Inc., one of the country’s largest corporate communications and marketing firms.

SONIA NIETO – Texas A&M Social Justice
Sonia Nieto is Professor Emeritus of Language, Literacy, and Culture, School of Education, University of Massachusetts, Amherst. Dr. Nieto has taught students at all levels from elementary through graduate school, and she continues to speak and write on multicultural education, teacher preparation, the education of Latinos, and other culturally and linguistically diverse student populations. Her book Affirming Diversity: The Sociopolitical Context of Multicultural Education (5th ed, 2008, with coauthor Patty Bode), is widely used in teacher preparation and in-service courses.

JOHN H. JACKSON – Jackson Scholars Workshop & Evening
John H. Jackson became President and CEO of the Schott Foundation for Public Education in 2007. In this role, Dr. Jackson leads the foundation’s efforts to ensure a high-quality public education for all students regardless of race or gender. Dr. Jackson joined the Schott Foundation after 7 productive years in leadership positions at the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). Dr. Jackson served on the Obama-Biden transition team as a member of the President’s 13-member Education Policy Transition Work Group.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registrant</th>
<th>Regular</th>
<th>Late (beg. Oct. 15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UCEA Faculty</td>
<td>$ 210</td>
<td>$ 225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-UCEA Faculty</td>
<td>$ 225</td>
<td>$ 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCEA Graduate Student</td>
<td>$ 90</td>
<td>$ 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-UCEA Graduate Student</td>
<td>$ 105</td>
<td>$ 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practitioner</td>
<td>$ 195</td>
<td>$ 195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$ 210</td>
<td>$ 210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Summit*</td>
<td>$ 30</td>
<td>$ 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In addition to applicable Graduate Student registration rate listed above

It is the policy of UCEA that all persons in attendance at the 2012 UCEA Annual Convention and Exhibition, 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 2012 Annual Convention. If you require a letter of invitation to travel to the UCEA Convention, please e-mail your request to rmd6b@virginia.edu

NEW for 2012: UCEA Graduate Student Summit
The first annual UCEA Graduate Student Summit will be held at the City Center Marriott in Denver, Colorado. The convention summit will commence Wednesday, November 14, 2012, at 3:00 p.m. and will conclude Thursday, November 15, 2012, at 11:45 a.m. The purpose of the 2012 UCEA Graduate Student Summit is to provide a space for graduate students to engage in authentic dialogue about their scholarly work. This summit will offer opportunities to meet and network with graduate students and faculty, to participate in presentations and to potentially publish in an online journal. For more information visit: http://www.ucea.org/ucea-gssummit/

http://www.regonline.com/ucea2012convention
LODGING DETAILS

Denver Marriott City Center
1701 California Street
Denver, Colorado 80202


Rates
Recreational amenities include an indoor pool, a health club, a spa tub, and a steam room. Individuals registered for the conference may reserve a room at the hotel at the following discounted rate, good until Oct. 22:

Single/Double: $165.00
Double: $165.00

Fee for wireless Internet in public areas: $2.99 per day. Fee for in-room wired or wireless high-speed Internet: $12.95 per day (rates may vary).

Reservations
IMPORTANT: To reserve a guest room, please use the dedicated web page provided by the Denver Marriott. All hotel reservations should be made directly with the Denver Marriott City Center.

https://resweb.passkey.com/Resweb.do?mode=welcome_ei_new&eventID=9212501

If you wish to have the option of making your reservations via phone, please use the following dedicated Group Reservations phone numbers in order to make you are able to access special block rates:

UCEA Reservations Toll Free: 1-877-303-0104
Reservations Local Phone: 1-506-474-2009

Marriott City Center Denver may not be able to accept reservation inquiries on certain nongroup reservation phone numbers. Please do not call the direct line to the hotel.

The 26th Annual UCEA Convention
City Center Marriott in Denver, Colorado
November 15-18, 2012
Contributing to the UCEA Review

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

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

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

Interview Editor:
Lisa Bass (North Carolina State University)
lrbass@ncsu.edu

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

Innovative Programs Editor:
Hans Klar (Clemson University)
hklar@clemson.edu

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

2012-2013 Calendar

September 2012  UCEA Center for Leadership & Ethics Conference, Brisbane, Australia, Sept. 30-Oct. 2

October 2012  UCEA Convention regular registration cut-off, late registration begins, Oct. 15
NPBEA meeting, Washington, DC, Oct. 30

November 2012  Clark Seminar nominations due Nov. 1
Executive Committee meetings, Denver, CO, Nov. 12-14
Plenary Session, Denver, Nov. 14-15
UCEA Graduate Student Summit, Denver, Nov. 14-15
2012 UCEA Convention, Denver, CO, Nov. 15-18

December 2012  UCEA HQ closed Dec. 21-Jan. 5

February 2013  2013 UCEA Convention Planning Meeting

March 2013  Executive Committee meeting, UCEA HQ
Excellence in Ed. Leadership nominations due Mar. 15

April 2013  David L. Clark Graduate Student Research Seminar, San Francisco, Apr. 26-27
Barbara L. Jackson Scholars Research Summit, San Francisco, Apr. 27
William L. Boyd National Educational Politics Workshop, San Francisco, Apr. 27

May 2013  UCEA 2013 Convention proposals due May 13
UCEA Award nominations due May 31