



*The University Council for Educational Administration,
headquartered at the University of Missouri at Columbia*

UCEA Review revisits the work of the National Commission for the Advancement of Excellence in Educational Administration

Catherine Lugg, Rutgers University & Alan Shoho, University of Texas-San Antonio

The following is a summary of the National Commission Report from 1987. The 60-page report's final recommendations called for sweeping changes in educational administration. While some of the issues that the report addressed seem quite contemporary, others are products of the 1980s excellence movement. We have included this reprinted article from Volume XXVIII, Number 3 of the *UCEA Review* in this issue to provide some historical background and context for present-day discussions of the National Commission for the Advancement of Educational Leadership (NCAELP). Readers will see that only one of the recommendations from 1987 has been fully implemented (creation of the National Policy Board on Educational Administration), while others are still being examined and debated, and the rest have been removed from the "policy table." Given this look back to 1987, what are the implications for the field of educational administration in 2002 and where will the field be in 2017? We encourage all scholars in the field to examine and contribute to this on-going dialogue. —eds.

National Commission Report Released

Asserting that the quality of America's primary and secondary education can only be as good as the people who lead it, the 27-member National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration issued a 60-page report "Leaders for America's Schools" which called for sweeping change in how this country recruits, educates, regulates, supervises, evaluates and manages the men and women who administer the education of 40-million school children.

After a year of study, the preparation of 30 research papers, six hearings across the nation and the participation of more than 1,300 people, the commission announced eight major recommendations:

- ◆ Educational leadership should be redefined.
- ◆ A National Policy Board on Educational Administration should be established.
- ◆ Administrator preparation programs should be modeled on those in professional schools.
- ◆ At least 300 universities and colleges should cease preparing educational administrators.
- ◆ Programs for recruitment and placement of ethnic minorities and women should be initiated by universities, school boards, state and federal governments, and business and industry.
- ◆ The public school should become full partners in the preparation of school administrators.
- ◆ Licensure programs should be substantially reformed.

- ◆ Professional development activities should be an integral component of the careers of professors and practicing administrators.

The Commission was established by The University Council for Educational Administration. Dr. Daniel E. Griffiths, former Dean of New York University's School of Education, Health, Nursing and Arts Professions, chaired the Commission which included state and local government officials, presidents, deans and faculty of universities and colleges, leaders of professional education associations and unions and private sector management experts.

Financial support for the Commission was provided by Arizona State University, the Association of Colleges and Schools of Education in State and Land Grant Colleges and Affiliated Private Universities, the Danforth Foundation, the Ford Foundation, the Johnson Foundation, the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, New York University, The Spring Hill Foundation, and The University Council for Educational Administration.

"For some four years proposals for changes in education from preschool to postgraduate have been coming from various segments of society," Dr. Griffiths noted. "These have focused on students and teachers but such a revolution in education requires competent, skilled, visionary leaders such as have never before been available."

"This Commission was asked to examine the quality of educational leadership in this country and I must say," Dr. Griffiths continued, "that our research reveals troubling aspects throughout the field, including:

- ◆ Lack of definition of good educational leadership;
- ◆ Lack of leader recruitment programs in the schools;
- ◆ Lack of collaboration between school districts and universities;
- ◆ The discouraging lack of minorities and women in the field;
- ◆ Lack of professional development for school administrators;
- ◆ Lack of quality candidates for preparation programs;
- ◆ Lack of preparation programs relevant to the job demands of school administrators;
- ◆ Lack of collaboration between school districts and universities;
- ◆ The discouraging lack of minorities and women in the field;
- ◆ Lack of professional development for school administrators;
- ◆ Lack of quality candidates for preparation programs;

- ◆ Lack of preparation programs relevant to the job demands of school administrators;
- ◆ Lack of sequence, modern content, and clinical experiences in preparation programs;
- ◆ Lack of licensure systems which promote excellence; and
- ◆ Lack of a national sense of cooperation in preparing school leaders.”

Dr. Griffiths concluded: “What this report aspires to, is nothing less than the restructuring of a national understanding of requirements for educational leadership in the future.”

The Commission calls for a new vision of school leadership in which schools must demonstrate that they are learning communities, foster collegiality, offer individualized instruction and encourage involvement.

The Commission also endorses “school-based change” in which “the school community, for example, should have the authority to develop programs; control budgets, hire, promote and retain staff; and select materials. One result, of course, would be smaller central office staffs.”

The Commission also calls upon school system superintendents to lead by symbolizing education in the community; being able academicians with the ability to recognize excellence in teaching, learning, and research; resolving conflicting demands and gaining support for education; and managing skillfully by selecting staff, planning for the future, building a budget, and constructing and maintaining the school plant.

The Commission has directed its 35 recommendations to six groups – public schools, professional organizations, universities, state policy makers, federal policy makers, and the private sector.

The seven specific recommendations for the public schools are designed to change “the way schools are organized so that teachers, parents, and students will play sig-

nificant roles in governance, teachers will have more discretion over classroom decisions and individual schools will have more control over curriculum, personnel and budget matters.”

In addition, “school districts are urged to broaden the scope of their educational activities, participate in recruitment and preparation programs of administrators, provide career development programs for administrators, and employ women and ethnic minorities as principals and superintendents.”

Most significant among the three recommendations to professional organizations in that a National Policy Board on Educational Administration be established. The Commission states that “the Board would have several functions including the following: monitor the implementation of the Commission’s recommendations, conduct periodic national reviews of preparation for educational administrators and professors, encourage the development of high quality programs on preparation of educational administrators, produce white papers on critical national policy issues in education, hold forums for the discussion of issues in educational administration, and generally ensure good communication across interest groups about policy concerns.”

The Commission goes on to say that “an early agenda item would be the consideration of the establishment of a national academy or board of professional school administration The academy is similar in purpose to the Carnegie Task Force’s suggestion for a National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.”

The Commission calls for sweeping changes from universities in how educational administrators are educated. Calling for programs more like those used to educate for professional practice, the Commission suggests that “university preparation ought to be quite different from that of researchers because it must emphasize the application of knowledge and skills in clinical rather than in academic situations.”

The Commission calls for “five strands” – the study of basic administrative science; the study of the technical core of educational administration; the application of research findings and

methods to problems; supervised practice; and demonstration of competence.

The Commission directs five specific recommendations to university professors, three to deans, and one to presidents or academic vice presidents. The latter recommendation urges that “universities unable to accept the spirit of excellence described in this report should cease preparing administrators.” The Commission notes that although 505 institutions offer courses in school administration in the United States, “less than 200 have the resources and commitment to provide the excellence called for by the Commission.”

The Commission urges that “campuses prepare fewer – better.”

Most of the Commission’s nine recommendations for state policy makers focus on aspect of licensure. According to the Commission, “current licensure procedures do a great disservice because they appear to designate individuals particularly suited by character, intelligence, and skill to administer schools. That claim is indefensible. This is a major issue which state policy makers need to address.”

The Commission’s detailed recommendations in this area address issues of standards, authority to revoke, state approved programs, adherence to a professional code of ethics, levels, and requirements for renewal, and portability from state to state. The Commission recommends against temporary or emergency licensure.

The Commission recommends that federal policy makers continue to provide significant funding for research in educational administration and institution of funding for graduate fellowships in educational administration for ethnic minorities.

The five recommendations to the private sector urge a sharing of personnel and technical assistance as well as research and study support.

In This Issue...

Feature Article.....	1	Educational Leadership Awards.....	13
From the President.....	3	David L. Clark Recap.....	16
From the Director.....	4	Davis Award.....	17
Interview with Dr. Driscoll.....	5	UCEA Program Centers Review.....	18
NCATE Leadership Standards.....	7	Journal of Cases Announcement	22
Point-Counterpoint.....	9	UCEA 2002 Convention Info.....	24
Innovative Programs.....	11	UCEA 2002 Convention Registration Forms.....	26

From The President: Mid-Year Reflections Gail Furman, UCEA President



This is an exciting time to serve as UCEA President. It is already past the mid-point in a year that is flying by—a good point for reflecting on what has been accomplished and what remains to be done, vis-à-vis my goals for this year. First, however, I offer some comments on *why* this is a particularly exciting and challenging time for UCEA and for our member institutions.

University preparation programs are being critiqued and challenged as never before. Often, our critics charge that our program content is “irrelevant” to the needs of the field; state “accountability” systems are demanding new evidence that our graduates make a difference in their schools; meanwhile, “alternative” certification programs are popping up everywhere, sometimes with substantial monetary support from foundations. Advocates for these programs argue that preparation will be more relevant, efficient, and inexpensive if provided “in the field” by experienced practitioners who know how to do the job.

Of course, for those of us who highly value the *scholarship* of educational leadership, these developments can be deeply troubling. While “practice-based” knowledge is extremely valuable, it is insufficient for understanding and responding to the complex social, moral, and institutional issues confronting education today; in fact, the argument can be made that relying solely on practice-based knowledge leads to replication of current practices rather than to creative, new responses. Further, teaching candidates to “do the job” is not the only goal of university-based preparation programs; our programs also generate new knowledge and understandings through the scholarly work of faculty and graduate students. The diminishment or outright demise of university-based preparation programs will severely impact the scholarship of educational leadership and thus the future of school improvement.

On the up side, these challenges do force us to confront our weaknesses and work to improve our programs. The growing demand that leadership be linked to student learning is one of the most interesting and productive developments in this regard.

These challenges make for “exciting” times as UCEA struggles with these questions: How can UCEA champion the role of universities in the preparation of school leaders? How can we help our member institutions respond to these challenges within their own state and institutional contexts? How can we work toward a more balanced approach with our colleagues in “the field,” both locally and in practitioner-oriented professional organizations? How can we promote research that leads to better understanding of the linkages between leadership and learning? And, how can we help our members revise their preparation programs with these linkages in mind?

This year has been a whirlwind of activity as UCEA works on a number of creative responses to these challenges and questions. As president, I’ve had the privilege of working as a team member with the Executive Committee and Executive Directors of UCEA to:

- ◆ Develop stronger working relationships with practitioner-oriented professional organizations;

- ◆ Adopt new mission, vision, and goal statements to guide UCEA’s work over the next five years; these statements reflect an increased emphasis on leadership for learning for all children;
- ◆ Work on revising UCEA membership criteria in alignment with these new goals;
- ◆ Improve UCEA’s capacity to disseminate critical information to members, e.g., through the website and publications;
- ◆ Establish and convene the National Commission for the Advancement of Educational Leadership Preparation (NCAELP, which is fully described elsewhere in this Review);

NCAELP is a particularly critical activity, as it has the potential to address many of the current challenges to the field. We hope, for example, that NCAELP’s work will result in a set of quality standards for university preparation programs, linked to ISLLC/NCATE; models for collaborating with the field; and models for evaluating program effectiveness. In regard to NCAELP, Special recognition goes to UCEA’s Executive Director, Michelle Young, and Associate Director, George Petersen, whose initiative and hard work made the commission and its first meeting at Wingspread possible.

This is just a sampling of UCEA’s current work on creative responses to the challenges we face as a field. This year as president is reinforcing what I already knew—that UCEA is not only a gratifying professional community, but also a critical player in the survival of educational leadership as a scholarly field. My thanks to all of you for your continued collegueship and hard work, and to our dedicated Executive Committee: Gary Crow, Mary Driscoll, Fenwick English, Maria Luisa Gonzalez, Margaret Grogan, Fran Kochan, Khaula Murtadha, and Jay Scribner, Sr.

I look forward to seeing you all in Pittsburgh this fall!

Kudos

Ann Hart, former University of Utah Educational Leadership faculty and an active faculty member in UCEA, was recently named President of the University of New Hampshire.

James Cibulka, former University of Maryland Educational Leadership faculty and an active faculty member in UCEA, has been named Dean of the College of Education at the University of Kentucky.

Douglas Thom, professor of Education Administration at Lakehead University in Canada was recognized in *Canada Living*, March 2002 for starting a book drive that collected 30 tons of books, computer equipment and medical supplies for relief efforts in Ghana and Uganda. For more information, contact Dr. Thom at: douglas.thom@lakeheadu.ca

Please help us congratulate our colleagues on their impressive achievements.



From the Director.... NCAELP Convenes

Michelle D. Young, Ph.D.
Executive Director, UCEA

In years past, educational reformers generally ignored the role of school and school system leaders, despite effective schools research that demonstrated the key role

leaders play in effective educational change. However, this has changed. Indeed over the last few years, a national conversation has emerged around the issue of educational leadership. Even groups that previously had very little interest in educational leadership issues, began examining the landscape of leadership practice and preparation. One very interesting characteristic of the budding national conversation around school leadership was that it was taking place primarily outside of contexts in which leaders were practicing and being prepared.

In the fall of 2000, the University Council for Educational Administration, in consultation with educational leaders and scholars from across the country, planned to convene a national panel of representatives from practice, preparation, professional development, and policy to collaboratively assess the status of educational leadership. In the spring of 2001, this plan was realized with the establishment of the National Commission for the Advancement of Educational Leadership Preparation (NCAELP).

The National Commission for the Advancement of Educational Leadership Preparation was established to examine and improve the quality of educational leadership in the United States. The NCAELP comprised 40 individuals, including major scholars and leaders in the field of educational leadership and of national organizations.

The charge to the NCAELP took into account the foundational work of the National Commission for Excellence in Educational Administration (NCEEA) as well as the important work organizations like the Interstate School Leadership Licensure Consortium (ISSLC) the National Policy Board in Educational Administration (NPBEA) and the National Council for the Accreditation of Colleges of Teacher Education (NCATE) have accomplished in the area of standards and accreditation.

On February 7-8, 2002, the first meeting of the National Commission for the Advancement of Educational Leadership Preparation (NCAELP) was held at the Johnson Foundation's Wingspread Conference Center in Racine, Wisconsin. The Wingspread meeting, *Ensuring the University's Capacity to Prepare Learning Focused Leaders*, was co-sponsored by the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA), the National Policy Board in Educational Administration (NPBEA), and the Johnson Foundation. During this initial meeting, the NCAELP focused its efforts on:

- 1) **developing** a complex understanding of contemporary contextual factors impacting educational leadership and leadership preparation;
- 2) **examining** exceptional and innovative educational leadership preparation and professional development programs;
- 3) **determining** clearly and precisely what must take place both within and outside the university to ensure effective educational leadership preparation and professional development,

- 4) **designing** the future of educational leadership preparation; and
- 5) **creating** a comprehensive and collaborative set of action plans for the future.

Several themes were clearly evident during the Wingspread meeting. First, the field of educational leadership must re-center and reculture itself around student learning and student success, and the time is now to make this change. Nothing in our field is more important than ensuring the success of all children. The Commission adopted this belief as the guiding construct of its work.

Second, key to the success of any effort to positively and substantively change the preparation of school and school-system leaders is a commitment among stakeholders to finding common ground and working interdependently toward the realization of mutually agreed upon goals. No single organization, group, or individual can create the kind of changes for leadership preparation that our nation's children need and deserve. A third but related theme is that, while collaboration is hard work, it is the goal we must strive for, and we are all responsible for making it work. We are all stakeholders in each other's successes and failures and in the success or failure of our schools.

Third, we all need to know what "good" really looks like. While we may have standards to guide our thinking with regard to content, we need to be able to identify the exemplary programs and practices and differentiate them from other programs. The field needs an agreed upon set of program elements that align easily with accepted standards and actually can differentiate the extraordinary program from the ordinary program, and the ordinary program from the unacceptable program. This would facilitate both the improvement of leadership preparation programs and the development of effective licensure policy across the nation.

Fourth, the preparation and professional development of school and school system leaders must substantially change and improve, and this must happen soon. This will require both widespread knowledge of best practice in preparation and development and a shared sense of urgency among preparers and developers.

Fifth, accountability exists, and both preparers and developers cannot escape it any more than practitioners can. The work of preserve programs and the effects of in-service programs have to be evaluated in light of at least three factors: 1) were they aligned with the profession's standards of best practices? 2) did they demonstrably contribute to increased effectiveness of the school or school district's leadership? and, 3) can a relationship be expressed between the program's content and processes and student learning and student success?

Sixth, the development of educational leaders is a continuing work in progress, and so long as we see leadership development as a discrete series of starts and stops, we'll continue the dissonance. Preparers, developers, and practitioners play important roles at all stages of development, and when we come to realize that preparation, development, and acculturation belong to us all, consonance will have a chance to emerge.

Seventh and finally, as a field we must act proactively within the political world to ensure that the best interest of children are at the foundation of educational policy decisions. Though some believe it is too late to make a difference, others think not. However, even those who see opportunity urge movement with faster than all deliberate speed.

The NCAELP is truly unique; never before has such an array of outstanding leaders and education researchers been brought together to address issues of educational leadership within a national forum. The commission represents an opportunity to critically examine and generatively discuss the complex factors and interconnections that support and detract from quality leadership preparation and practice. It is an opportunity to design recommendations for supporting positive, substantive change in educational leadership preparation and professional development. Moreover membership on the commission represents educational leaders' and scholars' commitment to finding common ground and working interdependently toward the realization of mutually agreed upon goals.

The Field Experiences a Loss

It is with great sadness that we report to you that Ralph Harbison, Dean of the School of Education at SUNY Albany, died suddenly in February of this year while on a skiing trip with his family. Ralph, who was also a member of the Department of Educational Administration and Policy Studies, was very interested in all aspects of educational leadership and passionate about providing the best training possible for future leaders.

The Educational Administration Quarterly welcomes the following new editorial board members:

C. Cryss Brunner	University of Minnesota
Patricia E. Holland	University of Houston
Catherine Lugg	Rutgers University
Catherine Marshall	University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill
Khaula Murtada-Watts	Indiana University
Robert Nicely	Pennsylvania State University
Robert A. Peña	Arizona State University
Jay Paredes Scribner	University of Missouri - Columbia
Alan R. Shoho	University of Texas at San Antonio
Kenneth A. Sirotnik	University of Washington
C. John Tartar	St. John's University
Megan Tschannen-Moran	College of William & Mary
Cynthia L. Uline	Ohio State University

**UCEA CONVENTION 2002
INFORMATION AND
REGISTRATION FORMS CAN BE
FOUND ON PAGES 24 & 25.**

UCEA in the National Arena: An Interview with Mary Erina Driscoll



Recently, Gerardo R. López (University of Missouri-Columbia) and Linda Tillman (Wayne State University) were asked to serve as the “Interview co-Editors” for the UCEA Review. By way of introduction, Gerardo R. López interviewed Mary Erina Driscoll (New York University) about the various issues impacting UCEA in the national arena, as well as the role of the National Commission for the Advancement of Educational Leadership Preparation (NCAELP) in addressing these concerns. A portion of their interview is transcribed below.

Given your active role in the Wingspread conference, and as well as your previous role as past president of UCEA, I'd imagine you have a pretty good grasp of the issues that are impacting our field on a national scale. In your opinion, what would you say are some of those issues?

Well, I think that one of the most important issues the Commission is looking at is how do you insure that you have the best-prepared and best-supported administrators to work in schools to see to it that all kids can learn. In terms of the field, there is a lot of talk these days about a shortage, and I think there is some data to support that certainly there are fewer people applying for principalships [and] superintendencies. Although, if you look at the data on candidates—or potential candidates—in most states, you'd find that we still have large numbers of people who pursue preparation but actually never go into the field as a line administrator. So I think the field itself is struggling with why that happens. Part of the issue probably surrounds certification requirements that encourage teachers to move ahead with a Master's Degree in Administration well before there are interested into moving into the position itself. . . . I [also] think there's another issue that is really important and that is that our programs, at least in the UCEA institutions, are preparing many more women and many more people of color than they used to. And that demographic profile does not map onto the existing professions. I don't have the statistics in front of me, but we still have many fewer female superintendents than male superintendents, and the representation of people of color in the principalship and in the superintendency—outside of the large cities—is still pretty slim. So I think there is a real shift in the field between incumbents who are holding the position and the people who are being prepared for it. This is something that we have to work out together with the field.

I know that in the past, similar issues were raised particularly with the National Commission for Excellence in Educational Administration. How do the current state of affairs differ from what was raised in the past?

Well, I think in some ways it's really trying to continue what is what was recognized then, and continues to be a very important mission. I think if you go back to the original Commission report, they were obviously focused on these issues. In other words, they fully recognized the representation issue as one of the many conditions under which all children could learn. They asked—“How do we prepare the kinds of leaders who are advocates for children

and who possess the skills to make that happen?" I think people clearly recognize that we haven't finished that job yet. And so various organizations felt it is time to bring folks together to revisit that issue. Every organization that's represented in the current Commission is focused on how to make schools better places for children. I think another issue that is really pressing is that, since the time of the original Commission, we have many more pressures for accountability in schools. We have many more reforms that use high stakes tests or other accountability measures for schools. We also have a lot of experimentation and innovation in the field in the form of charter schools, privatization, school reorganization, and other experiments. So there is certainly a pressure now—more than ever—to try alternative preparation programs. So I think all of those things are issues that we want to look at together and see how can we begin to structure a common report that addresses these and other pressing issues. I believe most institutions have changed their program significantly in the last ten years in response to these larger issues. It's certainly a difficult business to think of what constitutes engaging professional education for the kinds of high need to prepare—individuals who are often in the middle of their career or in a very busy teaching job, and who want to commit to their own learning but still are committed to the practice and the work that they're doing in schools. I think figuring out how to build on what they know and use the problems of practice as they engage the curriculum is something we've talked about, and I think we've tried in some places, but it's still very hard to do. I think the other thing that we are all thinking about is the fact that preparation is just one piece of the puzzle.

What do you mean by that?

Well, no one in any profession, no matter how well prepared they are, stops learning on the day that they get their first job. So one of the things that the Commission is also trying to look at is what are the professional development experiences that are provided and who is providing these services. Many of them are professional association partners. How do they help support mid-career professionals in their learning and growth? What kinds of coherence and structures do those programs have? We have to look at these "in-service" issues at the same time that we're looking at what it is that we do around preservice preparation.

It sounds to me that we're on a different playing field than we were in the past. There is more of a sense of urgency to do look at administrator preparation in a different way. Where does that urgency come from?

I think the urgency comes from a couple of places. I think there is a concern on the part of all of us about the collective ability of our schools to provide the kinds of learning experiences and environments in which all children can learn. By that we not only mean what happens within the schools, but also the conditions that schools face. That brings us into the area of resources—particularly in our most underprivileged schools. Leaders must have the skills not only to work in these environments, but to help marshal resources to support education for the children who live there. In these situations, leaders must have the skills to facilitate the work of teachers and foster effective links with the community in ways that promote the learning of all children. So I think

there's a sense of urgency because we haven't really finished that job—and I think the need is getting greater every day. At the same time, I think there is also a sense of urgency around some of the players in the policy field who are eager to completely reinvent the system, and discount the professional expertise of people who have been working in schools and in professional preparation programs. . . . So there's a sense of urgency there. Because if we don't start to think together about what it is we do and what it is we need to do better, more and more people will assume that we're doing nothing and move in to fill the void.

On that note, it seems to me that many programs of educational administration are increasingly faced with the challenge of serving two masters: the problems that are facing practitioners, and the problems of working in a university setting. Part of the crisis is found in negotiating those tensionalities. How can UCEA and its member institutions reconcile those factions?

Well, if you go back to the original Commission report, I certainly think that the people that were involved thought long and hard about those issues, and restated a commitment that there *is* a place for professional preparation within research institutions. But I think that in order for us to do an effective job in this regard requires a reconceptualization of the way we think about "research" and what it looks like in our field. That doesn't mean that we have a lower set of standards by any means. It means that we need to think about the kind of research that can be useful for practitioner scholars—research that addresses the most pressing problems they face. . . . I think we need to be creative and flexible within our own institutions about what productivity is and what scholarship looks like but also have a serious commitment to the improvement of practice. I think in some ways, we've tried lots of different things. We've looked at differentiated staffing models that bring in different kinds of professors that have different kinds of responsibilities. I do think that good research certainly can be linked much more directly to the sort of pressing issues in the field. I think that there's a place for those of us in the universities who are bringing to bear primarily the skills of scholarship toward these problems just as there is, I think, an enormously important role for those who are immersed in practice.

Are you suggesting we try something different or sail into uncharted waters?

I certainly think this is a problem that the field of education has wrestled with for a long time. What we're talking about in educational administration is obviously paralleled and preceded by the folks who have worked in teacher preparation—who also have struggled to think about the role of teacher preparation in institutions that have a research mission. We have plenty of successful programs around where people have demonstrated the kinds of advantages of having teacher *as* researcher and teacher *as* someone who understands and helps shape policy. I think we all have different roles to play in the broader picture of making a difference in schools.

I agree wholeheartedly. Is there anything else you'd like to add?

One of the issues that I think is coming to the fore is the ques-

tion of “How do we know that what we’re doing makes a difference?” And I think one of the biggest contributions the Commission could make would be to think about some sensible way of trying to evaluate what it is that we do and linking it to what happens in classrooms. That’s a difficult and daunting task because the traditional research tools that we have tell us that the percentage of variance we can explain through leadership alone is pretty small. So we have to think of some ways that really begin to demonstrate how the support structures, both at the preservice and professional development level, can be linked back to the improvement of what’s happening in schools. I think we should have a broad and robust construction of what that looks like, and, by no means, a narrow construction of that accountability.

I think this is certainly an issue that we’re going to have to face head on in this day and age, especially with the increased call for accountability by different constituencies. I agree that we certainly do need to broaden our understanding of the impact of leadership on learning, and I also agree that we can’t do it alone.

I think the Commission is certainly aware of this challenge, and fully recognizes the need to prepare educational leaders who can work in a different type of educational, social, and political context.

Diana Pounder Recognized by EAQ Board

This year the Educational Administration Quarterly (EAQ) Editorial Board recognized Diana Pounder, University of Utah, for her extraordinary, careful, and thoughtful reviews of manuscripts that were submitted for publication to EAQ over the last year. The high quality content of EAQ is dependent in large measure upon reviewers like Diana who take their work seriously. Diana’s efforts were publicly acknowledged during the EAQ Editorial Board Meeting in New Orleans, and she received a certificate of appreciation.

Congratulations

**To learn more about the
NCATE debate, read the
Point-Counterpoint article
on page 9.**

NCATE Accepts NPBEA Standards For Educational Leadership Programs

by Joe Schneider, Educational Leadership Constituent Council

A new set of standards by which to judge the overall quality of departments of educational administration has been adopted by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA) and the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).

The standards will replace those used since 1995 by NCATE as part of its overall accreditation of departments, schools, and departments of education within institutions of higher education.

The new “standards for advanced programs in educational leadership” were developed for the NPBEA and NCATE by a working group selected by the 10-member associations that constitute the Policy Board (see attached box of NPBEA members and the membership of the working group). The working group was dominated by faculty from departments affiliated with the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA).

The working group was chaired by Scott Thomson, past executive secretary of NPBEA, and staffed by Joe Schneider, who currently holds that post, and Honor Fede, ELCC coordinator. Thomson also chaired the development of the original standards.

Departments of educational administration/leadership within NCATE-affiliated institutions that prepare superintendents, curriculum and instruction central-office staff, and principals at the master’s, post-master’s, specialist, or doctorate degree level must prepare a program report for review by the Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC), a subunit of NPBEA that conducts the reviews for NCATE. The ELCC is managed and sponsored by a consortium consisting of the American Association of School Administrators (AASA), Association of Supervisors and Curriculum Developers (ASCD), the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP), and the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP). Joe Schneider, deputy director of AASA, currently chairs the ELCC.

The standards revision took place as part of NCATE’s five-year update of its accreditation process that followed release of its NCATE 2000 publication (view it on NCATE’s website, www.ncate.org). The emphasis in the new accreditation process focuses on results-focused outcomes rather than input standards. That is, NPBEA and NCATE both want university preparation programs to design courses in an integrated and/or a problem-based mode that promote an understanding of the connectedness of the various knowledge and skill areas in educational leadership.

Preparation programs are expected to include three dimensions: (1) Awareness, defined as acquiring concepts, information, definitions, and procedures; (2) Understanding, defined as interpreting knowledge to school environments, integrating concepts with practice, and using knowledge and skills in context; and (3) Capability, defined as applying knowledge and skills to specific problems of practice.

The new standards are written as “candidate proficiencies” because program assessment should be based on results criteria. While departments of educational administration may use an array of methodologies and resources, emphasis must be placed on those methods and materials that anticipate the candidate’s role and performance in the workplace.

Educational administration is only one of 17 program areas examined by NCATE as part of its accreditation process. In other words, every department within a college of education is undergoing a similar revision. The ELCC review, however, was one of the first ones through the revision process and is being used by NCATE as a model for other program areas.

While the old standards enabled departments of education to forego a review of doctorate programs, the new standards require the review of any program designed to train either school-level or district-level administrators, regardless of the degree status attached to the training.

That is, institutions undergoing a review will have to concern themselves with “standards for school leadership” and “standards for school district leadership.” The former are intended to review those programs typically at the master’s degree level that prepare candidates to work at the school-building level. The latter standards are intended to require a broader set of skills and more knowledge than the standards of school leadership. The latter should be used for those programs (typically certificate of advanced study and doctoral degree programs) that prepare candidates to assume leadership programs at the district level. A degree or certificate that intends to prepare candidates for both school- and district-level leadership must submit evidence in both.

The new standards retain a firm requirement that all candidates must have the benefit of a structured, sustained internship in authentic settings. Although the internship must be full-time and six-months in length, the experience may be satisfied different ways. For example, the culminating experience may be met by experiencing two noncontiguous internships of three months each, a four-month internship and two field practicums of one month each, or some other equivalent combination.

The outcomes-based orientation of the new standards reflects the influence the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium’s “Standards for School Leaders” had on the Working Group. The developers of the NPBEA/NCATE standards wanted to ensure a link between their standards and those used by an increasingly large number of state departments of education to license school administrators.

“The primary thrust of the new performance assessment is to ensure that preparation programs are preparing and nurturing educational leaders who can enhance teaching and learning for all children and youth,” states the NPBEA instructional manual.

Copies of the manual, *Instructions To Implement Standards for Advanced Programs in Educational Leadership*, can be downloaded from the NPBEA website (www.npbea.org).

NPBEA Member Associations:

- American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE)
- American Association of School Administrators (AASA)
- Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD)
- Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO)
- National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP)
- National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP)
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)
- National Council of Professors of Education Administration (NCPEA)
- National Council National School Boards Association
- University Council for Educational Administration

NPBEA Working Group:

- Scott Thomson, past executive secretary, NPBEA (chair)
- John R. Hoyle, Texas A&M University, College Station
- David Sperry, University of Utah
- Agnes Crawford, ASCD
- Neil Shipman, University of Memphis
- Frederick N. Brown, NAESP
- Diane Ashby, Illinois State University
- Michael Martin, University of Colorado, Denver
- James Cibulka, University of Maryland, College Park
- Joe Schneider, NPBEA, and Honor E. Fede, ELCC (staff)

7th Annual UCEA Values and Leadership Conference

The 7th Annual UCEA Values and Leadership Conference will be held at the OISE Centre for the Study of Values and Leadership at the University of Toronto on Thursday, October 3rd through Saturday, October 5th, 2002. The conference is sponsored by the UCEA Center for the Study of Leadership and Ethics run jointly by the University of Toronto and the University of Virginia. The Values and Leadership Conference is an international conference that has attracted participants from Australia, Canada, the United Kingdom, Barbados, Sweden (including a delegation of 25 Swedish principals), as well as from all over the United States in past years. It was held in Charlottesville, Virginia at the University of Virginia in 2001. Keynote speakers included Elizabeth Campbell at the University of Toronto, Colleen Larson at New York University, George Wood at Wildwood Secondary School, and William C. Boshier at Virginia Commonwealth University. The conference attracts both practitioners and scholars interested in ethical leadership. Small session presentations allow for interactive discussions throughout the conference.

The 2002 theme for the conference is **Responding to Ethical Dilemmas: Personal and Professional Challenges of Educational Leadership**. Presenters will include Paul Bredeson at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, Bruce Barnett at the University of North Colorado, Robert J. Starratt at Boston College, Christopher Hodgkinson at the University of Victoria, Margaret Grogan at the University of Virginia, Ken Leithwood at the University of Toronto, Paul Begley at the University of Toronto, Olof Johansson at the University of Umea, Elizabeth Campbell at the University of Toronto, Jim Ryan at the University of Toronto, Joan Poliner Shapiro at Temple University, and Jacqueline Stefkovich at Pennsylvania State University.

Please see the information below to register for the conference.

Fax: 416-926-4752

Phone: 416-923-6641 ext. 2406

E-mail: vhawkins@oise.utoronto.ca

Mail: 7th Annual Values and Leadership Conference
Centre for the Study of Values and Leadership
OISE/University of Toronto
252 Bloor Street W., Toronto, Ontario M5S 1V6
Canada

Point-Counterpoint

*Pro(fessionalism) and Con(tinuous improvement):
NCATE and Standards in Educational Administration
programs.*

by Kent Seidel, University of Cincinnati

Do you know who's teaching your children?

The public and political fervor to insure a good answer to this question has resulted in numerous efforts to make institutions that prepare educators more "accountable for results." New competition from alternative pathways to the profession, expanded licensure requirements and accompanying exams, state and national standards, Title II requirements, and "new and improved" accreditation procedures all serve to challenge colleges of education. NCATE accreditation and various associated standards for educational administration programs are at the center of these accountability concerns for most higher education institutions. For this article, we decided to explore the promises and problems of NCATE and standards in reviewing and improving educational administration programs.

Because this is a rather unorthodox "point-counterpoint" piece, I feel it necessary to offer the reader a quick background for my views. I have been involved with NCATE in various ways—mostly positive—since 1990. My experiences have come mainly through work with the so-called "SPA"s, or specialized professional associations—many of the SPAs are also members of a national collaborative that I direct, the Alliance for Curriculum Reform. I was involved very early with the development of new NCATE 2000 standards, serving on advisory committees. More recently, having taken a faculty post with the educational administration program at the University of Cincinnati, I have had the opportunity and challenge of putting the NCATE process to work as we review and redesign our program. Because of, or perhaps in spite of, all this, I agreed to write for this article.

But then came the difficult part—dividing this discussion down the usual "point-counterpoint" lines. I confess that I have concerns about the accreditation process as it currently exists, but I am certainly more on the "pro" side. Most people we spoke to were also conflicted although, interestingly, few wished to place themselves squarely in the "con" role. While this hints at the political concerns surrounding NCATE and other current accountability movements, there is no need to rely on hints alone.

As Ohio is a partner state with NCATE, requiring all institutions to work with the NCATE 2000 performance-based standards (whether seeking accreditation or not), I decided to poll my Ed Admin colleagues around the state for their views. Thirteen replied, and all but one respondent requested anonymity—easy enough to do, but a couple of specific comments underscore the political discomfort that this process is bringing to some institutions. "I personally don't mind you using my name but I wouldn't want my Dean to suffer because of my critical take on NCATE so please leave me anonymous as well as the institution." "I prefer to remain anonymous. This is a political nightmare! I am frustrated and have been venting, but I sure wish people would speak out!"

Some colleagues answered questions about NCATE in spite of not having an Ed Admin program, but seven institutions are deal-

ing directly with the standards and accreditation issues in Ed Admin. These include a range of colleges and universities, both public and private, large and small. Here, then, are the questions I asked, and the selected responses of eight Ohio educational administration leaders. I summarize some common points, and point out conflict areas to help readers consider their own personal "pros and cons" with regard to these issues.

The Questions

- 1) How are you addressing your NCATE review and report (is your entire faculty involved in the NCATE review, is there a particular person responsible, or some other configuration)?
- 2) Regardless of your report status, have you made use of the new NCATE 2000 standards from the Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) to review your educational administration program?
- 3) Are there any specific elements or aspects of the NCATE standards that have helped you improve your program and/or your work with students?
- 4) Are there any specific elements or aspects of the NCATE standards that you do not like?
- 5) What are your thoughts on the NCATE process itself (not the standards per se)?
- 6) May I use your name and/or the name of your institution, or would you prefer to remain anonymous?

Use of Standards and the NCATE Process

All of the respondents reported actively involving their entire faculty in some way with standards and program review. If nothing else, curriculum-related decisions required full faculty consensus.

Some see the NCATE process itself as a barrier to use of standards in a continuous improvement process driven by the institution—while also seeing the NCATE standards themselves as useful. One institution notes their choice of focus on the standards—"We no longer have separate NCATE meetings as the standards are driving what we do to prepare teachers." Another says, "We have a structure that involves the entire faculty in some direct manner. Unfortunately from the perspective of a continuing process, the structure rematerializes when the NCATE visit is imminent. Since the structure is loosely based on the NCATE Standards, the change in Standards necessitates a change in the structure of faculty involvement." Another colleague notes that "the process requires a lot of time for a number of faculty, and faculty have limited time to address the process...Many feel the process does NOT provide a true reflection of the actual program and actual needs."

Most of the respondents have made use of the new standards, but two specifically note their sole reliance on the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards. Fortunately, these two sets of standards are reasonably aligned with regard to content, but their differing formats have caused difficulties for programs. Again, respondents note that their use of either set of standards was driven more by non-NCATE pressures, such as internal review ("we were approved under the earlier standards, and we are currently in the process of using the new standards to decide on some (possibly) major changes in our principalship curriculum") or state changes ("Yes, however the impetus for review is not strictly due to NCATE. All of our programs, degree and licensure, were approved one year before we changed from

quarters to semesters. This year we have had to resubmit everything to ODE in terms of semesters, hence an automatic review of our program. I think this will also help with the task of complying with the next version of the ELCC Standards.”)

There are concerns about the accreditation process itself. It distracts from the “real” work of the institution—“NCATE rolls around too fast! It is a massive amount of work and, even if you try to keep it up in between times, you get caught up in all of the other changes that the state requires and just in your day-to-day running of things. It seems sometimes that we spend most of our time proving that we do what we do well and not enough time actually doing it!” There is also some skepticism about the value of the work involved—“My thoughts are not kind. We have been accredited since before I came here 25 years ago, and no visit has been pleasant or particularly beneficial. We have had some downright nasty BOE representatives, many who are not very perceptive, and some who seem to be on witch hunts. Sometimes the Standards are not clear, sometimes their interpretation is not consistent, and sometimes we are forced to spend too much time and money chasing a goal we can never realize or a goal that does not seem critical to the accomplishment of our mission.” But even this cynicism is tempered with “On the other hand, I’m not convinced that without NCATE—or alternatively the Ohio Department of Education—that we would look any different today than we did 25 years ago.”

The Content of the Standards and Their Value to the Field

In spite of apparent concerns with the accreditation process, most respondents support the use of standards and data in improving programs. Given what the various standards recommend for the Ed Admin curriculum, it seems my colleagues try to practice what they preach, favorably citing “the renewed emphasis on assessment” and “using data to improve our programs.” Others stated that NCATE “probably provides the best available vehicle for continuous improvement” and that “doing a self-study can only improve your programs...finding benchmarks of excellence and driving in those directions [and] keeping data on programs and student performance.”

We again see a difference noted in the internal improvement process at the institution, and the perception of the NCATE accreditation process: “However, it should be more of a snapshot of what you are doing related to your institutional mission and your strategic plan.” In response to using NCATE standards to make program changes, some state outright that, to quote one colleague, “the short and jaded answer is no.” Whether this is due to lack of interest in the standards, or because the existing program is already in agreement with the standards is unclear.

Institutional continuous improvement versus external accountability

All of the respondents were very concerned about the building public and political pressures on schools of education. Not all see NCATE as the strong ally that it might be, however, criticizing the assessment processes as well as calling for NCATE to more actively stand up for institutions.

Regarding assessments, respondents note a seeming lack of trust—“...the idea of checkpoints and ‘meta-evaluations’ seems to imply a lack of trust in the training done by higher educational institutions. When you have checkpoints and artifacts that have already been graded in courses, the implication is that the course

and the course evaluation aren’t enough.” The focus and content of performance assessments is also an issue—“We are far too caught up in content and data that is measurable and we have forgotten what counts: our clients are children with complex needs that have much more to do with multiple intelligences and Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs than ... how well they perform on a Praxis test. Some lip service is given to dispositions, but this is very difficult to define and assess. That whole dispositions thing is a lawsuit waiting to happen.” And finally, the emphasis on certain tests is noted—“It reminds me of a monopoly. There also seems to be an incestuous relationship with ETS that reminds me of a monopoly.”

And while it has been this author’s personal experience that NCATE is indeed trying to improve the profession, it is clear that the partnership aspect of this effort does not always translate in the field: “Colleges of education take a lot of criticism in the press for training the way they do. The reporters never seem to report on NCATE standards which are in large part responsible for the way we train people.” “Sometimes I wonder whether the purpose of the federal government and NCATE is to put institutions that train teachers out of business! The noose just gets tighter and tighter! It reminds me of a book I read about Nazi Germany. The Jews kept thinking things would get better but they slowly got worse until they found themselves in the ovens.”

A call for research

One way in which NCATE might better support institutions is by providing a strong, public, research-based argument supporting the standards themselves. This would also answer questions from the field: “We seriously question the NCATE standards. It seems that to make severe shifts in requirements toward portfolios without a serious literature review supporting the hypothesis that such a shift will turn out better administrators is irresponsible. Is anyone planning a follow-up study to see if these standards actually do turn out better administrators?”

Involving Arts and Sciences Faculty

Many respondents noted the difficulty in meeting standards requirements that increase involvement of A&S faculty in preparing new educators. We know about the structural and motivational issues at institutions that create difficulties, but there also seems to be a fundamental issue regarding the value of including these other faculty. One colleague notes that “None of them even have public school teaching experience and it is unlikely that those departments would hire a person with public school teaching experience. They value content expertise and look down on pedagogical expertise. This means that we not only have to do all our normal teaching, but we also have to figure out ways to in-service our arts and sciences faculty, who don’t respect education as they think that we are ‘content-less’.” Another states, “In the case of both NCATE and the federal government, it is hard to argue against things that will ultimately help children in schools. However, much of this misses the boat. As a former superintendent said, ‘I never saw a teacher fail because he/she didn’t know enough content. They fail because they can’t work with children.’”

Moving from Standards to Curriculum

Whether conflict or confusion, respondents held very different views of the standards. Several noted that the newer standards are easier to use—“The new standards are less restrictive than the old ones. They are based on ISLLC standards and seem to have broad

acceptance across the field. I think they give us 'permission' to reconceptualize our program in some interesting new ways" and "We definitely found the earlier NCATE standards quite restrictive. We felt they forced us to keep in place conventional courses like 'School Law' without giving us opportunities to develop more interesting problem-based or project-based alternatives." However, some standards offered a different interpretation of the new requirements—"Some are so specific that they seem to require a particular course" and "The process seems a bit cumbersome, especially the insistence that every indicator be included in the curriculum and evaluated."

Along these same lines, respondents generally liked the renewed focus on ties to school partners and Professional Development Schools, "an opportunity for simultaneous renewal that focuses on student learning in the preK-12 schools." But they also note the difficulty in making this happen given the way that many institutions are currently structured—"I appreciate all that, but the reality is that it is far easier said than done." and "Getting our administration to support release time for our faculty to work in Professional Development Schools is going to be really tough. The reality is that money is tight."

We Like It, We Like It Not

NCATE accreditation is undergoing some rather profound changes with the new performance-based standards and new, increased emphasis on administration and graduate programs. The pressures for evidence of the value of educational administration programs—as well as for the value of accreditation—have perhaps never been stronger. At the same time, alternative routes to the education profession and alternative methods for accrediting educators and educational institutions are increasing in number and support. We are in interesting times.

With regard to NCATE and educational administration standards, there is much to support and many important issues to be addressed. Given the current political climate and alternative options, NCATE needs to work more proactively and supportively than ever before. In light of the above responses, I will take the liberty of speaking for my colleagues to respectfully—if somewhat anonymously—suggest that NCATE associations and institutions are in this together, and that we must improve efforts to support each other in improving the profession. Perhaps that is why addressing "pros" and "cons" of NCATE was difficult: we would like to think that we're all on the same side, "pro" better education for all preK-12 students.

CCEAM Conference 2002

CCEAM, the Commonwealth Council on Educational Administration and Management, will hold its annual conference September 23-25, 2002. The Centre for Principal Development at Umeå University in Sweden will host the event. The conference theme will be Exploring New Horizons in School Leadership for Democratic Schools. The Conference, with its important theme, will hopefully bring together delegates from all over the world eager to explore New Horizons in School Leadership for Democratic Schools. We encourage all delegates from different parts of the world to consider presenting under the advertised theme. For more information please visit: <http://www.websol.co.nz/cceam/default.shtml>

Innovative University Programs

Contributing Authors:
Jerrie S. Frank, U of Utah
Claudia Seeley, U of Utah
Gary M. Crow, U of Utah



Exceptional University Preparation Programs

The need to improve the quality of our university preparation programs has become a resounding theme in national conversations held by a variety of constituencies. One example of this national discourse occurred last February at the NCAELP (National Commission for the Advancement of Educational Leadership Preparation) meeting in Racine, Wisconsin. A significant focus of the commission was the identification and examination of exceptional and innovative leadership preparation and professional development programs. These "lighthouses" provide examples of programs that are making promising strides in the preparation of educational leaders. We believe that the University of Utah's internship program provides one example of a quality learning experience for pre-service administrators. In their description of the University of Utah's administrative internship program, Frank, Seeley, and Crow articulate the program's strengths, especially how the conceptualization and design of the internship experience enables future administrators to participate, address, and manage many of the complex situations faced by today's school leaders.

—George Petersen, UCEA Associate Director

The University of Utah: Clinical Experiences for Leadership Preparation

The role and importance of clinical experiences for the preparation of school administrators has been emphasized for more than a decade. The National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (1987) in its report focused attention on clinical experiences and the importance of connecting this experience with course work. The new NCATE requirements for educational leadership developed by the National Policy Board (2002) include Standard 7, which requires "substantial, sustained, standards-based work in real settings, planned and guided cooperatively by the institution and school district personnel for graduate credit" (p. 23). The current National Commission for the Advancement of Educational Leadership Preparation is considering the purpose and effectiveness of preparation programs, including such strategies as internships.

Clinical experience, such as internships, need to be seen within the context of socialization theory, i.e., how do they contribute to learning the job (Crow & Matthews, 1998). In this article we provide a brief overview of this connection as the context in which the internship at the University of Utah is designed, implemented, and evaluated. Clinical experiences, like other socialization tools, provide the opportunity to learn three components of work: the technical knowledge and skills of the role, the adjustment to the work environment, and the internalization of the values of the role in the larger organizational and environmental context. Intern-

ships can provide excellent opportunities for aspiring administrators to learn the managerial and leadership tasks of the role. But they also provide an opportunity to learn the more interpersonal and political nuances of working in an organizational context, e.g., learning whom to trust, discovering the cultural and subcultural norms of the school and district, and negotiating the political territory. Clinical experiences, such as internships, also provide the opportunity to internalize the values of the organization and profession. Here is where conflict can occur between the values of the specific setting and the larger values of the role for leading school improvement, democratic community, and social justice (Murphy, 2002).

Internships are a type of socialization method in which the veteran socializes the newcomer. This “serial” socialization tool literally transmits the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to the next generation of administrators. This tool is inherently conservative, focused on maintaining the status quo (Van Maanen and Schein, 1979). The traditional way of diminishing this conservatism is to balance the on-site learning with outside critical reflections. Another way of viewing this conflict is between organizational and professional socialization, i.e., learning the technical and cultural skills and knowledge to survive in the present setting versus learning the more reform oriented conceptions of the role for the future.

In this context, the internship as a socialization tool has both benefits and pitfalls. Without trying to exhaustively identify each, the following relate specifically to the rationale for the University of Utah internship program. First, internships provide firsthand, immediate experiences in the tasks, rhythm and role of the administrator on site. University coursework is ill equipped to provide this type of experience. Second, internships connect aspiring administrators with potential career resources to aid in their advancement to positions.

Internships, however, involve potential pitfalls. First because they are an inherently conservative method, reforms can be thwarted. Second, interns can be used to increase the human resources of schools or districts without meeting the socialization needs of the intern. Third, internships can be focused on discrete tasks and the development of survival skills rather than developing the skills to respond to administrative decisions and strategies. The Seminar is an arena where essential elements from the program’s core courses can be applied. Decision making models are utilized in debriefing front-line experiences, problem-solving strategies are applied to the events of the week, new experiences are scrutinized for opportunities to learn different strategies, extend leadership ideas and celebrate professional growth. The seminar also serves as a place for venting, expressing frustrations, and talking about mistakes in a safe environment. Another critical component of the Leadership Seminar is providing the opportunity for students to interact with experienced leaders from all parts of the system who are invited to the seminar to share ideas, retell stories of the “real world of administrative life” and offer friendly advice and notes of wisdom. These sessions are scheduled throughout the semesters and include such topics as dealing with the media, applying and interviewing for positions, conducting IEP meetings, developing leadership styles, and managing student affairs.

Students who completed the Masters/Administrative Licensure Program in summer of 2001 were requested to respond to a survey about their internship and Leadership Seminar experience. Seventy-six percent of the respondents said that the relationship with mentors during the internship experience was valuable (including “valuable” to “very valuable”). When asked how useful the internship experience was in preparing them for an administrative position, 90% regarded it as valuable. Eighty-six percent of the students stated that the internship experience was helpful in preparing them for the range of experiences they encountered or might encounter in an administrative position. Seventy-one percent stated that the Leadership Seminar was valuable in preparing them for their current or future administrative position.

Clinical experiences, such as internships, are powerful socialization tools that should be part of the preparation models of school administrators. However, how these tools are used affects the outcomes by either maintaining the status quo or preparing aspiring administrators to be catalysts for school reform and student success.

References

- Cohn, K. C., & Sweeney, R. C. (1992). *Principal mentoring programs: Are school districts providing the leadership?* Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Crow, G. M.; Hausman, C. S.; & Scribner, J. P. (2002). *Reshaping the role of the school principal*. In J. Murphy (Ed.). *The educational leadership challenge: Redefining leadership for the 21st century*. Chicago, IL: National Society for the Study of Education Yearbook.
- Crow, G. M. & Matthews, L. J. (1998). *Finding one’s way: How mentoring can lead to dynamic leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Jackson, B. L., & Kelley, C. (In press). Exceptional and innovative programs in educational leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*.
- Murphy, J. (2002). Reculturing the profession of educational leadership: New blueprints. In J. Murphy (Ed.), *The educational leadership challenge: Redefining leadership for the 21st century*. Chicago, IL: National Society for the Study of Education.
- National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration. (1987). *Leaders for American Schools: The report of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration*. Tempe, AZ: University Council for Educational Administration.
- National Policy Board for Educational Administration (2002). *Instructions to implement standards for advanced programs in educational leadership*. Arlington, VA: NPBEA.
- Van Maanen, J., & Schein, E. H. (1979). Toward a theory of organizational socialization. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol. 1, pp. 209-264). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Walker, A., & Stott, K. (1993). Preparing for leadership in schools: The mentoring contribution. In B. J. Caldwell & E. M. A. Carter (Eds.), *The return of the mentor: Strategies for workplace learning* (pp. 77-90). London: Falmer.

UCEA Announces the 2002 Educational Leadership Award Recipients

by *Jumoke Sanusi*

Thirty-four outstanding school administrators have been named as recipients of the seventh UCEA Excellence in Educational Leadership Award. This award is an annual recognition of practicing school administrators who have made significant contributions to the improvement of administrator preparation. Each year, the UCEA Executive committee invites member university faculties to select a distinguished school administrator who has an exemplary record of supporting school administrator preparation efforts. This is a collaborative award in that it affords national recognition, but individual universities select, nominate, and present the award to the recipients. The award provides a unique mechanism for UCEA universities to build good will and, at the same time, recognize the contributions of administrators who are supporting future school leaders. This year's recipients (with nominating universities in parentheses) are:

Dr. Randal Bagby (Kansas State University) is presently supervisor of schools for the Marysville (KS) Public Schools, one of the most progressive and technologically advanced school districts in the state of Kansas. His teaching and administrative experience spans more than 20 years. His technology experiences include the development of a high-performance technology teaming website, development of numerous school district technology plans, and several presentations on technology and education.

Ms. Rhonda Bohannon (Miami University) is Assistant Superintendent of Talawanda (FL) City Schools. Ms. Bohannon has initiated a new, productive relationship, characterized by cooperation, goodwill and determination, between Talawanda and Miami University. She has been supportive in identifying and supporting aspiring administrators in Miami University's education graduate program. Ms. Bohannon is a well-respected leader with broad based experiences at the elementary, secondary, and central office levels. She was awarded \$15,000 from the Ohio Dept. of Education for effective school initiatives.

Ms. Nancy Brogan (St. John's University) is the principal of I.S. 62 and a member of the Chancellor's Cohort which was a program funded by the New York City Board of Education to train principals to be outstanding leaders in the New York City Schools. Ms. Brogan has also recently won a Chase Manhattan Bank Award which provided computers to every parent and child in her school with training provided by Chase employees.

Dr. JoAnn A. Brown (Georgia State University) is principal of Berkeley Lake Elementary School in Duluth, Georgia. She has done outstanding work with teachers aspiring to become principals and with first year principals as they make transitions into that role. Dr. Brown has also conducted data-based decision making sessions for the Principals' Center at Georgia State University. Her professional affiliations include memberships in the Design Team for the Leadership Institute for School Improvement, and in the Advisory Board for the Principals' Center (part of the educational leadership program at Georgia State University).

Dr. Phillip Cagwin (Miami University) has been Superintendent of Talawanda (FL) City Schools since 2001. Dr. Cagwin has initiated a new, productive relationship, characterized by cooperation, goodwill and determination, between Talawanda and Miami Uni-

versity. He has been supportive in identifying and supporting aspiring administrators in Miami University's education graduate program. In his first year as superintendent, Dr. Cagwin co-authored and secured a \$100,000 entry-year mentor grant. He also chaired the district-wide curriculum council and served as district coordinator of state proficiency tests.

Dr. Richard Doll (Kansas State University) is presently superintendent of schools for Rock Creek Unified School District (KS) #323. His teaching and administrative experience spans 25 years, with emphasis on curriculum development, teacher evaluation, and staff development at the school and district level. Dr. Doll has served on the state Quality Performance Accreditation (QPA) advisory committee to the commissioner. Under his direction, a dropout recovery program was implemented at Rock Creek. His work is recognized statewide for creative and innovative leadership in school improvement.

Mr. William S. Eckels (University of Louisville) has been the Executive Director, Human Resources, for the Jefferson (KY) Public Schools since 1994. His responsibilities include supervision of administrator recruitment and selection for the 96,000 student district. When he came to the district, university-school district formal collaboration was in its infancy. Since assuming his position, Mr. Eckels has demonstrated enthusiastic support for university-district partnerships, including two nationally recognized programs: Identifying and Developing Educational Administrators for Schools (IDEAS) and Principals for Tomorrow. In March 2002, his district was awarded a major leadership development grant from the Wallace-Reader's Digest Fund.

Mr. Michael P. Flanagan (Wayne State University) is currently the Executive Director of the Michigan Association of School Superintendents where he influences policy and legislation for all school districts in the state of Michigan. Mr. Flanagan's career as a professional educator spans more than twenty years. He has served as vice chairperson of the National Superintendency Institute and is respected as one of the nation's outstanding educators and leaders. The list of Mr. Flanagan's honors includes a Business Administrator Endorsement and a Superintendent Endorsement.

Dr. Linda G. Foster (University of Texas-San Antonio) is principal of Alamo Heights High School and an adjunct professor at the University of Texas - San Antonio. She is a strong mentor to her assistant principals, many of whom have gone on to accept positions as principals in neighboring school districts. Dr. Foster is actively involved in community and professional affairs, including serving as assessor for the Texas School Improvement Initiative. In 1995, Dr. Foster received the Outstanding Administrator Award for the State of Texas from the Texas Foreign Language Teachers Association.

Dr. David E. Gee (New York University) District Superintendent of the Board of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES) of Western Suffolk County (NY). He is serving a three-year term on the Executive Committee of the 15,000-member American Association of School Administrators (AASA). Dr. Gee is past president of the New York State Council of School Superintendents and was superintendent of schools in Queensbury, NY. In recent years, Dr. Gee presented at numerous professional meetings including those of the AASA and the Virginia and New York States' Education Department.

Mr. Tom Glenn (Southwest Texas State University) has been in education for twenty-seven years and is currently the Superintendent of the Leander Independent School District in the state of Texas. Leander Independent School District, with over 10,000 students, is the fastest growing PreK–12 school district in the state. Under Mr. Glenn's superintendency, quality learning has been implemented. Mr. Glenn has also co-authored several articles on quality in education.

Dr. Phyllis S. Harrington (Hofstra University) is the assistant superintendent of schools for the Oyster Bay-East Norwich Central School District in New York. Her career in education includes positions as elementary school principal, supervisor of administrative interns, director of special education, and speech/language pathologist. She is a staunch supporter of administrative preparation programs and mentors several aspiring educational leaders. This year she initiated the organization of a cohort preparation program – the Hofstra Certificate of Advanced Study Learning Community.

Mr. Thomas P. Henry (University of Oregon) is assistant superintendent for Instruction in Eugene 4J School District. Mr. Henry has worked tirelessly in the district to bring persons of color and with disabilities into leadership positions. During the past year, he was instrumental in bringing a federal grant to the district, which will work collaboratively to enhance the leadership skills of administrators and teacher-leaders throughout the state. He has also guided the district in the design of an innovative administrator licensure program in partnership with the University of Oregon administrator licensure program.

Dr. Gwen Jackson (University of Minnesota) is Assistant to the Superintendent of Minneapolis Public Schools. During her tenure in the Minneapolis Public Schools, she served in a variety of leadership roles as assistant principal, principal, and executive director of Leadership and Accountability. She has helped in the development of an integrated plan for the succession management, performance review and professional development of principals in Minneapolis Public Schools and she leads the Corporate Mentoring for Principals program, a professional development partnership with corporate leaders.

Dr. Gary McCartney (Lehigh University) has been Superintendent of Parkland (PA) School District since 1992. Most recently, he served as president of Lehigh University School Study Council – a group of superintendents representing member school districts. He successfully nominated two Milken Teacher Award Winners in 1994 and '96. Dr. McCartney was selected as one of six outstanding superintendents in Pennsylvania by his peers in 1996. He is an educational consultant, has given several presentations about educational issues and is active in community affairs

Dr. Karlene McCormick-Lee (University of Nevada Las Vegas) teaches Administrative Applications of Technology and Administration for curriculum improvement courses as an adjunct instructor for the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. Dr. Lee is also a consultant in the development of technology applications for school administrators. She is dedicated to the continued improvement of school leadership preparation. Her educational experience includes stints as assistant principal, dean, and teacher of music, computer and mathematics.

Dr. Jerrie McGill (University of Dayton) is Superintendent of Dayton Public Schools. She is an active supporter of collaborative

programs between Dayton City Schools and the University of Dayton allowing future leaders to shadow her during busy, long days. She helped to secure a 10 million dollar grant for her school system. She also obtained continuous grants for the establishment and development of a Nutritional Education Training Center. Dr. McGill was named "Teacher of the Year" by College of Education, Central State University.

Ms. Sue Mendel-Hausman (SUNY-Buffalo) is principal of Heritage Heights Elementary School in Amherst, NY. She has served as mentor, clinical supervisor and instructor with the Leadership Initiative for Tomorrow's Schools program at SUNY-Buffalo. Ms. Mendel-Hausman was recognized as outstanding administrator by the "Executive Educator Magazine" and her school received the Blue Ribbon of excellence in the first year of New York state's participation in the program. Ms. Mendel-Hausman is cited in the United States Office of Education's Schools that Work.

Dr. William R. Papallo (University of Connecticut) has served Connecticut as an outstanding educational leader for over forty years. He is currently the interim superintendent of schools for the Fairfield Public School district. Not only has he held many leadership positions, he has also been a mentor to many of the current school leaders. Dr. Papallo has served as educational consultant and President of Westchester Business Institute, White Plains, NY. His global perspective has led Dr. Papallo to participate in study tours to Russia and Japan, and to travel to Peru, Cambodia, China (Tibet), Thailand and Nepal.

Dr. William Pope (University of Pittsburgh) is Superintendent of Schools, Upper St. Clair School District, Pennsylvania. He has made significant contributions to the improvement of the preparation of education administrators in the Western Pennsylvania region. For the past five years, Dr. Pope has served on the School of Education Board of Visitors and has provided valuable feedback to the School's planning efforts.

Dr. David Rock (University of Missouri-Columbia) just retired as Superintendent of the Independence (MO) school district. Dr. Rock provided outstanding leadership to the district, which led to the district being accredited with distinction. Dr. Rock facilitated a strong partnership between his school district and the University of Missouri-Columbia resulting in the creation and success of Bryant (MO) Elementary School.

Mr. Michael Rusak (University of Northern Colorado) is the director of leadership development in the Aurora (CO) Public School District. He supervises the leadership development of principals and assistant principals in all district schools. He has served on the board of directors for the Colorado Principals' Center. His professional activities include consulting in organizational development, facilitator training, and conflict resolution. Mr. Rusak is also a leader in facilitating school-university partnerships between the University on Northern Colorado and Aurora Public Schools.

Dr. Craig Schilling (Northern Illinois University) is currently Assistant Superintendent for Business Affairs, Glenbrook, IL High School District. He has served as a business manager in Illinois for over 20 years. He was recognized in July 1999 by the ASBO International Eagle Service as one of four outstanding school business administrators in the United States and Canada. Dr. Schilling was a recipient of "Top Ten Teaching Award" from Northern Illinois University, Dept. of Educational Policy Studies and was listed in *Who's Who Among Outstanding Americans* in 1994/95 and 1995/96.

Dr. James Scott (The Pennsylvania State University) is superintendent of schools in the Spring Cove District in Roaring Spring, PA. During his tenure, the Spring Cove District was awarded a \$4 million grant as the nation's first Digital School District as designated by the Pennsylvania Department of Education, and received a \$975,000 grant from the federal government in conjunction with the Heinz Foundation to implement a Comprehensive School Reform Model in the district. While president of the Pennsylvania School Study Council, Dr. Scott was a driving force in the creation of the Pennsylvania Leadership Development Center and he has served on its Board of Sponsors since its inception.

Dr. Joyce Sellers (The University of Alabama) has held many administrative positions (superintendent, principal, assistant principal) in education during the past twenty years. She is currently the Superintendent of Tuscaloosa County (AL) School system. She is also an adjunct professor at the University of Alabama where she prepares school administrators. As superintendent, Dr. Sellers fosters leadership development by permitting aspiring administrators to spend 50 hours in the district office. In 1999, Holt High School (Dr. Seller's alma mater) dedicated the Dr. Joyce Sellers Library.

Ms. Vickie Sewing (The University of New Mexico) is the Principal of Salazar Elementary School in New Mexico. For the past 17 years, Ms. Sewing has been a mentor in the Educational Leadership Program at the University of New Mexico, where she has developed leadership skills that lead to continuous improvement and responsiveness to students' learning and developmental needs. Ms. Sewing has served the Santa Fe Public School District as Assistant Coordinator of Special Education for five years and Associate Superintendent for Human Resources for six years.

Dr. Eleanor Flora Smalley (University of Virginia) is the Superintendent of Clarke County Public Schools. As superintendent, she supported the schools to be number one in the state in technology SOLs at the middle school for two years. She also decreased and maintained dropout rate below 1.5%. Dr. Smalley has been in education for over twenty years as a teacher, assistant principal, assistant superintendent, and superintendent. She has supported and mentored rising school administrators within Clarke County and elsewhere over the years and has been a guest consultant at various educational workshops.

Dr. Donnie C. Snider (University of Oklahoma) is superintendent of the Duncan Public Schools in Oklahoma. He inherited a school system that in previous years had been in constant turmoil. The school system had been through a state audit, grand jury indictment, declining enrollment and a bleak financial picture. Within a short period of time, Dr. Snider restored confidence and trust to the school system. As an example, under his guidance for the first time in twenty years the district passed a 41 million dollars school bond issue.

Dr. Carol A. Stack (University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign) is the interim superintendent of Champaign (IL) Community Unit No. 4 School District. During her tenure, she implemented a comprehensive, system-wide accountability plan and initiated a study of the creation of a dual-district charter-school initiative. She is a clinical supervisor of students in principal certification programs is also an instructor of 'The Principalship' courses. Dr. Clark is a recipient of Illinois Principals Association's Hermann Graves Award for Service and Champaign County Regional Office of Education's

"Outstanding Educator" Award.

Dr. Steven R. Staples (The College of William and Mary) has successfully served as superintendent of the York County Schools for over 11 years. During his tenure there, he developed a program for school system professionals who had interest in administration. He has provided support in the form of internship opportunities, tuition reimbursement, and local workshops to develop these aspiring administrators. Dr. Staples was selected Virginia Superintendent of the Year in 1997. He has made several professional presentations, and published extensively, about educational issues.

Dr. Danny L. Talbot (The University of Utah) is currently Visiting Assistant Professor in the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy at the University of Utah. His 30 years of educational services have included positions as Superintendent of Schools for the Wasatch (UT) School District, Director of High Schools for Granite (UT) School District, and principal of two of the largest high schools in the state. During his principalship, his school received the U.S. Department of Education Blue Ribbon Award. In 1993 he was a recipient of the Huntsman Award for Educational Excellence, the most prestigious honor for educators in Utah.

Dr. Doris McEwen Walker (University of Washington) is the superintendent of the Clover Park (WA) School District where the military population is over 39 percent of the student body. Her previous positions in education include assistant superintendent, director of school administration, principal, and educational consultant. Dr. Walker served on the Professional Education Advisory Board for the principal preparation program at the University of Washington and she regularly leads seminars on the topic of school leadership programs and alternative education programs.

Dr. Darlene Westbrook (The Texas A&M), Deputy Superintendent of Curriculum, Instruction, and Professional Development, has, over the years, designed, provided, and supported strategies for the preparation and professional development of school leaders in the Austin Independent School District. Typical of her many contributions have been the close alliance she forged with Texas A&M University in providing doctoral studies for a cohort of 14 Austin school administrators and the exemplary teacher leadership program she has implemented and monitored to develop classroom teachers as leaders in their schools.

Dr. Doyle E. Winter (Washington State University) is executive director of the Washington Association of School Administrators and has previously served as Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction, and as a school principal, vice principal and teacher. Throughout his many years of professional experience, Dr. Winter has provided counsel and advice to educational leadership programs as a consultant for administrative searches and board training for over seventy school districts in the state of Washington.

Thank you!

A special thank you to all who agreed to serve as proposal reviewers for the 2002 UCEA Convention.

23rd David L. Clark Graduate Student Research Seminar Convenes in New Orleans

by Jeffrey S. Brooks

Forty graduate students and sixteen professors gathered for two days in New Orleans for the 23rd David L. Clark National Graduate Student Research Seminar in Educational Administration & Policy (NGSRSEA). The seminar, sponsored by Divisions A and L of AERA and Corwin Press, offers students a unique opportunity to interact with accomplished scholars and get valuable feedback on their research. This year's seminar was conducted over the second weekend of the annual AERA conference. Each year, students are chosen to participate in the seminar through a rigorous selection process: first, they are nominated as candidates by their department chair or dean; second, they develop a detailed research proposal which outlines salient features of their study; finally, the proposals are reviewed by a planning committee, which selects the forty highest-ranking nominees.

Participants engaged in a variety of activities designed to enrich their professional development as researchers. Sessions began Friday, April 5, with a formal welcome from Dr. Patrick Forsyth (representing AERA Division A), Dr. Gail Furman (President of UCEA), Dr. Jane Hannaway (representing AERA Division L), and Dr. Michelle Young (Executive Director of UCEA). This greeting underscored the rich tradition of the seminar, both in terms of distinguished scholars who have participated as facilitators, and with respect to the consistently high quality of graduate students over the seminar's tenure.

After the welcome, Dr. Carolyn Kelley introduced a panel session titled "Applying the Lens of Practice: An Examination of Current Issues Facing Schools." Local educators Mr. Chipper Simon, Mrs. Thelemelese Porter, Dr. Karen Soniat, and Dr. Clayton Wilcox discussed pressing issues that face the students, parents, legislature, and personnel of Louisiana.

Seminar participants then dispersed for small group work sessions that focused on proposed graduate student research. Students gave detailed presentations of significant components of their studies and discussed challenges that their topic and approach posed. Each student received critical feedback from peers and professors.

After hours of intense and useful work, participants adjourned their groups to dine and listen to the final speaker of the day. Dr. Megan Tschannen-Moran introduced Dr. Kent McGuire, Senior Vice President of the Manpower Demonstrations Research Corporation. Dr. McGuire has held many high-level positions with OERI, AERA, at universities, and several philanthropic foundations. Dr. McGuire's comments on "How Research Can Contribute to Policy and Practice" were insightful, and sparked an interesting exchange of ideas between the speaker and seminar participants concerning the nature and orientation of contemporary educational research and the role of UCEA in fostering meaningful inquiry.

Saturday began with Dr. Gail Furman introducing another panel session, entitled: "Faculty Research in Educational Administration and Policy." Dr. Fenwick English, Dr. Rodney Ogawa, Dr. Linda Skrla, Dr. Linda Tillman, and Dr. Mike Dantley explained the empirical and theoretic substance of their research.

More small group work ensued, then Dr. Helen Marks introduced a final panel: "Belonging to a Community of Scholars." This panel included Dr. Mike Dantley, Dr. Gail Furman, Dr. Jay P. Scribner, Dr. Betty Steffy, and Dr. Megan Tschannen-Moran. These professors shared their insight into various dimensions of the professional, political, social, and ethical aspects of being an active member of an higher education research community.

Additional professors who served as mentor-scholars to the graduate student attendees included: Dr. George Petersen, Dr. Judy Alston, Dr. Dianne Taylor, and Dr. Mark Gooden. UCEA would especially like to thank the contribution of Dr. Barbara Johnson of the University of New Orleans, who graciously joined the seminar as a last minute replacement.



Nominations for next year's David L. Clark Graduate Student Research Seminar in Education Leadership and Policy are due **November 15, 2002**.

Please see UCEA's website for further information at:

www.ucea.org

Participants of the 23rd David L. Clark National Graduate Student Research Seminar in Ed. Administration & Policy

Young and McLeod Receive 23rd Annual William J. Davis Award

Michelle D. Young (University Council for Educational Administration and University of Missouri, Columbia) and Scott McLeod (University of Minnesota) received the 23rd William J. Davis Memorial Award for their article, “*Flukes, Opportunities, and Planned Interventions: Factors Affecting Women’s Decisions to Become School Administrators*,” which appeared in the October 2001 issue (Vol. 37, Num. 4) of Educational Administration Quarterly (EAQ).



Michelle D. Young is the Executive Director of the University Council for Educational Administration and a faculty member in Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis at the University of Missouri, Columbia. Dr. Young received her Ph.D. in 1997 at the University of Texas at Austin in Educational Policy and Planning. Her scholarship focuses on how school leaders and school policies can ensure equitable and quality experiences for all students and adults who learn and work in schools. Dr. Young’s work has been published in the *Review of Educational Research*, the *Educational Researcher*, the *American Educational Research Journal*, the *Educational Administration Quarterly*, the *Journal of School Leadership*, and the *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, among other publications.



Scott McLeod is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Educational Policy and Administration and an affiliated faculty member of the Law School at the University of Minnesota. He received both his J.D. and his Ph.D. in Educational Administration from the University of Iowa. Dr. McLeod’s research and teaching interests center around school technology leadership, data-driven decision-making, and education law. Dr. McLeod’s current research projects include a national survey of educational leadership programs’ technology preparation practices, an analysis of the anticipated effects on student achievement of class-based desegregation policies, and articles on outsourcing school district web sites, using handheld computers to facilitate teacher appraisal, and the scope of elementary and secondary teachers’ curricular speech rights.

The authors were presented with the 2002 Davis Award by Gail Furman, UCEA President, at the AERA Division A Business meeting in New Orleans in April. The William J. Davis Award is given annually to the author(s) of the most outstanding article published in the Educational Administration Quarterly (EAQ) during the preceding volume year. A list of previous Davis Award recipients can be found on the UCEA website (www.ucea.org).

The Davis Award was established with contributions in honor of the late William J. Davis, a former associate director of UCEA and an assistant professor at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Contributions to the award fund are welcome and may be sent to UCEA, 205 Hill Hall, Columbia, MO 65211-2190.

UCEA would like to formally welcome the following new Executive Committee members: **GARY CROW**

Gary Crow is professor and chair of the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy at The University of Utah. He received his Ph.D. from the University of Chicago and has taught at Bank Street College (NYC) and Louisiana State University. His research interests include principal socialization, leadership, and school reform. He is currently conducting comparative research on the socialization of new school administrators in England and the US. His articles have appeared in Educational Administration Quarterly, Journal of School Leadership, Journal of Educational Administration, and American Educational Research Journal. His books include *Leadership: A Realistic and Relevant Role for Principals* and *Finding One’s Way: How Mentoring Can Lead to Dynamic Leadership* (both co-authored with Joseph Matthews). He is currently completing a textbook on the principalship (with J. Matthews). He has been involved with UCEA for over ten years, serving as PSR at both LSU and Utah. He is also editor of the UCEA Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership.

FENWICK ENGLISH

Fenwick (Fen) W. English is the R. Wendell Eaves Distinguished Professor of Educational Leadership at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. He has authored or co-authored over twenty books and one hundred journal articles. Among his books are *Educational Administration: The Human Science* (1992) and *Theory in Educational Administration* (1994). Recent journal articles include: A Critical Appraisal of Sara Lawrence-Lightfoot’s “Portraiture as a Method of Educational Research” which appeared in the October 2000 issue of Educational Researcher and “A Critical Interrogation of Murphy’s Call for a New Center of Gravity in Educational Administration”, which was published in the September 2000 issue of Journal of School Leadership. Fen was named a Distinguished Professor from the National Academy of School Executives (NASE) of AASA in 1973 and an Outstanding Consultant by ASCD in 1981. In higher education he has served as a department chair, dean of a school of education in Fort Wayne, Indiana at a regional campus of Purdue University, and vice chancellor of academic affairs at the same institution. Fen earned his B.S. and M.S. at the University of Southern California and his Ph.D. at Arizona State University.

KHAULA MURTADHA

Khaula Murtadha is an Associate Professor of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at the Indiana University School of Education at Indianapolis. She teaches a culture and gender seminar for the Educational Leadership doctoral program as well as supervision and curriculum classes for the principal certification program. Murtadha has written about African-centered education, spirituality, social justice activism, and urban school leadership. She is currently researching the lives of African American women in educational leadership and the roles they play in city school reform efforts. Her service to schools includes multicultural curriculum and policy development as well as working with school-based multiagency collaboratives that support students who live in poverty, their families and communities.

UCEA Program Centers Review

George J. Petersen, UCEA Associate Director with the assistance of the UCEA Program Directors

The primary purpose of a UCEA Program Center is to work in a target area of interest over a substantial period of time through identifying and coalescing the interests and resources of UCEA-member and non-member institutions, school districts, and governmental agencies. Currently UCEA has eight program centers. Each of these centers has contributed greatly to UCEA's mission through their involvement of faculty in timely and significant work in focused areas of inquiry. The presence of these centers has also added a vibrant dimension to their respective departmental academic activities. They have made substantial contributions to knowledge production and the exchange of ideas in the field of educational administration and the varied organizations served by educational leaders. In this issue of the UCEA Review we will share with our colleagues the focus, strengths, and contributions recently made by each of these centers.

UCEA Center for the study of Patterns of Professional Preparation in Administration

Director: M. Scott Norton, Arizona State University
Contact Information:
Scott.norton@asu.edu or (480) 965-7483

The UCEA Program Center for Preparation Programs has concentrated on three study areas within the last two years. One area of study was that of the status of Distance Education programs in educational administration preparation programs. All UCEA member institutions were included in the study population. Of the 60 member institutions, 46 responded and 41 of this number were active in some way with Distance Education program delivery.

Although it is not the purpose to detail the results of this study here, summary findings were as follows. Web-based Internet was the primary technology used for the delivery of Distance Education courses in educational administration programs. E-courses, TV courses, Closed Circuit TV I Videotape Technology, Conference Audio Communication, Telephone, and U.S. Mail were the leading technologies used by participating institutions. Such educational administration courses as School Law, Personnel Administration, Administrative Leadership, Supervision, and Instructional Leadership led the list of courses being delivered through Distance Education technology.

Two other studies were recently completed by the Center. One study focused on the personnel administration responsibilities of school principals. In brief, the study revealed the increasing work requirements of building principals and their growing responsibilities in the processes of personnel selection, Induction, placement, evaluation, development, climate development and others. The need for more work in human resources administration within preparation programs for school principals and other administrators was clearly underscored by the study results.

A statewide study of the school superintendency in Arizona was completed by the Center in 2001. The study gathered data relating to the professional training and experience of practicing school superintendents, personal and sociological data of persons in the

superintendency, responsibilities of school superintendents, school board and superintendent relationships, problems and troublesome issues facing superintendents, job satisfaction and job fulfillment in the role of the superintendent, salary and compensation data, time commitments and work habits, and school district characteristics. The study monograph report serves as a useful supplementary resource in courses of leadership and the school superintendency. Copies of the results of this study are available upon request from the Center without cost.

Currently the Program Center for Preparation Programs plans to initiate a study concerning the use of portfolios in UCEA member educational administration programs. Many preparation programs have expressed concerns about the monitoring of student progress in degree programs, the effectiveness of comprehensive examinations, the monitoring of student internships and other practice, progress on dissertation proposal development and other preparation program activities. It is the purpose of the proposed study to determine the status of the utilization and effectiveness of portfolios in the foregoing program activities and to determine the role of faculty personnel in designing and monitoring portfolio processes, and then disseminate the findings within the UCEA network.

UCEA Center for Academic Leadership

Co-Directors: Mimi Wolverton, University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Walter H. Gmelch, Iowa State University

Contact Information:

Mimi.wolverton@cmail.nevada.edu or (702) 895-1432
Wgmelch@iastate.edu or (515) 294-7000

The 2001-2002 year saw continued work in the area of higher education academic leadership. Researchers affiliated with the Center made eight paper presentations at national conferences, conducted several workshops for department chairs and deans, published several pieces including two books, and supervised or worked with students who completed dissertations on academic leadership topics. Two in particular bear mentioning: one on deans at community colleges and the other, which focused on the development of a leadership instrument specific to higher education. A project at UNLV designed to look at women in executive roles, including those in academic leadership positions, is now in the planning stages. This project will be jointly sponsored by several national centers, including UCEA's Center for Academic Leadership.

The Center has just completed a two year campus study entitled the Academic Leadership Forum (ALF)-designed to develop department and college leaders, not managers, in a systematic ongoing manner through a developmental program tied to leadership development theory. Its strategy, structure, skills, and results are generalizable to other campuses with the hope that others will benefit from this campus case study. Overall, the objectives of ALF were:

1. To develop an understanding and clarity about the leadership style, motives, and roles of department chairs and deans.
2. To acquire the key leadership skills required to be an effective academic leader.
3. To build a peer coaching system to support academic leaders.
4. To help department chairs and deans deal with professional and personal sacrifices inherent in their positions.

Evaluation of the program solicited data on the three areas of the theoretical framework: conceptual understanding, skill development, and reflective practice in academic leadership. Demographic information gathered from ALF participants was comparable to the UCEA Center's national sample of academic leaders. Based on comparisons with the national sample, conclusions from the ALF data are generalizable beyond Iowa State University. The evaluation of the program suggests that ALF was successful in achieving its objectives. We believe the success of the program lies in the format that allowed for numerous "small wins" (Weick, 1984). A full report of the study is available from the Center at wgmelch@iastate.edu.

UCEA Center for the Study of Educational Finance

Co-directors: David C. Thompson, Kansas State University
R. Craig Wood, University of Florida

Contact Information:

finance@ksu.edu or (785) 532-5766

rcwood@coe.ufl.edu or (352) 392-2391, Ext. 266

The UCEA Center for Education Finance is co-directed by R. Craig Wood who is the B.O. Smith Research Professor in the Department of Educational Leadership, Policy, and Foundations in the College of Education at the University of Florida and David C. Thompson who is Professor and Department Chair of the Department of Educational Administration and Leadership at Kansas State University.

During this past year, the second edition of *Money and Schools*, published by Eye on Education, authored by the two co-directors appeared. This text is an introduction to the arena of education finance for those training to become building principals. The co-directors new textbook with Prentice-Hall is due next year and is an education finance text intended for doctoral students. The co-directors have published this past year in *the Journal of Education Finance*, *West's Education Law Reporter*, *Educational Considerations*, as well as chapters in several books. Additionally, Dr. Wood has presented several times for the National Conference of State Legislatures and Thompson has presented several times before the National Education Association. The Center continues to gain national visibility for UCEA through these efforts.

Department of Educational Administration and Leadership at Kansas State University. He has published well over 200 publications in refereed journals, chapters, invited articles and numerous invited general sessions before national audiences. He has worked as an expert witness for states and plaintiffs in numerous education finance litigation cases.

UCEA Center for the Study of Leadership and Field Practices, Special Education Administration

Co-directors: Leonard Burrello, Indiana University
Carl Lashley, University of NC-Greensboro
Edith E. Beatty, State of Vermont
Lauren P. Hoffman, Lewis University

Contact Information:

burrello@indiana.edu or (812) 856-8378

carl_lashley@uncg.edu or (336) 334-3745

ebeatty@vismt.org or (802) 828-0294

lph@jorsm.com or (219) 322-6512

This program center is designing a new structure for special education service delivery as well as building a new school improvement template based upon the research of Fullan, Newmann, and Louis and Kruse. The latter will be reported on fall UCEA Conference. The Center also submitted a third year national significance grant with UCEA endorsement of standards-based preparation of principals and directors of special education for the next three years. This grant will be used to develop 14 instructional modules and assessment tools to determine the level of student knowledge and skills in effecting change in professional and student learning.

UCEA Center for the Study of Leadership and Ethics in Educational Administration

Co-directors: Margaret Grogan, University of Virginia
Paul Begley, University of Toronto/OISE

Contact Information:

mgrogan@virginia.edu or (804) 924-0747

pbegley@oise.utoronto.ca or (416) 923-6641 ext. 2406

The 7th Annual UCEA Values and Leadership Conference will be held at the OISE Centre for the Study of Values and Leadership at the University of Toronto on Thursday, October 3rd through Saturday, October 5th, 2002. The conference is sponsored by the UCEA Center for the Study of Leadership and Ethics run jointly by the University of Toronto and the University of Virginia. The Values and Leadership Conference is an international conference that has attracted participants from Australia, Canada, the United Kingdom, Barbados, Sweden (including a delegation of 25 Swedish principals), as well as from all over the United States. It was held in Charlottesville, Virginia at the University of Virginia in 2001. Key-note speakers included Elizabeth Campbell of the University of Toronto, Colleen Larson of New York University, George Wood of Wildwood Secondary School, and William C. Boshier at Virginia Commonwealth University. The conference attracts both practitioners and scholars interested in ethical leadership. Small session presentations allow for interactive discussions throughout the conference.

The 2002 theme for the conference is **Responding to Ethical Dilemmas: Personal and Professional Challenges of Educational Leadership**. Presenters will include Paul Bredeson of the University of Wisconsin-Madison, Bruce Barnett of the University of North Colorado, Robert J. Starratt of Boston College, Christopher Hodgkinson of the University of Victoria, Margaret Grogan of the University of Virginia, Ken Leithwood of the University of Toronto, Paul Begley of the University of Toronto, Olof Johansson of the University of Umea, Elizabeth Campbell of the University of Toronto, Jim Ryan of the University of Toronto, Joan Poliner Shapiro of Temple University, and Jacqueline Stefkovich of Pennsylvania State University.

Please see the information below to register for the conference.

Fax: 416-926-4752

Telephone: 416-923-6641 ext. 2406

E-mail: vhawkins@oise.utoronto.ca

Mail: 7th Annual Values and Leadership Conference

Centre for the Study of Values and Leadership

OISE/University of Toronto

252 Bloor Street W., Toronto, Ontario M5S 1V6

Canada

UCEA Center for the Study of Leadership in Urban Schools

Director: Richard Hooker, University of Houston
Contact Information:
richardlhooker@hotmail.com or (713) 743-5035

The Center for the Study of Leadership in Urban Schools focuses on the pursuit of research in urban educational settings. The center facilitates the free exchange of ideas on urban educational leadership issues, establishes collaborative networks with institutions and organizations working within urban education, and develop creative leadership in individuals working in educational settings.

UCEA Center for the Study of the Superintendency

Co-directors: Lars Björk, University of Kentucky
C. Cryss Brunner, University of Minnesota
Contact Information:
lbjor1@pop.uky.edu or (859) 257-2450
brunner@umn.edu or (612) 624-1006

The Joint Program Center for the Study of the Superintendency's mission is to improve the preparation of educational leaders and to promote the development of professional knowledge aimed at school improvement and administration.

The Joint Program Center is also in the process of expanding its focus to include research in the area of school boards. This expansion may result in a new title for the center.

Recent Publication and Research Highlights: *Journal of School Leadership (Forthcoming)-Special Issue: The Superintendent Shortage: Myth and Reality*. This special issue of the Scarecrow Press *Journal of School Leadership* is co-edited by Lars G. Björk and John Keedy. The guest editors of this special issue convened a group of distinguished researchers to address a significant education policy issue facing the field of educational administration. Contributors include Thomas Glass, Bruce Cooper, Theodore Kowalski, C. Cryss Brunner, Marilyn Tallerico, and Margaret Grogan. Research findings from six recent national studies are examined and discussed with regard to state and national policy implications.

The New Superintendency: Advances in Research and Theories of School Management and Educational Policy (2001). Oxford, England: Elsevier Press. Co-edited by C. Cryss Brunner and Lars G. Björk. This volume highlights the work of academics and practitioners interested in the changing role of the school superintendent.

"*State Action for Education Leadership Project*" (SAELP), Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) is supported by a \$300,000 grant from Wallace-Readers Digest Fund through the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) for 2001-2003. The Center is conducting a comprehensive study of changing roles for school principals and district superintendents in terms of the job expectations, relations between these two executives, and complementary roles with school and district governing bodies (school council, local school board), teachers, parents and the community.

Successful Superintendents: Understanding Their Work, Sharing their Knowledge (AASA). This research initiative is supported

by \$1.2 Million Wallace Readers Digest Funds grant (2001-2002). Dr. Björk is a member of a research team convened by Dr. Robert Yin to study superintendents' tacit knowledge and cognitive leadership styles.

Program Center Advisory Board: The Advisory Board, led by Co-Directors Brunner and Björk, met in February at the AASA Annual Conference, held in San Diego, CA. The agenda included a discussion of recent and future publications and research. In addition, the Advisory Board voted to change the name of the Center to *the Center for the Study of the Superintendency and School Boards*. This change reflects the increased focus on superintendent/school board governance teams.

UCEA Center for the Study of School-Site Leadership

Co-directors: Stephen L. Jacobson, SUNY at Buffalo
Kenneth A. Leithwood, University of Toronto/
OISE

Contact Information:
eoakiml@acsu.buffalo.edu or (716) 645-2471
kleithwood@oise.utoronto.ca or (416) 923-6641

On July 15-16, 2002, the Center will sponsor a conference on school leadership at the University at Buffalo (UB), entitled, "*Standards for Successful School Leadership*." The event will include the first ever Willower Family Lecture (details below), keynote presentations, panel discussions and interactive working sessions intended to help current and aspiring school leaders better understand and critique the proliferation of performance standards intended to guide administrator preparation and practice.

Featured speakers include:

Kent Peterson, Professor, University of Wisconsin-Madison, "Dimensions of Effective Leadership" * *Willower Family Lecture*
Kenneth Leithwood, Professor, University of Toronto "Setting Standards for Standards"
Stephen Jacobson, Professor at the University at Buffalo "Making Sense of Current Standards"
For more details about the Center's summer conference contact: Stephen Jacobson at (716) 645-2471 ext. 1103, or at: EOAKIML@BUFFALO.EDU

The Center has also become a partner in an international research project inquiring about successful school leadership with colleagues in Sweden, the UK, Australia, Hong Kong, the US and Canada. The first stage of this project entails the collection of carefully selected case studies of exceptionally successful primary and secondary school leaders. These case study data eventually will be used to model successful leadership in a manner available for large-scale quantitative assessment, the second major stage of the project. Books, articles, and training materials are among the planned outputs of this endeavor.

Finally, Center co-Directors Stephen Jacobson and Kenneth Leithwood, in collaboration with David Monk, Professor and Dean of the College of Education at The Pennsylvania State University; have launched a new journal, *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, published by Swets & Zeitlinger in the Netherlands. The aim of this journal is to provide a high quality forum for educational researchers, practitioners and policymakers to publish analyses

and research about how school leaders and educational policies utilize fiscal, material and human resources to bring about change in education and the effectiveness of schools. For more information about the journal, including submission of manuscripts and subscripts, visit the Swets & Zeitlinger web site at <http://www.szp.swets.nl>.

*THE WILLOWER FAMILY LECTURE

In September 1999, Donald J. and Catherine Willower established the Willower Family Lecture Series to add to the intellectual climate at The University at Buffalo (UB), Don's alma mater. The lecture series resides in the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy, specifically its program in Educational Administration.

Dr. Willower, who passed away suddenly in January 2000, earned three degrees from UB, a bachelor's and masters in philosophy and a doctorate in educational administration. Willower was a distinguished professor of education at Pennsylvania State University. During his lifetime, he published widely and lectured nationally and internationally on educational administration and school leadership. He was the 1989 recipient of numerous professional awards, including the Distinguished Alumni Award from the UB Graduate School of Education.

The Center is proud to announce that Dr. Kent D. Peterson, professor in the Department of Educational Administration at the University of Wisconsin – Madison and Founding Director of the Vanderbilt Principals Institute, will deliver the first Willower Family Lecture on July 15, 2002 at the Summer Conference on School Leadership.

Dr. Peterson's presentation, "Dimensions of Effective Leadership" will be the keynote address of a two-day conference entitled, "Setting Standards for Effective School Leadership," that is being co-sponsored by the Graduate School of Education and the UCEA Center for the Study of School Site Leadership.

UCEA Program Center Advisory Board

On behalf of UCEA and our national Program Center Directors, I would like to acknowledge the contributions of our colleagues for their participation on the newly formed UCEA Program Center Advisory Board (PCAB). The PCAB's responsibilities are similar to the role formerly played by the UCEA Program Center Coordinator. Respecting the important symbiotic relationship of the Program Centers and UCEA, the rationale for the PCAB was developed around three themes: (1) better coordination of the work performed by the program centers and directors with the work and mission of UCEA; (2) facilitation of communication and knowledge of the work, needs, and objectives of the program centers with the governing and administrative bodies (e.g., EC and Plenum) of UCEA; and (3) empowerment and inclusion of Program Center Director representatives in the processes of consultation with the UCEA President and Executive Director, and participation in democratic decision-making surrounding areas of evaluation and review of current program center policy.

Representing the UCEA PSR's

Dr. Judith Ponticell, University of New Mexico

Dr. Donald Hackman, Iowa State University

Representing the UCEA Program Centers

Dr. Leonard Burrello, Indiana University (Co-Director, UCEA Center for the Study of Leadership and Field Practices, Special Education Administration)

Dr. Mimi Wolverton, University of Nevada Las Vegas (Co-Director, UCEA Center for Academic Leadership)

Representing the UCEA Executive Committee

Dr. Gary Crow, University of Utah

Chair, Program Advisory Board

Dr. George J. Petersen, UCEA/University of Missouri-Columbia

Program Advisory Board Member (Ex-Officio)

Dr. Michelle D. Young, UCEA/University of Missouri-Columbia

Duties of Program Center Advisory Board (PCAB) *

"The Program Center Advisory Board replaces the Program Center Coordinator and fulfill the coordinator responsibilities as outlined in UCEA Policy (Section VIII, p. 39-45). The PCAB serves in an advisory capacity to the UCEA Executive Committee and the Plenum. Other functions may include updating current policy on the program centers, developing an objective "point" system or other criteria for the evaluation of mini-grant proposals, review of proposals for new centers, and review of existing program centers."

* (Policy Adopted, November 1, 2001, UCEA Plenum, Cincinnati, OH)

University of Pittsburgh and Pennsylvania State University will serve as co-hosts of UCEA Convention 2002



www.psu.edu



www.pitt.edu

In addition to assisting with plans and logistics for the convention, the University of Pittsburgh and Pennsylvania State University will be hosting the Past Presidents reception. Additionally, these hosts will sponsor the UCEA Graduate Student Symposium, a session for UCEA program chairs, and other important events.

UCEA extends sincere appreciation to their universities as well as the faculty. To learn more about the education administration programs at these institutions, please visit their web pages.

UCEA CONVENTION 2002

This year the University Council for Educational Administration will hold its sixteenth annual convention in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. The convention, co-hosted by the University of Pittsburgh and Pennsylvania State University, takes place November 1-3 at the Pittsburgh Hilton. Facing Pittsburgh's famed Three Rivers, the hotel overlooks Three Rivers Stadium and is a short walk to PPG Place, Fifth Avenue Shops, Saks Fifth Avenue, Heinz Hall, PNC Plaza, and CNG Tower.

The theme of this year's convention is "Fostering Learning for All: Honoring Multiple Leadership Perspectives". There will be many opportunities to explore the connections between leadership and learning from a broad and inclusive range of approaches. Our convention speakers this year are Charles C. Haynes, Vicki Phillips, James Anderson, and UCEA President Gail Furman.

Charles C. Haynes, the Mitstifer Lecturer this year, is senior scholar at the First Amendment Center. Haynes is best known for helping schools and communities find common ground on conflicts involving religion and values in public schools. He is the author of *Religion in American History: What to Teach and How*, winner of a 1990 Educational Press Award, and *Finding Common Ground: A First Amendment Guide to Religion and Public Education*, among other publications. An educator for more than 20 years, Haynes holds a master's degree in religion and education from Harvard Divinity School and a doctorate in theological studies from Emory University.

Vicky L. Phillips is the Superintendent of Schools for the School District of Lancaster, a mid-size, urban school district located in South Eastern Pennsylvania. Vicki, who received her doctorate from the University of Kentucky in 1993, also serves as the Executive Director of the Children Achieving Challenge and Director of the Greater Philadelphia First Partnership for Reform – Organizations directly linked to the reform of the School District of Philadelphia. Vicky is the author of *Finishing the Race: A District Perspective of Standards-Based Reform, and Developing the Habits of Quality Teaching*, among other publications.

James D. Anderson, who will be delivering AESA's Butt's Lecture co-sponsored by UCEA this year, is Professor and Head of the Department of Educational Policy Studies at the University of Illinois. He is the author of *The Education of Blacks in the South, 1860-1935*, which received the Outstanding Book Award from the American Educational Research Association and the Critics Choice Award from the American Educational Studies Association. Dr. Anderson's research has won him wide recognition as the premiere historian of African American education.

There are many exciting events at this year's convention. We are planning a special event to connect with two other educational conventions who will be in Pittsburgh while our group is there, the American Educational Studies Association (AESA) and the History of Education Society (HES). Also on the agenda is a riverboat cruise and dinner for Friday evening and the Past Presidents' Reception on Saturday evening.

Mark your calendar! Please note that there are several important schedule changes for this year's convention. The Plenum Session will begin at 8:00 am Thursday. Regular convention sessions will begin at 8:00 am on Friday morning. The official opening of the convention takes place Friday at 11:00 am and features an address

by Gail Furman, UCEA President. On Sunday, we will have a breakfast speaker, followed by paper sessions and workshops. Optional tours will be available on Thursday and Sunday. Plan to bring your family and come early and/or stay late to take advantage of the many tour packages available in Pittsburgh. Watch the UCEA website and the fall edition of the UCEA Review for further details. See you in Pittsburgh this November!



Pittsburgh has a number of attractions sure to be of interest to those attending the 2002 UCEA Convention.

Pittsburgh... Things to do and see

When coming to Pittsburgh for the 2002 UCEA Annual Conference, October 31-November 2 plan to come early and stay late. No matter what your taste, there is something special to see and do in Pittsburgh. Explore all that Pittsburgh has to offer at www.visitpittsburgh.com

If you enjoy museums, Pittsburgh has plenty! The Carnegie Museum of Art hosts some of the finest pieces in the world, including Monet's Water Lilies. The Carnegie Museum of Natural History transports visitors to the past. The Senator John Heinz Pittsburgh Regional History Center offers a glimpse of Pittsburgh's proud past. The Frick Art and Historical Center is a 5.5-acre site featuring the restored turn-of-the-century home of industrialist Henry Clay Frick, a greenhouse, an Antique Car and Carriage Museum, and a Museum Shop and Visitors' Center. After touring the Frick, treat yourself to lunch or tea at the Café, one of Pittsburgh's top twenty restaurants. Don't forget to take a walk on the wild side and visit the Andy Warhol Museum!

The Carnegie Science Center, just a short walk from our conference hotel, offers hands-on science exhibits for young and old. The Science Center has been described as an "amusement park for the mind" with hundreds of exhibits, an OMNIMAX theater, interactive planetarium, and World War II submarine. Visit the Pittsburgh Zoo or Phipps Conservatory and Botanical Gardens, where something is always in bloom. Head to the Pittsburgh Children's Museum and visit puppets from Mister Rogers' Neighborhood or go to the National Aviary, featuring more than 450 colorful and exotic species from all over the world. Pittsburgh is home to numerous professional sports teams including the Pirates (baseball), the Steelers (football), and the Penguins (hockey). There are other cultural opportunities in Pittsburgh including the Pittsburgh Sym-

phony, Byham Orchestra, Benedum Center and theater, City Theater, Heinz Hall, Harris Theater, and O'Reilly Theater. Visit www.pgharts.org or www.proartstickets.org to find out what is on stage while you are in town.

Getting around is easy in Pittsburgh. Everyone can ride the "T", Pittsburgh's subway train, between downtown stops at no charge. From any spot downtown you can head to The Point, the park at the tip of the Golden Triangle that offers a great view of Pittsburgh's three rivers. The Strip District offers fresh produce, restaurants, and clubs in an open market venue. Across the Monongahela River you'll find Station Square, which includes more than 50 specialty and boutique shops and eighteen restaurants including the landmark Grand Concourse Restaurant, and Gandy Dancer Saloon.

If you enjoy shopping, you will love shopping in Pittsburgh. You can even begin your shopping excursion in the Airmail at Pittsburgh's International Airport. Downtown is home to the headquarters for four major department stores and shops of every description. The Strip District, Southside, Shadyside, and Squirrel Hill neighborhoods each offer cozy restaurants and unique shops.

You should also consider a visit Oakland, home to the University of Pittsburgh and Carnegie Mellon University. While in Oakland be sure to allow time for cappuccino and shopping along South Craig Street then visit the Heinz Chapel to view some of the most spectacular stained glass windows in the world. Next door to the chapel is the Cathedral of Learning where you can view the Nationality Rooms, 26 classrooms built by Pittsburgh's many ethnic groups to tell the story of the city's diverse cultural heritage. You won't want to leave Pittsburgh without seeing these classrooms!

UCEA encourages you to bring your family and come early and/or stay late so that you can enjoy some of the many things that Pittsburgh has to offer!

UCEA Governance Meetings Schedule for October 2002

UCEA Executive Committee Meeting.....29th-30th
 UCEA Plenary Session.....31st
 UCEA Pre-Convention Sessions.....31st

UCEA 2002 Pittsburgh Convention

UCEA Annual Convention.....
 November 1-3, 2002
 UCEA Annual Graduate Student Symposium.....
 November 1-3, 2002

River Boat Dinner Cruise

This year the UCEA Convention Planning Committee decided to take our annual banquet on board the Gateway Clipper to sail along the Monongahela, Allegheny and Ohio Rivers. The Gateway Clipper Fleet, America's premier riverboats, presents an unforgettable experience that is said to capture the personality of the great river city—Pittsburgh. This UCEA cruise will depart from the dock in front of the Pittsburgh Hilton and Towers around 7:30 pm on Friday night. The cruise includes dinner, music, and a cash

bar. The cost of the dinner cruise is \$40 per person. Because the boat only holds 200 persons, it is important that you purchase your tickets early. Tickets will be dispersed on a first come, first serve basis.

Special Interest Group Meetings

We have several slots available at the 2002 UCEA Convention for Special Interest Group Meetings. Please contact the UCEA office as soon as possible, as SIG meeting space will be provided on a first come first serve basis.

The Cathedral of Learning

The University of Pittsburgh was well on the way to becoming an acropolis of neoclassical buildings on an Oakland hillside when John G. Bowman became the University's 10th chancellor in 1921. Bowman's plan to develop a grand structure expanding upward served as a visible inspiration to all who approached the city. He hoped it would carry the message that education was the result of aspiring to great heights. As the structure was developed, the city's ethnic communities were invited to undertake the creation of nationality classrooms, which would enrich the new building with their old world heritages. After a decade, the building, rising 535 feet into the sky, was completed.

The building contains classrooms that reflect the culture, heritage and craftsmanship of China, the Check Republic, England, France, Germany, Hungary, India, Israel, Italy, Lithuania, Norway, Romania, Sweden, and a host of other countries from across the globe. If you are interested in visiting the Cathedral while you are in Pittsburgh for the Annual UCEA Convention, hour-long tours guided and self-guided tours are available. For more information on guided tours, see the fall UCEA Review or monitor the UCEA Convention website for updated conference information. If you would like to take an on-line tour of the Cathedral please visit <http://www.pitt.edu/~natrooms>.

Convention PreSessions and Workshops

At the 2002 Annual UCEA Convention, a number of interesting presessions and workshops have been planned. A presession hosted by Robert Kottkamp (Hofstra University) and Terry Orr (Teachers College) focused on developing an evaluation process for measuring the impact of preparation on the practice of school leaders will take place on Thursday, October 31st. A workshop on the use of technology within the educational leadership classroom will be provided by Scott McLeod (University of Minnesota). At least two workshops on publishing will be provided this year. The first, focused upon the "how to" of getting published will be provided by Jim Scheurich (University of Texas at Austin) and a second focused on publishing in the Educational Administration Quarterly will be provided by Jane Lindle (University of Kentucky).

If you have an idea for a presession or workshop that you would like to have considered for this year's convention, please contact UCEA headquarters as soon as possible by calling 573-884-8300 or emailing Ann Sleper at admnucea@coe.missouri.edu.



Hotel Reservation Request



UCEA Convention 2002

November 1-3, 2002

Name _____

Affiliation _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Phone _____

Check In Time 3:00 p.m. Arrival Date _____

Check Out Time 12:00 p.m. Departure Date _____

These rates are available until October 10th. After this date rates increase substantially. Please make your reservations early.

Singles	[] \$125	Doubles	[] \$125
Executive Floor	[] \$155	Suites - call hotel directly	[] \$350 and up

Each additional Person is \$25.00 per night.

[] Smoking [] Non-Smoking

[] ADA Requirements _____

[] Advance Deposit (One Nights Deposit Required, checks & credit cards are acceptable to establish prepayment)

Deposit is Refunded if Cancelled Within 72 Hours

[] Credit Card (If you choose to use a credit card, please complete the information below. Credit cards will be charged when reservation is made.)

Card Holder's Name _____

Credit Card _____

Card # _____

Signature _____

Every effort will be made to accommodate those guests arriving at the Hilton prior to the designated check-in time. These rates are quoted exclusive of appropriate state and local taxes, which are currently 14%. All guests are required to present a valid credit card upon registration; no checks accepted upon check-in. The deadline for reservations are October 10, 2002. Reservations may be made by calling Hilton Reservations at 800-445-8667 or mailing/faxing this form as per below. If calling, be sure to mention The University Council for Educational Administration to receive the special convention group rate (CODE: UCE).

Mail Directly To:

Hilton Pittsburgh
Gateway Center
600 Commonwealth Place
Pittsburgh, PA 15222
Phone: 412-391-4600

Fax Directly To:

Hilton Pittsburgh
412-467-3400