Race and Educational Leadership: Conversation Catalysts to Prompt Reflection, Discussion, and Action for Individuals and Organizations

Jeffrey S. Brooks, Florida State University

The purpose of this article is to stimulate reflection and discourse on issues of race in educational leadership. Drawing predominantly from research on social foundations of education, educational leadership, and anthropology I briefly discuss several points that can be used to initiate or advance conversations about race among members of the educational leadership professoriate, practicing educational leaders, and graduate students. While there are certainly much more in-depth investigations of the issues I will raise, some of which I cite in this article, my intent here is not to give the topic an exhaustive treatment but rather to selectively mention particular points that have stirred my own thinking on the subject, and that have prompted me to rethink and change the way I engage and ignore these issues in my own teaching, service, and research. To be sure, the brevity of the newsletter format makes it difficult to sufficiently explore the multifaceted nuances of issues germane to the topic at hand. However, while this is a limitation of form, the succinct nature of a newsletter article also has advantages; it is an excellent vehicle for starting conversations with colleagues, students, and leaders, who can then begin a more substantive and sustained dialogue. I invite you to use this article as a tool to help you reflect on your own attitudes, assumptions and behaviors, and also as a tool to initiate conversations with your colleagues that might eventually lead to action. As such, this is not meant as a definitive statement on race and educational leadership, rather it is an invitation to the beginning of a dialogue.

Conversation Catalysts for Discussions about Race in Educational Leadership

These “conversation catalysts” can serve a dual function: (a) to prompt you to reflect on your own attitudes, assumptions and behaviors in regard to issues of race in educational leadership, and (b) to help individuals and institutions begin dialogues about issues of race and educational leadership. While you may choose to read this and ponder in silence, I urge you to share this brief article with colleagues and to extend your discussions well beyond these points.

The definition of race is contested, and is by nature constantly under revision. On May 17, 1998 the American Anthropological Association adopted its Statement on “Race” (http://www.aaanet.org/stmts/racepp.htm). While I urge you to explore the AAA position in depth, and think about what it says about race, I also urge you reflect on what it embodies—a strong and research-based political statement formulated by one of the most highly respected social science organizations in the world. Should educational leadership scholars representing organizations such as universities, preparations, and international organizations such as the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) and Division A of the American Educational Research Association (AERA) likewise seek to develop such statements? The AAA statement essentially asserts that there are two fundamental concepts that should frame our understanding of race. The first of these fundamental concepts is that race can be studied in terms of phenotypic difference. Phenotype is the way a demographer might study race. That is, counting up the number of people who are identified, or self-identify, as a particular racial affiliation. In terms of educational leadership, it is important to note a basic inequity in the phenotypic distribution of school leaders in relation to students in the United States. The 2003-2004 School and Staffing Survey estimated the total distribution of “min Listens to Pod Casts of featured UCEA Speakers, Including Keynote Richard Elmore or”y principally in public schools at 17.6 percent, although the country’s minority student population was estimated at 39.7 percent (Strizek, Pittsonberger, Riordan, Lyter, & Orlofsky, 2006). Moreover, research suggests that instead of increasing, the number of school administrators of color may have actually declined over the past several decades (Gay, 1997). Why might this be? And what are the intended and unintended consequences of such trends and distributions for schools and children? What is the phenotypic distribution of students, teachers, and leaders in your educational organizations? The second fundamental concept in the AAA Statement on “Race” is that race is a culturally constructed phenomenon used for the purpose of oppression. Suggesting that race is a culturally constructed instrument of oppression is to acknowledge that people have a long and terrible tradition of using the concept of racial inequality to create dominant and subordinate groups.

Given an enormous corpus of multidisciplinary research on organizational culture that documents the enormous influence of culture on leadership practice in all manner of institutions, it is incumbent on educational
Race occurs simultaneously in multiple and ever-changing historical, social, political and economic contexts. Race is a multi-level phenomenon, and leadership scholars and practitioners to understand the ways leadership and race are co-constructed in schools, school systems and in other educational settings (Schein, 1992).

Research that ignores issues of race is bad science. In an era of inquiry marked by widespread assertions that “scientifically-based” research is superior to “non-scientific” research, it is curious that quite a lot of so-called “scientifically-based” research ignores issues of race. Ignoring a phenomenon every social science has acknowledged as an important and powerful social force is to selectively omit pertinent information that likely has either a direct or indirect influence on the subject(s) of interest. Color-blind research, and probably more generally difference-blind research (Larson & Murtadha, 2002), is simply bad social science. While one may be able to espouse an insular logic that allows for the “control” of race as a phenotypic variable, it is impossible to control for fluid social dynamics that take many overt and covert forms, change from situation to situation and evolve over time. Researchers must seek to understand and account for the particular ways in which race may manifest as individual and organizational phenomena.

Failing to include racial dynamics in educational leadership research will render the field obsolete, and already leaves it incomplete. Let me be clear about something: I make this point not as an activist with a “liberal” agenda, but as a social scientist. While there are many ways to conceptualize “leadership” as a research phenomenon, scholars commonly define it as the study of influence (Yukl, 1998). If we accept this broad-brush definition, it follows that studies of leadership must take into account social forces that compromise or privilege certain people and/or groups’ ability to exert influence. Race, as a culturally constructed instrument of oppression, has tremendous impact on individual and organizational leadership, precisely because it privileges some and constrains others. While the relatively paltry amount of educational leadership research on race may or may not be a moral disgrace—in terms of what it suggests about the field’s commitment to providing equitable schools for all students—it does indicate that the knowledge base which undergirds the study and teaching of educational leadership fails to consider important social dynamics of influence, the very subject scholars in the field purport to “understand” in their research. Again, setting moral arguments aside, when considered from a social science perspective, it is important for all researchers to consider race because it is a critical aspect of the study of influence—it is the intellectual responsibility of educational leadership scholars to investigate race.

Dedicated supporters of the University Council for Educational Administration who include UCEA in their wills or estate plans are UCEA Partners for the Future. These special donors have decided to extend their support beyond their lifetimes and leave a legacy of tolerance and justice.

Writing a will and including a bequest to UCEA allows you to choose where your estate will go and, in most cases, helps you to reduce taxes on your estate. Your bequest or planned gift—regardless of size—is a meaningful way to honor UCEA’s work and assure its future.

If you are interested in receiving information about wills, charitable gift annuities or other planned giving opportunities available at UCEA—with no obligation—please contact UCEA’s director of finance at 512-475-8592.

If you have already included UCEA in your will or estate plans, please contact us so we can update you as a UCEA Partner for the Future.
history is in some ways intertwined with these other racial dynamics and is in other ways an intensely personal and subjective experience. This should urge educational leaders, and the people who prepare and train them, to consider how personal history shapes their perspectives and actions in the context of other histories. Leaders must seek to develop an understanding of how they can and do influence the collective and individual experiences of their fellow educators and students in their charge. This perspective—that race is both a subjective personal experience and a multi-level social phenomenon—should also prompt educational leaders to develop a greater awareness of racial issues within and between people and subcultures within their organizations and communities.

By omission or commission, we are all engaging issues of race. Race is not the specialized domain of activists, the “leadership for social justice crowd,” or scholars and graduate students of color. It is instead an issue for all educational leadership scholars and practitioners, like it or not. To illustrate this point, I suggest a typology of racial engagement. In doing so I contend both that (a) there are many ways to engage and ignore issues of race, and that (b) the way we engage and ignore these issues often varies from situation to situation, and when we interact with different people at different times. Consider the ways in which you, your colleagues, and your organizations might assume one or a combination of these roles in different aspects of your leadership practices:

- The Advocate Role: Urges others to change their behavior, mostly on behalf of other people rather than for their personal gain.
- The Activist Role: Opposes or supports a position through vigorous deeds and proactive work. Often in a highly visible manner.
- The Ally Role: Works with others for racial equity behind the scenes.
- The Alchemist Role: Insists that lead is gold. Alchemists’ attitude toward issues of race is based on a false assumption that what they have always done is tantamount to social justice. This is often based on the “irrefutable proof” that they once had a student of color who graduated or that they “treat all students the same way, regardless of race.”
- The Anti-racist Role: Develops and implements practices that actively fight racism at the interpersonal and organizational levels. Anti-racists seek to dismantle hegemony and eradicate oppression in their personal and professional work.
- The Absolutist Role: Believes that race is not their problem. They may believe that they live in a racially homogeneous community, leave the work to others because it is too difficult, or simply be ignorant of racial dynamics. But, as we are part of a fluid global community and racial issues permeate all levels of society, the idea that engaging racial issues “is someone else’s job” is misguided.
- The Apathetic Role: These people have some awareness and knowledge of racial issues, but they do not speak out or act on this awareness.

How do YOU engage and/or ignore various issues of race in educational leadership?

While issues of race are important for everyone, White men in particular must engage issues of race and race relations in educational leadership. As White men make up an extremely high proportion of practicing educational administrators and professors of educational leadership, their silence on issues of race speaks volumes. Until White men engage issues of race, and use their disproportionate amount of privilege and power for equity rather than to perpetuate hegemony, they are exacerbating the problem. Importantly, silence is not a neutral stance; White men must understand that by neglecting to proactively engage, understand, and interrogate issues of race in their teaching, service, and research they are participating in a long-standing tradition of oppression, exclusion, and marginalization in educational leadership (Young & Laible, 2000). White men’s collective and historic lack of engagement issues of race is the “elephant in the room” (Wynne, 1999) of educational leadership; the huge issue about which few will speak.

In conclusion, I re-assert that I don’t pretend to be an expert on issues of race in educational leadership, but I do count them among the most important issues facing the field today and I am committed to learn more about and study these dynamics in my own teaching, service, and research. I am personally committed to understanding and trying to teach about and conduct inquiry on leadership, broadly conceived, and this demands an investigation and interrogation of issues that affect influence, such as race. I acknowledge that many similar arguments can be made for issues of gender, sexual orientation, class, etc. Yet as a White male professor conducting social science-based inquiry on educational leadership, I feel it is both my intellectual and moral responsibility to explore these dynamics in all facets my work. I hope you will find that the points I have raised in this article also prompt you to consider your own attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors on race and educational leadership and compel you to amend this list with many more points for conversation. I also hope that you become a catalyst yourself for issues of race in educational leadership through your teaching, service, and research.
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The field benefits from well-designed research such as that described in Preparing School Leaders for a Changing World, a report recently released by the Stanford Educational Leadership Institute (SELI). The report presents the results from a nationwide study of principal development programs, identified as exemplary, and the policies that influence them. The researchers involved in the study, Linda Darling-Hammond, Michelle LaPointe, Debra Meyerson, and Margaret T. Orr, sought to understand more fully the contents and context of effective leadership preparation. Although there have been multiple attempts to describe the landscape of leadership preparation and to document both progress and shortcomings in the field, as Young, Petersen and Short (2002) point out, “we have not seen an analysis that places preparation within its complex and overlapping environments and then seeks to understand and analyze the factors that support and detract from a programs ability to provide quality leadership preparation” (p. 143).

Preparing School Leaders for a Changing World appears at an important time. Over the past ten years the field has endured intense criticism, and while significant efforts are underway to research and improve preparation programs (such as the work of the UCEA-TEA leadership preparation evaluation taskforce) the tendency is still strong to paint leadership preparation in a negative light. However, that is not the case in Preparing School Leaders for a Changing World. Rather the researchers, true to their purpose of understanding what was working and why, present rich portrayals of programs working in cooperation with school districts and current school administrators to recruit committed educators and provide quality preparation experiences that highlight what they and their participants understood to be significant about that preparation.

Program Curricula and Experiences

Over the last decade, increasing numbers of educational leadership programs across the nation have engaged in program improvement efforts, and it is refreshing to see some of these programs described in a highly visible report like Preparing School Leaders for a Changing World. However, the focus placed within the report on the importance of a full-time, fully funded, high quality internship may be the report's most important contribution. It is in those programs, where internships are full-time and fully funded, that you will find the higher quality internships. Students in those programs are given on-the-job training where they are able to connect what they are learning in their programs to leadership practice. This is a much more difficult undertaking in programs where internships are not full-time nor fully funded. The report makes a strong case for states to put in place comprehensive policies concerning the recruitment, preparation and development of educational leaders. Such an approach is indeed important and the centerpiece of such efforts should be a high quality, full-time and fully funded internship.

The content of the highlighted programs is notable as well. As one would expect, the curricula are aligned to national leadership standards and respond to contemporary political emphases, such as high stakes testing. As such, students in these programs work to develop skills, such as data-based decision making, which allow them to work with teachers as instructional leaders. This is of course essential to both the provision of instructional leadership as well as to ones survival as a school leader in the current political environment. Given that the alignment of leadership preparation curricula to national leadership standards has been one of the most significant changes in preparation in the last ten years (Young, Crow, Orr, Ogawa & Creighton, 2005), it is validating to learn that such alignment has been associated with program quality. However, we feel that it is necessary to temper our enthusiasm because while such curricular emphases is both important and necessary, we are not convinced that it is sufficient for providing the kind of leadership that schools need today and will need in the future. We were disappointed with the lack of attention given in the report to curricular elements that addressed critical thinking skills (e.g., gathering, reflecting on and critically analyzing multiple sources of data), engagement (community and political), and social justice, which are essential to effectively leading and supporting ones school community.

Highlighting Contextual Issues

One of the things that makes this study so useful is its attention to program context, particularly its recognition of the importance of looking at leadership preparation in the context of university-district partnerships as well as within the professional development continuum of preservice and inservice. Studies or commentaries that treat university leadership preparation in a vacuum apart from what districts do to induct and develop leaders paint (perhaps unwittingly) an inaccurate picture of university preparation as the only professional learning experience necessary for principals. Such portraits, of course, ignore the complex nature of learning a new job and developing expertise within that job, which depend upon continuous professional learning opportunities and organizational socialization (Crow & Glascok, 1995). Preparing School Leaders for A Changing World captures this important relationship well.

The study also embeds its understanding of effective leadership preparation within policy contexts. This too is very useful because it allows the authors to identify policy levers that acknowledge the multiple stakeholders in this process (e.g., University-based preparation programs, professional organizations, field-based practitioners, and government agencies). Acting as if universities are the only stakeholder and ignoring the roles and responsibilities that others have in preparing leaders is absurd and shortsighted. Yet, there have been few points in our history when the field has sought change through collaboration. Perhaps the programs highlighted in this study can begin to provide a precedent for the kind of interdependent conduct that is currently needed.

Institutionalizing Relationships and Resources

However, for such interdependency and collaboration to become embraced by the field, stakeholders will need longitudinal studies of this nature which lay bare the strategies and paths taken to initiate, build and sustain such relationships. The current report only alludes to the issue of institutionalization. Yet, under-
standing how exemplary programs can sustain their efforts over-
time is essential. The types of funding that programs rely upon,
including the fickle nature of foundation funding, and chang-
ing district/state policy agendas create environments in which
the long-term, institutionalization of quality components of
leadership preparation programs is doubtful and problematic.

The researchers directly acknowledge the financial constraints of
most leadership preparation programs and note that ameliorating such
constraints is very important to establishing effective and sustaining
programs. At a minimum, preparation programs and their students
should be provided with the resources needed to: 1) employ a critical
mass of full-time faculty, 2) develop a cohort of quality and commit-
ted leadership candidates, 3) provide full-time, fully-funded intern-
ships, and 4) work effectively with district partners to identify, prepare
and professionally develop current and future leaders. Resources that
are provided and used for these purposes would benefit the field.

However, the important role that financial support played in pro-
viding effective preparation within the exemplary programs, raises the
question of whether such support will be possible on a larger scale.
Over the years, Danforth, Gates and Wallace Funds, have supported
initiatives across the country focused on improving the practice and
preparation of school and school system leaders (Cambron-Mc-
Cabe, 1999; McCarthy, 1999; Milstein, 1993), and yet once the exter-
nal funding was gone, most programs had a difficult time sustaining
the most innovative and exciting components of their programs.

Complicating Issues

The issue of long-term sustainability of effective preparation is parti-
cularly important given several complicating issues, such as
regional administrator shortages and increasing support for market
competition. Universities in a number of regions, especially state
institutions, are being asked to increase both the quality and quan-
tity of leadership candidates that they prepare in order to respond
to administrator turnover and retirements. Unfortunately, concerns
over quantity in many states and localities are given precedence over
quality, and increasing numbers of under-prepared candidates are
entering school leadership positions. Unfortunately, many programs
that are improving and increasing the demands of their programs,
are also finding that their student enrollments are decreasing. Al-
though popular arguments about market competition make the case
that low-quality programs will be driven out of the market by higher
quality markets, increasing competition in the current context is not
increasing the general quality of programs. In fact, it appears to be
having the opposite effect on many preparation programs. Students
seeking licensure in school administration appear “unwilling to de-
vote adequate time and effort to their preparation” (Murphy & For-
syth, 1999). As a result, the fastest, easiest, and cheapest programs are
emerging as major players in states across the nation. This has result-
ed in a decrease in entrance requirements, a decrease in courses and
program hours, and in some cases a decreased focus on or absence
of the internship (Creighton & Jones, 2001; Young, et. al, 2002).

Although, the research in this report focused on what is working
and why within a set of programs identified as exemplary and did
an admirable job of describing contextual issues and resources that
supported success, we believe it is equally important to understand
the issues that undermine success. Understanding the impact of
contextual issues such as administrator shortages and market com-
petition, which impact countless programs, is essential for the field.

Closing Thoughts

For over fifty years, the UCEA consortium has worked to ensure
that its membership criteria support quality leadership preparation,
and the recommendations included in the Preparing School Lead-
ers for a Changing World parallel and validate those criteria. The
report’s recommendations, like UCEA’s standards, focus on insti-
tutional capacity, partnerships, recruitment, quality curriculum and
internships, candidate placement and professional development.
Strong program standards like UCEA’s (available at www.ucea.org)
in conjunction with quality leadership content standards and strong
program faculty form the basis of effective leadership preparation.
Although, “there are no simple solutions, no quick fixes” (Young,
et. al., 2002), the authors of this report provide a strong platform
to state level policy makers, leadership faculty and other stakehold-
ers who are interested in improving the preparation, practice and
professional development of school leaders. We applaud Darling-
Hammond, LaPointe, Meyerson and Orr (2007) for a job well
done and hope to see more research of this caliber in the future.
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From the Director: Reports on Education Push Workforce Preparation

Although the linkage between the American education system and the US economy is not an altogether new issue, it has sparked a great deal of recent attention. Several national commissions, including the National Governor Association’s Task Force on American Innovation and the New Commission on the Skills of the American Workforce, raised questions about the American education system’s (both p-12 and higher education) ability to prepare students for the workforce of the future. The Spelling Commission focused its concerns primarily on higher education and the transition from high schools to higher education.

These reports represent a mere sliver of the discourse focusing on the quality of education in the US and its (in)ability to prepare students and adults for the global workforce. In 1990, the first Commission on the Skills of the American Workforce warned that globalization of the world’s economy would send low-skilled jobs to countries where the price of low-skill labor was the cheapest and advised the US education system to focus on educating US students and workers to focus on developing a highly skilled workforce.

This spring a report from the New Commission on the Skills of the American Workforce, which is made up of former Cabinet secretaries, governors, college presidents, and business, civic and labor leaders, reported that the first commission got its forecast only half right. The 1990 commission did not anticipate the trend of outsourcing higher-paying jobs that demand high-level skills, as well. The report, Tough Choices for Tough Times, argued that a growing number of countries (e.g., China and India) have large numbers of highly educated workers who are willing to work for lower wages than similarly educated citizens of the US. The report noted, for example, that a company can choose to hire an American engineer at $45,000 or an Indian engineer for $7,500 a year. In response to this trend, the new commission has called for “a dramatic overhaul” of the American education system.

The fact that these commissions viewed the current US education system as needing to be improved is unsurprising; the mass media is overflowing with similar themes. Both reports provide a number of recommendations for renovating and/or improving both the education system and student outcomes. Recommendations include recruiting and training a teaching force from the top third of high school students going to college; building a high-quality and free early childhood education system; providing the nation’s disadvantaged students with the resources they need in order to meet new standards and graduate from high school; providing every adult worker a free high quality professional education supported by a system of new board exam standards, revamping education standards and assessments to reflect not only academic knowledge but also values deemed critical for the workforce (i.e., creativity and teamwork), and preparing teacher (and very likely leaders as well) through Teacher Development Agencies in each state. Schools of education, districts and other interested parties should compete for the right to recruit, prepare, and/or license teachers.

Regardless of where you stand concerning the conclusions or values of the three reports and their recommendations, the discourse of a failing US education system steadily continues to flood the public mind and provides the context in which both educational leaders work and leadership faculty prepare them. Although there are counter stories (and commissions that come to different conclusions), they are less likely to be printed and repeated. It is a contemporary reality, by which many in our field are frustrated and in which a growing number of faculty are trying to influence—regardless of the odds of doing so—through their teaching, service and research.

It is important for faculty, current and future leaders, and communities to engage these issues. Education faculty should not play the role of passive bystander on issues that speak to the heart of our work. Our classes should be spaces for critically engaging with these and other critiques and counter-stories as well as the data that both supports and negates them. Although educational leadership programs have multiple goals and responsibilities and are being influenced by policies and regulations that seem to reduce and constrain what programs can achieve, critical conversations that push thinking must remain a priority.

Our leadership programs should provide opportunities to explore new possibilities for schools and they should be places where future leaders sharpen their thinking skills, enhance their knowledge and develop important skills. Moreover, future leaders should not only have an opportunity to explore such contextual issues, they should leave our programs prepared to respond proactively. Responding proactively, however, doesn’t simply mean being able to respond to media and public inquiries into school issues or understanding how to spread messages about school successes. It might also involve being able to engage school community members in thoughtful conversations about such critiques and counter-stories that support understanding and efforts for school improve, ensuring that ones school is staffed by teachers who have strong skills and who are highly committed to the success of all students, and working to ensure that one’s school curriculum is rich and delivered appropriately.

Faculty should be engaging with these issues, not just in the classroom with their students but with their colleagues and communities. As teachers, researchers and scholars of leadership, school reform, equity, social justice, community engagement, governance, finance, policy, etc, faculty who work in educational leadership programs should be engaging in critical conversations about issues, such as the future of schooling, to inform their work and push their own thinking. Such conversations are indispensable.
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Currently pending before the United States Supreme Court are two important cases that examine the constitutionality of voluntary integration programs in Louisville, Kentucky and Seattle, Washington. Both voluntary integration programs allow parents to select a school for their child’s enrollment as long as the choice furthers the districts’ goals for racial integration. The cases, Meredith v. Jefferson County School District and Parents Involved in Community Schools v. Seattle, are considered by many to be the most important school cases considering the use of race in student assignment since the historic decision in Brown v. Board of Education in 1954. In fact, a number of the 64 amicus curiae, or friend of the court, briefs filed in connection with the two cases review social science literature to argue both for and against the importance of integrated education and for and against the necessity of the use of racial controls on student assignment. Given the importance of the pending decisions, expected by June 30, 2007, edited versions of two of the briefs are provided here to frame the debate.

First, the amicus curiae brief filed on behalf of David J. Armor, Abigail Thernstrom, and Stephan Thernstrom argues that research to date is too inconclusive to support the conclusion that controlling pupil enrollment in order to achieve racial diversity in public elementary and secondary schools is a compelling state interest. Dr. David J. Armor is a Professor of Public Policy at George Mason University. Abigail Thernstrom is Senior Fellow at the Manhattan Institute and the Vice-Chair of the United States Commission on Civil Rights. Stephan Thernstrom is Winthrop Professor of History at Harvard University and Senior Fellow at the Manhattan Institute. The brief, one of 11 briefs in support of the plaintiffs, groups challenging the school districts, was filed with the Court on August 21, 2006.

Second, the amicus curiae brief filed on behalf of the American Educational Research Association (AERA), one of 53 briefs supporting the school districts, argues that social science research demonstrates the compelling nature of integrated schooling as a goal and also supports the conclusion that controlling for race is necessary in order to achieve the benefits of integrated education. It was filed with the Court on October 10, 2006.

Both briefs have been edited for length and focus on the use of social science to inform the constitutional inquiry before the Court. Full versions of these and other briefs filed in connection to the cases are available at: http://www.lawmemo.com/sct/05/Parents/

1. Academic Achievement

Academic achievement has been studied more than any outcome in the desegregation research literature, which is understandable. Imparting knowledge and teaching cognitive skills is arguably the central mission of elementary and secondary schools. One might assume, then, that there would be broad consensus about the effects of desegregation on the achievement of minority students, but this is not the case. Given the large number of studies of achievement, the following analysis groups them according to whether they were done during the early years of desegregation (1970s and earlier), the middle years (1980s), or more recent years (1990 and later).

Early studies

Large-scale school desegregation plans did not become commonplace until the late 1960s, influenced by the passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the Supreme Court’s 1968 decision in Green v. County Sch. Bd. of New Kent County, Va., 391 U.S. 430 (1968). The Armor study was the first to review five evaluations of intentionally “generated” desegregation plans (vs. “natural” desegregation from housing patterns) using quasi-experimental designs. Finding few significant black achievement gains in these five programs, it was also the first social science study to conclude that desegregation would not produce major improvements in black achievement and thus close the achievement gap 20. St. John’s review in 1975 advanced the research on desegregation in several ways. 21. First, she was able to assemble thirty-seven versions of these and other briefs filed in connection to the cases are available at: http://www.lawmemo.com/sct/05/Parents/

II. SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH DOES NOT SUPPORT A CONCLUSION THAT RACIAL DIVERSITY IN PRIMARY OR SECONDARY EDUCATION CONSTITUTES A COMPPELLING STATE INTEREST.
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study involves only a single school district, it was unique for its large sample of students (1700), its duration of six years, and the number of outcomes assessed. 22. Unlike most studies of desegregation, it included large numbers of Hispanic students as well as black students, and as such it remains one of the largest studies of desegregation's impact on Hispanic students. The authors conclude:

“Analysis of standardized reading achievement data offers a picture that provides little encouragement for those who see desegregation as a panacea for reducing the achievement gap that so ubiquitously characterizes minority academic performance. While the achievement of Anglo children did not suffer, minority students showed no overall benefit.”

Studies in the 1980s

There were only two major studies of desegregation and achievement during the 1980s, but two features make them the most important of the historical studies. First, a larger number of studies of desegregation had become available, making generalization more viable. Second, they used formal meta-analysis, a technique developed during the 1970s. This technique has the advantage of quantifying the effects of desegregation (called “effect” sizes) across many studies. These effect sizes can then be described by summary statistics instead of simply counting the number of positive, negative, or neutral studies.

The first formal meta-analysis was published by Crain and Mahard in 1983 using 93 separate studies of the effects of desegregation on black achievement.24. Overall studies and grade levels, Crain and Mahard found a small effect size of about .08, but the effect size for kindergarten and first grade students averaged about .30, which is quite large. The authors concluded that desegregation had a significant impact on achievement, but only if it started at the very beginning of schooling.

Given the wide variation in conclusions about desegregation's effect on black achievement, the National Institute of Education (NIE) sought to clarify the issue by convening a panel of experts to carry out further meta-analyses. 25. All but one panelist had done prior research on this topic. Thomas Cook, a noted specialist in methodology, chaired the panel and wrote a summary chapter. . . .

Each panelist wrote a separate chapter in the report; four of those chapters were separate meta-analyses because each author rejected one or two studies on methodological grounds. One author did not compute effect estimates for 11 of the 19 studies (for technical reasons), and therefore that analysis was considered problematic in Cook's summary. Of the three remaining meta-analyses, the effect of desegregation on reading ranged from .06 to .16 with a mean of .12; the average median was .04. For math, the range was .01 to .08 with a mean of .04 and an average median of .01. Based on these results, Cook came to the following conclusions:

“On the average, desegregation did not cause an increase in achievement in mathematics. Desegregation increased mean reading levels. The gain reliably differed from zero and was estimated to be between two to six weeks [of a school year] across the studies examined. . . . The median gains were almost always greater than zero but were lower than the means and did not reliably differ from zero. . . . I find the variability in effect sizes more striking and less well understood than any measure of central tendency.”

26. Cook also discussed the difference between the NIE panel’s results and those of Crain and Mahard. He noted that their overall mean effect size found by Crain and Mahard was similar to that found by the NIE panel. The difference was due to kindergarten and first grade studies that were included in the Crain and Mahard analysis but not in the panel’s studies due to methodological problems. The problem was that most studies of these early grades did not have comparable pre-tests and post-tests, an omission that can lead to inflated effects because children in desegregated schools usually have higher initial ability. Thus Cook says that that Crain and Mahard’s estimates “probably result in overestimating the effects of desegregation . . . ,” but he also said that the issue is not fully resolved and would require further research.

Recent Studies

Between 1995 and 2005, a number of important studies appeared . . . By 1995, many school districts had operated desegregation plans for a long time, which allowed case studies that could assess the long-term effects of desegregation in a particular school district. The first of these recent studies was a more traditional research review by Schofield in 1995. 29. Although it is not a formal meta-analysis, it is one of the most comprehensive literature reviews ever undertaken on all of the educational and social outcomes of desegregation.

Schofield reviews all of the work mentioned in this brief as well as some not cited here, but she devotes the most space to a discussion the 1984 NIE study. She found that Cook's “conclusions seem to be a fair summary of the projects outcome ...” and describes all of the points mentioned above.

“ ... research suggests that desegregation has had some positive impact on the reading skills of African American youngsters. The effect is not large, nor does it occur in all situations, but a modest measurable effect does seem apparent. Such is not the case with mathematics skills, which seem generally unaffected by desegregation.”

30. Schofield notes that there is very little empirical evidence on Hispanic achievement, concluding that the Gerard and Miller study of Riverside is still the most important source of information about the effect of desegregation on Hispanic students. She repeats their conclusion that “... desegregation did not significantly influence the achievement level of any of the groups, including the Mexican American children.”

31. Armor also published reviews of the achievement research literature in 1995 and 2002, all of which have been discussed earlier. But these two works also include a total of seven case studies of long-term achievement trends in large school districts that have undergone extensive desegregation, as discussed below.

32. After a total racial balance plan was ordered for Pasadena, California, in 1970, there was no change in achievement or the gap over the next four years. Norfolk, Virginia, adopted a complete racial balance plan in 1970, and yet there was no net improvement in achievement or the gap as late as 1977. After Dallas, Texas, adopted a partial desegregation plan in 1976, black achievement did rise significantly over the next ten years and the gap was reduced accordingly; but the black gains in predominantly minority schools were just as large as those in desegregated schools. In Kansas City, Missouri, following implementation of the most expensive desegregation remedy ever ordered by a court, achievement and the gap remained flat over the next ten years (the district was majority black at the start of the plan). After Minneapolis, Minnesota, attained substantial racial balance in 1982, black achievement and the achievement gap remained also relatively unchanged over the next twelve years.

The last two case studies, Wilmington-New Castle County, Dela-
ware, and Charlotte-Mecklenburg, North Carolina, are particularly important because their desegregation plans were county-wide, encompassing both city and county suburban schools. Not only were minority children exposed to middle-class white environments, but the predominant white enrollments in the counties enabled high levels of racial balance for many years despite significant white flight. The Wilmington-New Castle County plan was adopted in 1976 and modified in 1982; achievement scores were available from 1982 to 1993. Despite these relatively ideal conditions, the achievement gap remained flat and, between 1989 and 1993, the reading gap was slightly larger than the national reading gap.

By virtue of the Supreme Court’s decision in Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Bd. of Educ., 402 U.S. 1 (1971), Charlotte-Mecklenburg implemented a comprehensive racial balance plan in 1971, and it maintained highly integrated schools for the next twenty years. Black and white achievement rose significantly between 1978 and 1985, but black achievement rose somewhat faster and the achievement gap declined from 40 to 30 percentile points. A new achievement battery was introduced in 1986, at which time both black and white achievement declined. At this time, the achievement gap returned to 40 percentile points where it remained until 1992. The case study also showed that, in 1998, there was no significant relationship between school racial composition and either reading or math achievement for black elementary students. Thus Charlotte-Mecklenburg, often described as the best example of desegregation in the nation, shows no net reduction in the achievement gap over a 15 year period.

Finally, a new study by Armor examines the national relationship between school racial and ethnic composition and achievement using the 2003 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). 40. After controlling for student socioeconomic status, the study found no relationship between Hispanic concentration and Hispanic achievement, and this lack of relationship was also observed for both California and Texas which have the largest number of Hispanic students in predominantly Hispanic schools.

2. Long Term Outcomes

Some research reviews have concluded that the long-term benefits of desegregation are greater than short-term benefits such as test scores. 42. The available research does not justify this conclusion. With regard to the long-term impact on levels of educational attainment (college attendance, for instance), wages, and occupational status, the research fails to indicate clear benefits of desegregation. With respect to one long-term outcome - more desegregated adult environments - amici do not dispute the relationship but disagree with the interpretation that it is a benefit that can be traced to school desegregation.

Desegregated Adult Environments

There are two major reviews of school desegregation and the degree to which adults choose racially integrated settings later in life. 43. Rather than discuss these studies in detail, it can be acknowledged that there is significant relationship between black students attending a desegregated high school and attending a predominantly white college, and a somewhat weaker relationship with working in predominantly white employment settings.

Amici disagree that these relationships can be characterized as benefits of desegregation, however. Although the self-selection problem plagues all long-term outcome studies, it is a greater problem here. Since African American parents differ in their preference for integrated environments - especially with respect to their place of residence or the schools their children attend - students who attend integrated high schools are more likely be from families who prefer such environments, and thus their children also tend to prefer integrated environments when they become adults. That is, family preference for integrated environments is the most likely causal variable here, not school desegregation per se . . .

Educational Attainment

The fact that black students from desegregated high schools prefer predominantly white colleges doesn’t tell us whether they are more likely to seek post-secondary education. In fact, that question has been studied, and the results suggest no or a very small relationship between school desegregation and college attendance.

One of earliest national studies found that the relationship between desegregation and attending college differed between black students in the North and the South. 44. Controlling for family socioeconomic status, Crain and Mahard found that attending desegregated high schools raised college attendance slightly in the North (standardized effect of +.11) but lowered it in the South (standardized effect of -.07). However, neither relationship was statistically significant.

Using the same data but a different analytic model, Eckard controlled for test scores, family socioeconomic status, high school grades, and being in a college prep curriculum, and found that the relationship between high school desegregation and college attendance was virtually zero. 45. In a later study using the same data, Braddock and McPartland came to similar conclusions as Crain and Mahard: No relationship in the South and a small positive relationship in the North that was not statistically significant.

46. One of the better studies of this question was by Crain and others using data from Project Concern. 47. The advantage of this study is that it used a quasi-experimental design, so that Project Concern students could be compared to a control group of students who remained in predominantly black Hartford [Connecticut] schools.

After controlling for gender, family background, and test scores, there was no difference in college attendance between all Project Concern students and the Hartford control group. Moreover, some students spent a substantial number of years in desegregated suburban schools, but then returned to the Hartford schools, and they were no more likely to attend college than those who had remained in the city all along.

Finally, a study by Boozer, Krueger, and Wolkon used data from the National Survey of black Americans to estimate the relationship between the percent of black students in a high school and total years of education. After controlling for self-selection effects, the relationship was not statistically significant.

Occupations and Wages

49. There is very little research on the link between desegregation and occupation or wage attainment. Because of the weak relationship between desegregation and college attendance, we would not expect much of a connection between desegregation and the rate of white collar (vs. blue collar) jobs, since college is the primary determinant of this distinction.

An unpublished study by Dawkins in 1991 finds some relationship between desegregation and higher occupational relationship for younger adults, but the relationships are “weak and inconsistent
for respondents from the South . . .” 50. Another study of occupational attainment by Crain and Strauss using the Project Concern data find that “when self-selection bias is removed, it appears as though school desegregation does not have much effect on the occupational attainment of black men with no college education . . .”

51. The Boozer study also estimated the relationship between high school black composition and wages. As for educational attainment, they found a small negative impact on wages but it was not statistically significant after controlling for self-selection bias.

3. Social Outcomes

Self-esteem

Since neither of the lower courts in Seattle or Jefferson County mentioned black self-esteem as a benefit of desegregation, only a brief comment is necessary here. There is substantial consensus that “[t]he major reviews of school desegregation and African American self-concept or self-esteem generally conclude that desegregation has no clear-cut impact.”

Racial Attitudes and Race Relations

54. The first of these reviews was done by St. John in 1975. She looked at 27 studies that compared the prejudicial attitudes of students in segregated versus desegregated schools and presented the results separately for blacks and whites. For blacks, she found negative effects in six studies (desegregation worsened prejudice), positive effects in five studies (prejudice was reduced), and no or mixed effects in three studies. For whites the breakdown was eight, eight, and three, respectively.

St. John also examined a separate group of 17 studies that used friendship choices as the outcome measure. For black students she classified one study as positive (desegregation produced more cross-race friendships), four studies as negative (fewer friendships), and nine with mixed or no effects. For whites, three found more friendships, three found fewer, and ten showed mixed or no results. So the evidence draws a mixed picture, but there is some indication that desegregation may worsen white prejudice, since only one suggested a positive impact, while four found a negative impact. St. John explained these results by suggesting that the conditions for reducing prejudice and improving race relations may not be present in many school settings where there are large differences in levels of academic attainment between racial groups.

A second major review was published by Stephan in 1986; 56. The results were similar for whites but slightly different for blacks. He found prejudice worsened for blacks in four studies, lessened in eight, and showed no change in another eight. For whites the comparable figures were eleven, four, and nine. Thus, while Stephan found that positive studies outnumbered negative studies for blacks, like St. John he also found that the reverse was true for whites. This is of special concern since white prejudice gave rise to state-sponsored segregation in the first place.

Two other studies looking at social outcomes have some unique features which deserve special emphasis. One is the study of desegregation by Gerard and Miller in Riverside, California. It tracked friendship measures for six years, giving students ample time to recover from some of the short-term disruptions which characterize many desegregation plans, and it is one of the few studies of Hispanic desegregation. Some theoretical perspectives would predict that interracial friendships should increase over time, but the Riverside study found just the opposite: the number of black and Hispanic students chosen as friends decreased.

The other study was done by Patchen using a large survey of students in Indianapolis high schools. 58. He studied the relationship between racial attitudes and the black percentage in classrooms. He found that both blacks and whites had the most positive attitudes towards the opposite race in those classrooms that averaged more than 70 percent black. The most negative attitudes were found for those in integrated classes averaging between 20 and 40 percent black, although the attitudes became somewhat more positive when the percent black dropped below 20 percent. The author concluded that the “ideally” integrated classrooms had the highest levels of friction, in part due to academic competition.

There have not been many new studies comparing attitudes among segregated and desegregated students since the Patchen study, and thus the most recent comprehensive reviews of racial attitudes do not alter the conclusions first reached by St. John. The review by Schofield in 1995 concludes: “There is no guarantee that desegregation will promote positive intergroup behavior,” and also “The evidence on the impact of desegregation on intergroup relations is generally held to be inconclusive and inconsistent.” 59. Schofield came to much the same conclusion in a 1991 review of research on the same question.

Surveys of Personal Benefits

60. Another possible social outcome of desegregation is what might be called perceived “personal” benefits. These personal benefits are determined through surveys of students from desegregated schools, and some of these studies report generally positive reactions to the desegregation experience. According to these surveys, students mention such personal benefits as cross-racial friendships, learning how to work and get along with students of different races and ethnicities, and increasing their knowledge about racial and cultural differences.

A student survey of this type was conducted on Jefferson County 11th graders and introduced as evidence by Defendants. Wells conducted a national survey of students who graduated from racially mixed high schools in six cities, and similar findings emerged.

62. One can presume that many students in desegregated schools will perceive personal benefits from a desegregation experience. However, most of these surveys do not have a comparable control group of students from racially isolated schools, and therefore these studies are not designed to detect how much of particular attitudes can be attributed specifically to experiences in the desegregated school versus experiences in the larger society.

Conclusion

In deciding that the use of race is a compelling government purpose in the Jefferson County and Seattle racial balance plans, the lower courts relied on an incomplete record of research on the educational and social benefits of desegregation. Given the national implications of the use of race in school assignments, a conclusion that racial balance is a compelling state interest should be based on clear and consistent evidence of benefits. In fact, a fair and comprehensive analysis of the research shows that there is no clear and consistent evidence of benefits for any of the educational and social outcomes cited by the lower courts.

For the reasons cited herein, the Court should reverse the rulings of the Sixth and Ninth Circuits, and find that there is no compelling state interest in racial balancing.
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I. EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH SUPPORTS THE COMPELLING INTERESTS IN PROMOTING RACIAL DIVERSITY, AVOIDING RACIAL ISOLATION, AND MAINTAINING DESEGREGATED SCHOOLS

A. Racial Diversity Promotes Cross-Racial Understanding and Reduces Prejudice

Promoting cross-racial understanding among our nation’s students is a fundamental educational objective because, as both history and scientific research confirm, racial stereotypes and prejudices are powerful sources of division that can undermine academic success, social cohesion, and community stability. Prejudice reduction in elementary and secondary education is especially important because racial prejudices and implicit biases are developed early in life and can become entrenched over time. See Frances E. Aboud, Children and Prejudice (1988); Andrew Scott Baron & Mahzarin H. Banaji, The Development of Implicit Attitudes: Evidence of Race Evaluations from Ages 6 and 10 and Adulthood, 17 Psychol. Sci. 53 (2006).

Diverse school settings have been shown to be effective in reducing stereotypes and prejudice by promoting greater levels of contact among different groups and by fostering intergroup friendships. The literature on intergroup contact and prejudice reduction is indeed extensive, and both individual research studies and more comprehensive literature reviews and meta-analyses - statistical analyses that draw overall conclusions based on data compiled from a large number of relevant studies - confirm the positive effects of intergroup contact in reducing prejudice. See, e.g., Thomas F. Pettigrew & Linda R. Tropp, A Meta-Analytic Test of Intergroup Contact Theory, 90 J. Personality & Soc. Psychol. 751 (2006); Thomas F. Pettigrew, Intergroup Contact Theory, 49 Ann. Rev. Psychol. 65 (1998).

A number of the most recent studies in developmental psychology illustrate that negative stereotypes and prejudice among children are influenced by racial diversity in their schools. Two studies conducted in racially and ethnically diverse schools found minimal evidence of implicit bias in examining first-graders’ and fourth graders’ interpretations of ambiguous interracial encounters, where subjects can reveal implicit biases by attributing negative or positive characteristics to different racial characters. Heidi McGlothlin et al., European-American Children's Intergroup Attitudes About Peer Relationships, 23 Brit. J. Developmental Psychol. 227 (2005). . .; Nancy Geyelin Margie et al., Minority Children's Intergroup Attitudes About Peer Relationships, 23 Brit. J. Developmental Psychol. 251 (2005) . . . However, a parallel study of white children in racially homogeneous schools found evidence of stronger biases, with the children rating minorities more negatively than whites and indicating that cross-racial friendships between whites and minorities would be much less likely. Heidi McGlothlin & Melanie Killen, Intergroup Attitudes of European American Children Attending Ethnically Homogeneous Schools, 77 Child Dev. 1375 (2006). Taken together, the studies show that racial diversity and intergroup contact can play important roles in shaping biases in children's interactions with their peers and their formation of cross-racial friendships.

A recent meta-analysis conducted by Pettigrew and Tropp that analyzed 515 studies - drawing on over 700 samples and over 250,000 individual participants - makes clear that intergroup contact reduces prejudice and that greater intergroup contact is generally associated with lower levels of prejudice. Their analysis also confirms that optimal conditions for intergroup contact - equal status between groups in the situation, common goals, intergroup cooperation, and the support of authorities, law, or custom - generally enhance the positive effects of intergroup contact on prejudice reduction. . . . Pettigrew and Tropp also conclude that institutional support can be “an especially important condition for facilitating positive contact effects,” which implies that school districts should play an active role in promoting diversity and intergroup contact in order to attain the strongest effects in reducing prejudice.

Research on the effectiveness of school programs designed to promote cross-racial understanding reinforces the importance of policies that create diverse student bodies with sufficient numbers of students of different racial groups. Programs that indirectly encourage cross-racial understanding but do not rely on the actual presence of students of different races have been found to be less effective than direct measures, such as cooperative team learning strategies, that incorporate students present in the school; research suggests that indirect programs have little impact on changing the actual behavior of students. See Willis D. Hawley, Designing Schools that Use Student Diversity to Enhance Learning of All Students, in Lessons in Integration: Realizing the Promise of Racial Diversity in America’s Schools (Erica Frankenberg & Gary Orfield eds., Univ. of Virginia Press, forthcoming 2006). These findings support the logical notion that in order for the benefits of intergroup contact to accrue, there must be sufficient students of different races present in the schools to interact; they also underscore the importance of racial diversity in developing the teamwork skills that are essential for functioning in a diverse, democratic society.

B. Racial Diversity Promotes Student Achievement

. . . [B]oth early desegregation research and recent statistical and econometric analyses that isolate the effects of racial composition on student achievement indicate that there are positive effects on minority student achievement scores arising from diverse school settings. See generally Jomills Henry Braddock II & Tamela McNulty Eitle, The Effects of School Desegregation, in Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education (James A. Banks & Cherry A. McGee Banks eds., 2d ed. 2004); Janet Ward Schofield, Review of Research on School Desegregation's Impact on Elementary and Secondary School Students, in Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education 597 (James A. Banks & Cherry A. McGee Banks eds. 1995). Moreover, these gains do not come at the expense of white students, whose achievement has been shown to be unaffected by desegregation.
Early literature on desegregation from the 1970s and 1980s suggests that desegregation has had positive effects on the reading skills of black students. For instance, in their 1983 meta-analysis of 93 studies, Crain and Mahard found consistent results involving enhanced black achievement, with some variation in the extent and magnitude of these effects across districts, schools, grade level, and desegregation strategies. Robert L. Crain & Rita E. Mahard, *Effective School Desegregation* (Willis D. Hawley ed. 1981).

For example, one analysis of twenty-one studies examining "perpetuation theory" - a theory proposing that racial segregation tends to repeat itself across an individual's life experiences and across institutions - found that desegregated experiences for black students typically lead to increased interaction with members of other racial groups in subsequent years. Amy Stuart Wells & Robert L. Crain, *Perpetuation Theory and the Long-Term Effects of School Desegregation*, 64 Rev. Educ. Res. 531 (1994). Results from the studies suggested that school desegregation had positive effects on both black and white students in that students who attended desegregated schools were more likely to function effectively in desegregated settings, . . . later in life. The Wells and Crain analysis concludes that desegregation has the effect of "breaking[] the cycle of segregation and allowing[] nonwhite students access to high-status institutions and the powerful social networks within them." Thus "inter racial contact in elementary or secondary school can help blacks overcome perpetual segregation.”

As one recent study on the effects of desegregated schools on long-term benefits makes clear, "desegregation made the vast majority of the students who attended these schools less racially prejudiced and more comfortable around people of different backgrounds.” Amy Stuart Wells, et al., *How Desegregation Changed Us: The Effects of Racially Mixed Schools on Students and Society* (Apr. 2004). According to Wells’ study, . . . educators, advocates, and policy makers who were involved in racially diverse public high schools nearly twenty-five years ago, found that “the vast majority of graduates across racial and ethnic lines greatly valued the daily cross-racial interaction in their high schools. They found it to be one of the most meaningful experiences of their lives, the best — and sometimes the only — opportunity to meet and interact regularly with people of different backgrounds.”

Analyses based on interviews of graduates of desegregated schools are reinforced by recent surveys on the attitudes of high school students toward peers who belong to other racial groups, which indicate that students of all racial groups who attend more diverse schools have higher levels of comfort with individuals from racial groups other than their own, have an increased sense of civic engagement, and have a greater desire to live and work in settings with multiple racial groups. Michal Kurlaender & John T. Yun, *Fifty Years after Brown: New Evidence of the Impact of School Racial Composition on Student Incomes*, 6 Int’l J. Educ. Policy Res. & Prac. 51 (2005). In the survey of students in the Jefferson County School District, 85 percent of students reported that they were prepared to work in a diverse job setting and would be prepared to do so in the future, while over 80 percent of African American students and white students reported that their school experience had helped them to work more effectively with and get along with members of other races and ethnic groups. Michal Kurlaender & John T. Yun, *Is Diversity a Compelling Educational Interest?: Evidence from Louisville, in Diversity Challenged: Evidence on the Impact of Affirmative Action 111, 130 (Gary Orfield with Michal Kurlaender eds. 2001).

Labor market research also shows that the benefits of a desegregated education can continue as students enter the workforce. For instance, a study of black students in Hartford, Connecticut concluded that students who attended desegregated schools were more likely to have white-collar jobs and that the men were more likely to have completed more years of education than comparable students.

C. Racial Diversity Promotes Long-Term Benefits for Students

students who had attended segregated schools. Robert L. Crain & Jack Strauss, School Desegregation and Black Occupational Attainments: Results from a Long-Term Experiment (1985). A more recent analysis on the long-term labor market implications of school resource equalization before Brown and school desegregation after Brown found that desegregation had significant, positive effects on the incomes of southern blacks (as well as on their high school completion rates) after the implementation of desegregation. Orley Ashenfelter, William J. Collins & Albert Yoon, Evaluating the Role of Brown vs. Board of Education in School Equalization, Desegregation, and the Income of African Americans 23-24.

D. Racial Isolation is Associated with Unequal Educational Opportunities and a Variety of Harms

In Brown, this Court acknowledged the psychological and educational harms caused by public school segregation. Psychological harms continue to be associated with racial isolation. For example, recent survey research focusing on Southern California middle school students . . . found that black and Latino students in less diverse schools felt less safe in school, were more harassed by peers, felt more lonely, and had lower selfworth than comparable students in more diverse schools, even when controlling for classroom differences in academic engagement. Jaana Juvonen, Adrienne Nishina & Sandra Graham, Ethnic Diversity and Perceptions of Safety in Urban Middle Schools, 17 Psychol. Sci. 393 (2006).

Educational inequalities in racially isolated schools arise in several ways, such as limited educational resources, fewer qualified teachers, and inadequate access to peers who can help improve achievement. Curricular disadvantages, such as fewer honors, college preparatory, and Advanced Placement courses, along with within-school tracking and inadequate resources for counseling, only exacerbate the degree of inequality and limit opportunities for higher education. See John T. Yun & Jose F. Moreno, College Access, K-12 Concentrated Disadvantage, and the Next 25 Years of Education Research, 35 Educ. Researcher, Jan.-Feb. 2006, at 12. Consequently, students in predominantly minority schools are also less likely to graduate from college, even after taking into account prior test scores and socioeconomic status. See Eric M. Camburn, College Completion among Students from High Schools Located in Large Metropolitan Areas, 98 Am. J. Educ. 551 (1990). See generally Douglas S. Massey et al., The Source of the River (2003).

Not surprisingly, measures of educational outcomes, such as scores on standardized tests and high school graduation rates, are lower in predominantly minority schools. See, e.g., Roslyn Arlin. Mickelson, Segregation and the SAT, 67 Ohio St. L. J. 157 (2006); Christopher B. Swanson, Who Graduates? Who Doesn’t? A Statistical Portrait of Public High School Graduation, Class of 2001 (2004). For example, one recent study of metropolitan Boston found that only 61 percent of tenth-grade students in high-minority/high-poverty schools passed the state-required English/Language Arts examination in the 2002-03 school year, compared to 96 percent of the students attending low-minority/low-poverty schools. Chungmei Lee, Educational Outcomes in Metropolitan Boston (2004).

Recent research on teacher quality and turnover in predominantly minority schools is particularly revealing because studies indicate that race is a salient factor driving the decisions of teachers - and approximately 85 percent of the nationwide total are white - to leave minority schools, beyond actual working conditions or the presence of concentrated poverty in the school district. See Benjamin Scafidi, David L. Sjoquist & Todd Stinebrickner, Race, Poverty, and Teacher Mobility, (Andrew Young School of Policy Studies Research Paper Series, Aug. 2005); see also Eric A. Hanushek, John F. Kain & Steven G. Rivkin, Why Public Schools Lose Teachers, 39 J. Hum. Resources 326 (2004); Susanna Loeb, Linda Darling-Hammond & John Luczak, How Teaching Conditions Predict Teacher Turnover in California Schools, 80 Peabody J. Educ. 44 (2005).


II. EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH SUPPORTS UPHOLDING THE SEATTLE AND JEFFERSON COUNTY POLICIES AS NARROWLY TAILORED

Research studies provide direct support for concluding that the Seattle the Jefferson County school assignment policies are narrowly tailored.

A. The Use of Flexible Goals Promotes the Benefits of Diversity and Avoids the Harms of Tokenism and Negative Stereotyping

The school districts’ race-conscious policies are fully consistent with research evidence demonstrating the benefits of racial diversity. There are no fixed numbers that are recommended by the research, but studies on intergroup contact propose that the benefits of intergroup contact can be optimized when, among other things, there is equal status between groups. See Allport, supra; Pettigrew & Tropp, supra. Research summarizing studies of desegregation is consistent with this proposal, suggesting that “approximately equal proportions are best for maximizing contact and friendship between ingroup and outgroup members. If one or the other groups in a school has a large percentage (over 70%), it has the power to determine the signs and behaviors by which in-school status is ascribed or achieved.” John B. McConahay, Reducing Racial Prejudice in Desegregated Schools, in Effective School Desegregation 35, 39 (Willis D. Hawley ed. 1981). Moreover, “[m]embers of the racial or ethnic groups in the numerical minority protect themselves by attempting to isolate themselves from the larger group.” ; see also Maureen T. Hallinan & Stevens S. Smith, The Effects of Classroom Racial Composition on Students’ Interracial Friendliness, 48 Soc. Psychol. Q. 3 (1985).

Research evidence further supports the use of goals and target ranges to prevent the harms associated with extreme segregation and tokenism . . . Isolation, domination, and negative stereotyping are common problems that arise when minority numbers are especially low and the norms and behaviors of majority groups dominate. See Mischa Thompson & Denise Sekaquaptewa, When Being Different is Detrimental: Solo Status and the Performance of Women and Racial Minorities, 2 Analyses of Soc. Issues & Pub. Pol’y 183 (2002); Rosabeth Moss Kanter, Men and Women of the
Corporation (1977) . . . Experimental research has also shown that tokenism can cause self-consciousness that results in deficits in cognitive functioning and memory. Charles G. Lord & Delia S. Saenz, Memory Deficits and Memory Surfeits: Differential Cognitive Consequences of Tokenism for Tokens and Observers, 49 J. Personality & Soc. Psychol. 918 (1985).

The problem of “stereotype threat” can also cause harmful effects similar to tokenism. Research suggests that when people are a minority in a group, particularly women and racial minorities, they may experience stereotype threat, namely being at risk of confirming, as self-characteristics, a negative stereotype about one’s group. See Claude M. Steele & Joshua Aronson, Stereotype Threat and the Intellectual Test Performance of African Americans, 69 J. Personality & Soc. Psychol. 797 (1995). Stereotype threat may cause students not to perform to their full potential or not to express their skills and knowledge on tests. In controlled research studies, Steele and Aronson found that black students’ underperformance in relation to whites on standardized tests could be explained through stereotype threat. Similarly, a 2003 study found that black and Latino high school students were at risk of underperformance in college because of stereotype threat. Massey et al., supra . . .

Employing race-conscious goals in multiple-factor school assignment policies prevents these types of harms and complies with the mandates of narrow tailoring.

B. Race-Neutral Policies are Not as Effective as Race Conscious Policies in Promoting Racial Diversity and Avoiding Racial Isolation

1. Race-Conscious Managed Choice Policies are More Effective than Uncontrolled Choice Policies in Achieving Racial Diversity

This Court has long recognized that school assignment policies which grant “freedom of choice” are often inadequate as substitutes for more direct race-conscious measures that achieve desegregation, and recent desegregation research confirms that uncontrolled choice policies often lead to racial homogeneity and even higher levels of segregation, see, e.g., School Choice and Diversity: What the Evidence Says (Janelle Scott ed., 2005); Erica Frankenberg & Chungmei Lee, Race in American Public Schools: Rapidly Resegregating School Districts (2002).

Race-conscious school assignment policies that manage and limit choice, however, can help sustain diversity and can create the student bodies necessary to achieve diversity’s benefits. For instance, in one recent study . . ., researchers found that market-based choice systems added to overall school segregation, beyond what was attributable to residential housing patterns. Salvatore Saporito & Deenesh Sohoni, Coloring Outside the Lines: Racial Segregation in Public Schools and Their Attendance Boundaries, 79 Soc. Educ. 81 (2006). The researchers concluded that an expansion of “free market” choice policies would exacerbate racial segregation within large, urban school districts. They reported that school districts with race-conscious policies in the form of controlled choice options achieved substantial success in reducing racial segregation between black and white students; they also suggested that school choice need not be a barrier to racial integration if student mobility is restricted in ways that limit the isolation of white students from non-white students.

2. Policies Based on Socioeconomic Criteria are Not Adequate to Produce Racially Diverse Student Bodies

Recent analyses of school districts that have employed socioeconomic criteria . . . have shown that these policies are unlikely to produce the same levels of racial diversity attainable through race-conscious measures. Although race and class can be highly correlated, they are not perfectly correlated, and research shows that residential segregation, which typically fuels school segregation, can be more heavily driven by race than by class. See John Logan, Separate and Unequal: The Neighborhood Gap for Blacks and Hispanics in Metropolitan America (2002). Thus many minority families, despite having higher income levels, are not able to gain access to predominantly white neighborhoods and to enroll their children in the local schools. Given these problems, school assignment policies based solely on socioeconomic status are unable to address fully the effects of racial segregation.

A recent statistical analysis exploring the possibility of employing income-based school assignment policies . . . concluded that “income-based integration does not guarantee even a modest level of racial desegregation.” Sean F. Reardon, John T. Yun & Michal Kurlaender, Implications of Income-Based School Assignment Policies for Racial School Segregation, 28 Educ. Evaluation & Pol’y Analysis 49, 67 (2006). The Reardon et al. study examined data from eighty-nine of the country’s largest school districts and computed various estimates of possible and probable levels of racial segregation that would result from race-neutral, income-based school assignment policies. The study found that even under optimal circumstances . . . income-based policies would still not guarantee racial integration.

Reardon et al. concluded that “income and race cannot stand as proxies for one another in school integration policies. Absent some substantial decline in racial residential segregation, race-neutral assignment policies are unlikely to produce significant racial school desegregation.” In addition, their review of recent analyses of districts that have employed race-neutral socioeconomic criteria suggests that these attempts have not been as successful as prior race-conscious policies in achieving racial diversity. Preliminary evaluation of the socioeconomic plan in Wake County, North Carolina shows that adoption of the class-based plan in 1999 initially led to an increase in racially identifiable schools . . ., with a stabilization of the increases in more recent years; preliminary information on the socioeconomic plan in San Francisco, California indicates that desegregation levels have fallen under the new plan - while 64 percent of San Francisco schools were in compliance with racial desegregation standards during 1998-99, the last year of a consent decree, only 52 percent of schools met the same standard in 2002-03, two years after the start of the race-neutral plan.

3. Race-Neutral Policies Can Lead to Resegregation and Its Associated Harms

Research findings focusing on school districts that are no longer bound by court-ordered desegregation policies have revealed significant problems accompanying resegregation when these districts have abandoned race-conscious measures and replaced them with race-neutral plans. Resegregation is typically accompanied by declines in both educational resources and outcomes, including lower scores on student achievement tests.

For instance, a study of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg school district, which until 2002 had been subject to a desegregation plan for more than three decades, found increasing racial isolation that has led to a variety of negative educational effects. Roslyn Arlin Mickelson, [supra.] (2003). After the declaration of unitary status in 2002,
the Charlotte-Mecklenburg system implemented a race-neutral, limited-choice policy that focused on neighborhood school assignment; a majority of schools soon began to experience resegregation and in the year following the end of the desegregation plan the percentage of black students in racially isolated schools increased by eleven percent.

Mickelson's study found that racially identifiable black schools had deficiencies in teacher resources and material resources (up-to-date media centers, ample access to current technology, and newer, safer buildings), fewer Advanced Placement courses, and fewer services for gifted and talented students. In addition, the study found that minority students were disproportionately tracked into lower level placements and into special education classes, and that achievement scores in many racially identifiable schools were markedly lower than in the more racially integrated schools.

Similar patterns of resegregation and declines in student achievement have been documented in studies of Norfolk, Virginia, see Vivian Ikpa, The Effects of Changes in School Characteristics Resulting from the Elimination of the Policy of Mandated Busing for Integration upon the Academic Achievement of African-American Students, 17 Educ. Res. Q. 19 (1994); several Florida school districts, see Kathryn M. Borman et al, [supra]; and Denver, see Catherine Horn & Michal Kurlaender, The End of Keyes - Resegregation Trends and Achievement in Denver Public Schools (2006).

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the judgments of the Courts of Appeals upholding the constitutionality of the Seattle and Jefferson County school assignment policies should be affirmed.

University Council for Educational Administration
Draft Code of Ethics for Professors of Educational Leadership

The UCEA Code of Ethics for Professors of Educational Leadership is intended to serve as an educational tool as well as a set of expectations for faculty who prepare educational leaders. Faculty who teach, engage in scholarship and serve the field of educational leadership, must be mindful of the following:

- Model ethical behavior for others
- Adhere to professional standards
- Promote access to quality education
- Value and respect the intrinsic worth of individuals
- Value and respect diversity of person, practice and thought
- Practice with integrity in teaching, research and service
- Embrace responsibility for improving the profession
- Engage in reflection for professional growth
- Develop and improve scholarly competence
- Promote and improve the practice of educational leadership

This short list was developed by a group of volunteers in April 2007 based on input from UCEA plenary session representatives and the scholarship of ethics. We see the list as comprising our foundational ethical values as those who are entrusted with the preparation of future educational leaders.

In addition to this list, we believe that it is important to generate two additional documents expanding upon our Code. One would provide a description of various ethics such the ethic of justice, care, critique, profession and community as well as examples of the ways in which we would engage in each of the 10 values noted above. The second document would provide a compendium of readings and instructional strategies in and around the various ethics. It would include the literature and most current writing on the topic of ethics for our profession as well as the ethics of justice, care, critique, profession and community.

At this point we are very interested in hearing your thoughts on this Code and the additional work we have planned. Please send your comments to Christopher A. Ruggeri at ucea@austin.utexas.edu.

Thank you!
Innovative Program: University of Texas- Austin’s Principalship Program

The University of Texas at Austin (UT-Austin) Principalship Program has had a tradition of innovation, self-examination, and commitment to social justice since it was established in 1930. In 2002, however, the faculty embarked on the most comprehensive redesign of the program to date. The re-design had three major goals: (1) prepare high-quality principals who can effectively serve high-needs schools and emphasize a K-16 perspective; (2) create a network of district administrators and University faculty committed to supporting prospective and beginning principals and to improving the preparation of school leaders for high-needs schools, in general; and (3) study each program redesign component to both support a continuous program improvement process at the local level and contribute to professionalizing the field of leadership preparation nationally.

The focus here is primarily on the first goal. To accomplish this goal, five program components—recruitment and selection, program content and delivery, internships, outreach and research and evaluation—were radically rethought. Unfortunately, there is space to discuss only the first component in some detail, though some of the other components will be alluded to in the second half of this discussion which focuses on one student’s experiences in the program.

Recruitment and Selection

In early fall each year, letters soliciting nominations are mailed to over 500 Central Texas educational leaders; the letter asks the leaders to nominate outstanding teacher leaders who might be interested in becoming principals. The program also solicits nominations via personal contact with (a) the 30 to 40 UT Principal Partners that serve as school-based mentors for the students currently in the program and (b) the 20 superintendents that serve as Advisory Council members.

Once nominations (typically numbering around 100 to 150) are received, an information packet is sent to nominees, along with an invitation to attend one of three orientation sessions. (Nominees are required to attend an orientation session before submitting a formal application to the program.) Orientation sessions usually are 2 to 3 hours long. During the first part of the session, nominees hear presentations about the program and participate in 30 to 40-minute break-out sessions with students currently enrolled in the program. During the second part, nominees, who still are interested in applying to the program, provide a timed writing sample in response to a prompt.

Applicants then submit portfolio applications. The applications and the writing sample collected during an orientation session are assessed by a team of faculty members who use a set of rubrics. From an applicant pool (which normally numbers about 75), 20 to 35 nominees are selected to receive site visits by Site Teams consisting of two university faculty members, one principal or associate superintendent who is a member of the UT Partners group, and one student currently enrolled in the program. (Note: all the current students serve as assistant principals, instructional facilitators, or central office administrators).

The Site Teams spend four hours in each finalist’s school. During this time they (a) observe the finalist either in his or her classroom or, if the finalist is already an instructional facilitator, the team observes him or her engaged in a professional development session with teachers and, (b) use established protocols to interview both the nominee and the principal. The team then conducts a debriefing session during which team members evaluate the finalist using another set of rubrics. Finally, the faculty synthesizes all of the portfolio and site visit data for each finalist and makes a decision regarding admission to the program. Typically, 15 to 20 students are admitted.

The Students and Their Program: Give me a for Instance!

The procedures outlined in the previous section are labor intensive and time consuming, but the results suggest that the high costs are dwarfed by the benefits produced. Guadalupe Velasquez is an example of the kind of student the recruitment and section procedures have netted. Lupe applied to enter the program in the spring of 2003, after being nominated by both his principal and an associate superintendent in the district where he had been a highly regarded bilingual education teacher for 15 years. For the four years prior to entering the program, Lupe also served as a grade level team leader. While serving as a teacher and teacher leader, Lupe had consistently produced high levels of achievement among the elementary school students in his class; he also developed a number of school-community partnerships.

After Lupe Velasquez was accepted into the program, but before beginning formal coursework, he and the other members of his highly diverse cohort were required to attend two weekend retreats. The students have begun to refer to these weekends as boot camp. One goal of boot camp is to help the student’s transition into the graduate student role. For example, during the second weekend retreat, the students participate in academic writing seminars. Boot camp also is used to model for students how to begin the process of creating learning communities.

Lupe Velasquez and his cohort began their formal program of study during the summer of 2003 by participating in a 12-hour integrated course called Foundations of Educational Administration (FEA). FEA begins and ends with an event titled, “A Call for Social Justice.” Although social justice concerns are addressed throughout the program, the two one-day events place the issue of social justice—and how to promote it in schools—from front and center. National, state, and local community leaders join the discussions, as do many of the students’ mentor principals and district administrators.

The first full-fledged unit that Lupe’s cohort experienced in FEA was a bit atypical for principal preparation programs: It focused on doing case study research. The goal was to help Lupe and the other students develop the sensibilities and some of the inquiry skills of researchers (e.g., a commitment to look for disconfirming as well as confirming evidence and to listen first and interpret later) that excellent leaders also exhibit. The unit also prepared Lupe and others to conduct a formal study of a high-needs school during the remainder of the FEA experience. Lupe and the other members of his cohort, in fact, spent much of the rest of their first summer term in the program interviewing the school’s teachers and administrators and conducting neighborhood walks during which they informally interviewed parents in their homes.

As the summer progressed, Lupe and his fellow students also reviewed the literature on instructional leadership, professional learning communities and best practices in an array of curricular content.

www.ucea.org
areas. This literature put in perspective what had been learned in the school study and helped the students make recommendations for improvement when Lupe’s class presented the results of its study to the school’s staff during the final week of the FEA experience.

During the 2003-04 academic year, Lupe’s cohort was enrolled in university courses, but cohort members also had intensive on-the-job mentoring experiences. Lupe and three other students, for example, worked as instructional coaches in the school his cohort had studied the previous summer. Their mentoring team consisted of two university faculty members, two district administrators, and the school principal.

Mentoring took many forms, but one form continued the focus on inquiry that was so central to the FEA experience. The students, with the guidance of the mentoring team, identified a problem they wanted to focus on during the year. Lupe and his student colleagues decided to concentrate on finding ways to increase the reading levels of the school’s fifth grade students, almost all of whom were reading below grade level. Lupe and the other students developed a number of initiatives to help the students. For example, they created a camp experience prior to the start of school focused on reading and leadership skills. They also worked with other teachers and with parents. Progress reports were presented periodically to the other members of their cohort during reflective seminars held at the university.

At the end of the 2003-04 academic year, Lupe was selected to become an assistant principal in a high-needs school, and, after graduating from the UT-Austin program in 2005, Lupe was designated as a principal-in-training by his district. In the summer of 2006, he was selected as the principal of a high-needs elementary school. As a novice principal, Lupe is supported by a mentoring team that consists of two district administrators and two university faculty mentors. Faculty mentors spend an average of twelve hours per week working with Lupe and his administrative team.

One of the first things Lupe did after becoming a principal was to interview all of his school’s teachers. He also spent considerable time observing. During his observations and interviews, he attempted to seek evidence that disconfirmed as well as confirmed what he believed might be happening. Lupe credits his decision to engage in this kind of inquiry—and also the critical mindset with which he approached the inquiry process—to his first summer cohort experience.

Conclusion

It is unusual in the Austin, Texas area for graduates to move into principal positions as quickly as Guadalupe Velasquez did, though two other members of his cohort also were selected as principals at the same time Lupe was. In addition, all of the members of Lupe’s cohort—and virtually all members of subsequent cohorts—have been selected to play administrative roles in schools even before they completed the program. This was certainly not the norm in the past. The change undoubtedly is attributable to a number of factors including the rigorous recruitment and selection process discussed in this article, the careful mentoring of students both before and after graduation, and the partnership relationship between university faculty and school leaders that is visible in virtually all program components. For additional information, contact Juanita Garcia, the Director of UT-Austin’s Principalship Program at jgarcia@mail.utexas.edu.

UCEA Announces Two Associate Director Openings

UCEA is seeking an Associate Director for International Relations and an Associate Director for Development. Working as an UCEA Associate Director provides an exciting opportunity for service at a national level. As an Associate Director, you would work with the UCEA Executive Director and Executive Committee to support UCEA’s program efforts. Associate Directors serve for three year terms, which can be renewed once.

The Associate Director for International Relations would work to promote the mission, vision and goals of UCEA for ALL children irrespective of national boundary. Specifically, s/he would help to develop 1) mechanisms that support international cooperation and partnerships between UCEA institutions and others around the world; 2) international membership; and 3) reciprocal learning and research opportunities around issues of leadership preparation and practice.

The Associate Director for Development would work to promote the mission, vision and goals of UCEA at its program initiatives through grant writing and fund raising activities. Specifically, s/he would help to prioritize funding goals, identify appropriate funding agencies, work with UCEA headquarters to develop relationships with potential funders and collaborate with UCEA headquarters in grant writing activities.

To apply for a UCEA Associate Director position, please send a letter of inquiry, your CV and a letter of support from your department chair and/or dean to the UCEA Headquarters. It is preferred that Associate Directors be given at least one course release annually during their term as Associate Director as well as additional travel support. The application deadline for the January 2008-December 2010 term is October 1, 2007.
Julian Vasquez Heilig Named New Associate Director of Program Centers

Julian Vasquez Heilig obtained his Ph.D. in Education Administration and Policy Analysis and a Masters in Sociology from Stanford University. He also holds a Masters of Education Policy from the Center for the Study of Higher and Postsecondary Education and a Bachelor’s in History and Psychology from the University of Michigan. He is currently Assistant Professor of Educational Policy and Planning at the University of Texas at Austin.

In addition to educational accomplishments, Julian Vasquez Heilig has held a variety of research and practitioner positions in organizations from Boston to Beijing. These experiences have provided formative professional perspectives to bridge research, theory, and practice.

His current research includes quantitatively examining how high-stakes testing and accountability-based reforms and incentive systems impact urban minority students. Additionally, his qualitative work considers the sociological mechanisms by which student achievement and progress occur in relation to specific NCLB-inspired accountability policies in districts and schools for diverse students. Julian’s research interests also include issues of access, diversity and equity in higher education.

Audrey Addi-Raccah Receives EAQ’s 2006 Volume Year Davis Award

The 28th Davis Award selection committee announced its choice for the outstanding article in the 2006 volume year of Educational Administration Quarterly. Specifically, the committee has selected the article by Audrey Addi-Raccah, entitled, “Accessing Internal Leadership Positions at School: Testing the Similarity-Attraction Approach Regarding Gender in Three Educational Systems in Israel” which appeared in the August, 2006 issue (Vol. 42, No. 3) of Educational Administration Quarterly (EAQ).

The award selection committee was chaired by Rick Reitzug and included Sharon Conley, William Firestone, Mark Gooden, and Mengli Song, the EAQ’s 2005 volume year Davis Award winner. The committee commented on the Addi-Raccah article, saying, We believe the Addi-raccah article is very much aligned within the mission of EAQ, has a strong design, and speaks to issues of gender equity in a meaningful and useful way.

Audrey Addi-Raccah, Ph.D., is lecturer and head of the MA program of Sociology of Education, School of Education, Tel-Aviv University in Israel. Her main fields of interest are sociology of the teaching occupation, school administration and gender issues. She has published several studies on gender inequality in school leadership positions.

The author was presented with the 2006 Davis Award at the AERA Division A Business Meeting in Chicago in April, 2007, and will receive the recognition again at the 2007 UCEA Conference in Alexandria, Virginia. 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 below and on the UCEA website (www.ucea.org).

The EAQ editorial team and the UCEA Executive Committee join the selection committee in congratulating Dr. Addi-Raccah on her outstanding contribution to scholarship in the field of educational leadership and policy.

About the William J. Davis Award

The William J. Davis Award is given annually to the author(s) of the most outstanding article published in Educational Administration Quarterly (EAQ) during the preceding volume year. The article selection is made by a review panel that typically includes the previous year’s award winner, along with EAQ Editorial Board members or former members who have not published in the volume being reviewed.

The Davis Award was established in 1979 with contributions in honor of the late William J. Davis, former associate director of UCEA and assistant professor at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Contributions to the award fund are welcome and should be sent to University Council for Educational Administration, College of Education, Department of Educational Administration, The University of Texas at Austin, 1 University Station-D5400, Austin, Texas 78712-0374.
Dr. Lisa Delpit, Executive Director for the Florida International University Center for Urban Education & Innovation, received the award for Outstanding Contribution to Education in 1993 from Harvard Graduate School of Education, which hailed her as a “visionary scholar and woman of courage.” Her work on school-community relations and cross-cultural communication was cited when she received her MacArthur “Genius” Fellowship. Most recently, Delpit has been selected as the Antioch College Horace Mann Humanity Award recipient for 2003, which recognizes a contribution by alumni of Antioch College who have “won some victory for humanity.” She describes her strongest focus as “finding ways and means to best educate urban students, particularly African-American, and other students of color.” Among her publications are Other People’s Children: Cultural Conflict in the Classroom (1995); The Real Ebonics Debate: Power, Language, and the Education of African-American Children (co-edited with Theresa Perry, 1998); and The Skin That We Speak: Thoughts on Language and Culture in the Classroom (co-edited with Joanne Kilgour Dowdy, 2002).

MAG: Thanks for granting the interview.

LD: Sure!

MAG: I read that your work involves “finding ways and means to best educate urban students, particularly African-American, and other students of color”. Could you briefly describe some of those?

LD: Some of it has to do with attending to issues of culture which encourages kids to engage with the school. There is a certain part of the research that urban style, for example, and verve—just bringing a certain type of energy to the instruction helps in that engagement. Our kids are particularly sensitive to the level of energy and will tune out in half a second if it is not present. For example, if you think about preachers, the southern Baptist versus the Episcopalian preacher in Harvard Square—I think that will give you an idea of some of the difference I am speaking about here.

I think we also have to make sure that our kids know some of their history. A lot of kids end up saying things like one said to a student teacher I know…. “So, Ms. Summers, they made us the slaves because we were dumb, right?” When kids come in with that kind of perception then it’s very hard to for them to feel that they can excel. So what we have found is that actually helping them understand that 5000 years ago people who looked like them created the knowledge base of the world. The Egyptians [looked like them] and later the creators of the libraries and universities at Timbuktu. Africans taught Pythagoras and others, and a lot of Greeks who wanted to learn things would go to Africa to learn it. It’s only in the last 300 years or so that we have been in a kind of a down cycle. Kids have no clue of that, actually most teachers have no clue of that. They feel how it is is how it’s always been. So we need to have knowledge of history and if they can learn about their intellectual legacy and where they came from—what’s in their blood, As Jaime Escalante used to say to the barrio children [then] teaching them AP calculus. He would say to them, “You have to learn math. Math is in your blood. The Mayans discovered zero!” So we have to know enough to be able to tell our kids similar things. Those are some of the things we have to provide for our children. We also need to focus on the arts.

MAG: You discuss the Egyptian system of Ma’at and how one teacher implemented it in her classroom. I also noted that you refer to Dr. Asa Hilliard’s work in this area.

LD: Yes. That’s it. He knows it.

MAG: Principals are under a lot of stress to increase standardized test scores and often feel restricted in teaching what may be perceived as deviating from the standards-based curriculum. What advice would give leaders in working with students to get them to learn more about their history in light of the standardized exams?

LD: I would say if you look at the work I have done and Asa’s work in schools - if you look at these schools and the teachers who have produced exceptional results. I am not just talking about reaching the mean of the state or anything like that but who have gotten kids who are poor African American kids to excel to the highest levels of a state. None of these schools focus instruction on the test though they are scoring off the chart on the test. So I find that putting so much energy on the test seems to have the opposite effect of producing what you really want which is stellar test scores. Certainly, if you talk to teachers-and I have several of them in my class right now-you will find that this is what they are saying. It seems like what produces the highest test scores is to spend a lot of time and focus on excellent teaching, powerful curriculum, motivating kids to be involved in their own learning-connecting to their communities so that if they are looking at a problem in math or science they can do it in the context of a problem that exists in their own communities. All of that engagement necessitates teacher development so that teachers know how to do all of that. That’s what seems to raise test scores, and that would be the message I have. Schools that focus on arts seem to have higher test scores. I am from Baton Rouge, Louisiana where there is an arts-based school there and it is one of two schools, the other focuses on foreign language, that has virtually no achievement gap between Black and White students. So, I think we are focusing on the wrong thing, even if you want to raise test scores we are focusing on it incorrectly by doing this constant rote drill over and over.

MAG: What are some attributes of this powerful curriculum?

LD: Curriculum that assumes the brilliance of your students and that has them involved with tasks with a purpose. For example, doing an oral history of the community they live in. This engages kids and connects them to their community. If you want to do any work on spelling or grammar, you can do it in the context of transcribing oral language interviews that the kids would record so that all the skills that you want to teach are embedded in something that is meaningful. The work of Claude Steele shows the more you focus on remediation the worse off the kids end up being because they begin to believe they are not capable. Because this kind of oral history work is usually done in college and sometimes grad school, you may say to the students I think you are brilliant enough to do this even though others will not be able to do this. You are doing it because you are particularly capable 11th graders. It sets up a whole different kind of perception then it’s very hard to for them to feel that they want to learn things would go to Africa to learn it. That’s it. He knows it.
Black high schools in the southern region, who made a dynamic presentation of their oral history project at AERA. That's the kind of thing I am talking about.

MAG: It sounds like you are saying we should support teachers in becoming more creative and less restricted by the rigidity of exam and attendant pressures. Correct?

LD: Yes, it has to do with looking at real problems and real issues. Not just filling in a blank but doing things because they are producing some sort of product or helping an individual or community. One of the things a brilliant math teacher I know in Georgia did was take kids to a community business which sold African clothing and goods and the owner agreed to let kids work with the business, including creating a business plan with real numbers. They learned a lot in the context of doing this real thing that was useful to someone, much more so than if they were just learning mathematics in isolation. It is creativity but it is also being useful.

MAG: What have been your thoughts and experiences on getting the system or Ma'at (an Egyptian system that emphasizes truth, justice, harmony, balance, order, reciprocity, and righteousness) in schools?

LD: One teacher I worked with, Paula White-Bradley, used it in her classroom management system with students and talked about what each principle of Ma'at meant and they drew pictures and made a quilt to represent the different principles and they talked how each would be used in this classroom's management system. The kids internalized the meaning and learned to resolve conflicts rather than just be angry with one another or fight within the classroom setting.

MAG: I often hear from my students that work in urban district is difficult for a number of reasons. They remind me that they especially have trouble engaging parents in urban settings. What are your thoughts on this?

LD: I usually say let's pretend they don't have any parents, then what would you do? The point is there is a whole lot you can do within the school. If that were not the case, then there would not be these schools that Asa Hilliard talks about that have excelled despite the poverty of their school districts. I am sure they (the teachers) are working hard. I have no doubt that many are doing all they know how to do. The issue is look at the people who have done what you want to do. That's what we have not done yet. That is, study those schools in which the kids come from the same kinds of communities and they are excelling. You cannot change the parents but you can change what you do so you need to see what these other schools are doing. The other piece to that is something Asa says and that is consistent with what Vanessa Siddle Walker and others have found in their work. Parents get involved when they perceive schools working hard for their kids, not the other way around. That's why middle class White parents get involved… because they perceive the schools are working for their kids. That's nothing related specifically to Black parents. It is just human nature. If you want more parent involvement, improve what you do.

MAG: Do you have any suggestions for educational leaders who want to support teachers in these approaches that may be regarded as different in this culture of strict accountability?

LD: I have never been a principal but I just don't see why they just don't do it. I don't know what else to say about that or why they would need advice. If you see teachers doing good things, say, go for it! Ask, “What can I do to help?”

MAG: In educational leadership, and this issue of UCEA Review, there are more conversations starting to happen around and about race. What are some of your thoughts on race and achievement given the specter of the inferiority complex for Black students, and the phenomenon to push students out of schools if they are not achieving on these exams?

LD: I think it's very real and it manifests itself in all kinds of ways. It's hard to imagine ways it does not exist. It's in Black kids' heads and in Black and White teachers' heads because there is this notion that the inferiority exists. The only way to get around this is to prove it otherwise and you have to look at examples where there is no gap or kids are achieving. Ron Edmonds was a Black professor at Harvard who has passed on. He asked this question, “How many instances do you have to see of poor Black kids excelling to prove that it is possible?” His answer was, “If it's more than one, then you have some other issues that you need to deal with.” And that's where the racism issue comes in. That is, if it is more than one instance or exception then you are definitely carrying some greater weight with you than the notion that it can't exist. Like maybe that you are not willing to do the work to make it exist or if it exists then that takes away the benefits that my child might accrue. Asa Hilliard told me the story that after he spoke at an event a White parent approached him and said, “I am sure that if we did everything you said, it would increase Black kids' scores but then what would happen to my kid?” You have to give the parent credit for being so honest. I think there is a fear that those on the bottom are not there because they are supposed to be there. That's only because we have set systems in place to keep them there and if we got rid of all those systems and did what would be helpful to them, then it would turn upside down the whole social system we have become accustomed to.

MAG: Would this be what Derrick Bell refers to in “Faces at the Bottom of the Well”, that poor Whites were told by wealthy Whites that you may not be rich but at least you are above Blacks.

LD: Yes! Who did slavery hurt the most? Of course Black people. But who are the next group that got hurt the most? That was poor Whites because their labor was not worth anything. They were kept poor by the system of enslavement but in order for that system to continue they had to be convinced they were benefiting from it. At least they were not Black and that's what I see happening continuously.

MAG: I see. Well that brings us to the end of the interview. Do you have any closing thoughts?

LD: There's so much. I'd just like to share that I am teaching a course now and one weekend a month I have students over if they want to talk further about these issues— all of these we have talked about today keep coming up for those students who are teachers as well as for those doing other kinds of work. It's painful work sorting through all of this but it is stuff we have to look at. I also invite others to come as well to offer additional perspectives if it's related to what students are talking about.

MAG: I commend you for the work you have been doing and continue to do and I am really inspired by it. It's been an honor and a pleasure talking with you.

LD: Thank you, Mark. I have enjoyed talking with you as well.
UCEA Graduate Development at AERA
By: Cristóbal Rodríguez

This year’s AERA meeting in Chicago during the second week of April kicked off with two great UCEA events, the David L. Clark Graduate Student Research Seminar and the Barbara L. Jackson Scholar Seminar. The Clark Seminar was a 24 hour event, starting after lunch on Sunday and ending before lunch on Monday of the AERA meeting week. Forty Clark Scholars received additional scholarly advice and guidance from two Clark Faculty members and from a small group of peers studying related topics. One Clark Scholar said: “This seminar provided me with wonderful input on my dissertation topic from a group of scholars with a wide variety of backgrounds and experiences. There is no other way I could have benefited from the knowledge, expertise and experience that this group offered”.

Additionally, scholars participated in group discussions involving the following topics: establishing a line of research, from proposal to dissertation defense, the job search, transitioning into the professorship, and career in K-12 education. This year’s featured speakers were Andrea Rorrer from the University of Utah and Fenwick English from the University of North Carolina – Chapel Hill. Overall, students felt that the most important aspect of this seminar was “the opportunity to interact with and learn from the other Clark scholars and the faculty was the most meaningful to me. I left with greater insight into my own research and knowledge of the exciting research happening in the field of education leadership. The new friendships that have formed will be invaluable.”

The Barbara L. Jackson Scholar Seminar highlighted the experiences of two Jackson Scholars. Cristi Ford, who is at the University of Missouri – Columbia studying Higher and Continuing Education became a scholar in 2005 and shared her experience of preparing for her career while in graduate school. Thu Suong Nguyen became a scholar in 2005 while studying Education Policy and Planning at the University of Texas– Austin and is now a first year assistant faculty member at the University of Missouri– Columbia. She shared her experience of finishing her dissertation and being on the job market.

The event entertained a surprising large turnout of supportive faculty members and Jackson scholars, as well as our honored guest, Barbara L. Jackson. This year, AERA held an exciting, and at times, wet and cold meeting, but UCEA hosted the best graduate student development activities for the week. UCEA thanks Linda Tillman, the UCEA Associate Director for Graduate Student Development and the Clark and Jackson Planning Committees for another great round of activities and events at the 2007 AERA meeting.

To listen to Pod Casts of featured UCEA Speakers, Including keynote Richard Elmore visit UCEA’s website at www.ucea.org

Latest in UCEA’s Book Series


Edited by Lenoar Foster (Washington State University) and Linda C. Tillman (University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill), this book fills a void in the educational leadership literature relating to theoretical and cultural understandings that are critical for those who prepare leaders for schools with predominantly African American student populations.

Authors include Lenoar Foster, Linda C. Tillman, Adah Ward Randolph, Vernon C. Polite and Kristy Lisle, Paula Groves Price, Bruce Anthony Jones, Michael E. Dantley, Paul Pitre and Willie J. Heggins, III, Jonathan D. Lightfoot, James Earl Davis and Jean Madsen, and Nick and Brett Comier.

African American Perspectives on Leadership in Schools will be a critical resource for professors of educational administration and contemporary school leaders who practice in diverse school settings.

Publish your book with UCEA!
An Informational Workshop at the UCEA Convention.

Are you thinking about publishing a scholarly book? UCEA sponsors a peer-reviewed book series published through Rowman & Littlefield. We are looking for “cutting edge,” groundbreaking scholarly books that push the boundaries of what we know regarding educational leadership, leadership preparation, and educational politics and policy as they relate to educational leadership. Current books in this book series address: (1) leadership preparation, (2) the New National Research Council guidelines, (3) African American perspectives on school leadership, (4) female professors of educational administration/leadership, and (5) the history of the principalship (US).

In this convention workshop, which will take place on November 18, 2007, Gary Crow (chair of the UCEA publications committee), Linda Tillman (a book editor and author in the series) and Catherine Lugg (associate director of UCEA publications) will discuss the process from initial queries, to the review process, final manuscript submission and production, and what is expected for book editors/authors. Participants in this session can bring along their working manuscripts and proposals for discussion. Registration is limited, so please register early.
**UCEA 2007 EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP AWARD WINNERS**

**Lawrence Allen** - Dr. Lawrence W. (Larry) Allen was nominated by the University of Kentucky in recognition of his 41-year career as an educational administrator and leadership educator. An active participant in the development and implementation of the Kentucky Education Reform Act of 1990, he is dedicated to improving schools through improved leadership, evidenced by his decade-long involvement with the Kentucky Leadership Academy. He has developed training modules approved by the Kentucky Department of Education for administrator recertification. Dr. Allen has also been recognized by the Kentucky School Board Association and the Kentucky Association for School Administrators for contributions to public education.

**Wayne Anderson** - Dr. Wayne Anderson has contributed directly and in exemplary fashion to the development of schools and school leaders across the state of Wisconsin. As a superintendent, he led three successful referenda campaigns in the growing Mount Horeb community despite state imposed revenue caps for schools. He co-founded the Dane County Superintendent's Consortium and served as its President in 2003-04. He has been able to translate his professional insights through his service to UW-Madison as an adjunct faculty member in school business leadership, educational finance, and instructional leadership. In each of these venues Dr. Anderson has served as an advocate for effective, regional K-16 partnerships that improve educational leadership and policy making at all levels.

**William Bechtol, Jr.** - Mr. William (Bill) Bechtol, Jr. is the Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction for the Eanes Independent School District in Austin, Texas. Mr. Bechtol has served education in Texas for over 30 years. Bill has a longstanding commitment to the development of new administrators and has mentored beginning school leaders throughout his career. As Associate Executive Director of the Texas Elementary Principals and Supervisors Association (TEPSA), he reinforced the value of quality induction experiences for new principals and maintains a commitment to collaborative partnerships for school. Most recently, he was instrumental in planning for and developing the Partnership for Teacher Excellence Program with Texas State University.

**Bruce Brown** - Dr. Bruce Brown, a Northern Illinois University alumnus is the Superintendent of Mount Prospect School District 57, Illinois. As past president of Northern Illinois University-Society of Educational Administrators (2001-2003), he helped shape the interactions between the society and Educational Administration faculty. This society is the advisory board to the program area, connecting practitioners and faculty and helping students prepare for careers in educational administration. Dr. Brown has taught as an adjunct in the Ed. Admin. programs in the region. He has published in regional journals and is currently a mentor for new superintendents in the North Cook region. He has been actively involved in providing professional development for school leaders in the North Cook region.

**Carl Bruner** - Dr. Carl Bruner is currently the superintendent of schools for the Mt. Vernon School District in Washington State. Dr. Bruner is a 2005 graduate of the University of Washington's doctoral program for systems-level leaders, “Leadership for Learning.” Dr. Bruner's school system serves a diverse community that has grown in reputation under his leadership. Since graduating, Dr. Bruner has opened his school district as a hands-on case study for students in the UW continuum of leadership programs which has allowed emerging leaders to see from the inside the important work of ensuring high quality learning opportunities for all children.

**Michael Buckley** - Dr. Michael Buckley, long-time principal of Avon High School, currently serves as the director of the Connecticut Principals’ Center. Mike manages the day-to-day operations of the Center, which was established for the specific purpose of meetings the professional needs of school principals, assistant principals and aspiring administrators. Mike also oversees the association's student activities division, acts as liaison to the State Department of Education and the CT State Legislature, and coordinates the partnership between CAS and the University of Connecticut Administrator Preparation Program. Mike graduated from Bowdoin College (Maine), earned a Master of Arts and a Diploma of Further Study from Wesleyan University, and a Doctor of Philosophy from the University of Connecticut.

**Kathleen Cashin** - Dr. Kathleen Cashin is currently the Regional Superintendent of Region 5 in the NYC Department of Education. In this capacity, she serves as the instructional leader for a diverse multi-cultural population of 99 schools and 89,000 students. In each of its 3 years of existence, Region 5 has consistently achieved the greatest growth in both English Language Arts and Mathematics scores in the city, as well as a dramatic reduction in the number of schools designated as Schools Under Registration Review. She stresses pervasive educational focus, humility, restraint; ensuring a relentless vision for improving the lives of students. Dr. Cashin's educational background includes a Doctorate from Fordham University.

**Julian Crocker** - Dr. Julian Crocker was first elected as County Superintendent in 1998, and re-elected in 2002 for a second four-year term. The office is an educational service agency that performs a variety of leadership, oversight, and direct service functions for ten local school districts in the county, serving over 36,000 students. Prior to becoming County Superintendent of Schools, Dr. Crocker served as Superintendent of Schools for the Paso Robles Joint Unified School District for nine years. He has also been Superintendent of Schools in San Mateo and Palo Alto, California. Dr. Crocker earned his Bachelors and Masters degree from Vanderbilt University, and his Doctorate from Harvard University.
Diane DeBacker- Dr. Diane DeBacker is an outstanding role model for competence and quality. She has served as Interim Deputy Commissioner for the State of Kansas’ Department of Education; Director of School Improvement and Accreditation for the State Department of Education; local school administrator; and as a local school board president and school board member during an era of high profile community transition. She currently serves as Associate Superintendent for the Shawnee Heights Unified School District in Topeka, Kansas, where her work focuses in significant part on school improvement issues.

Warren Drake- Dr. Warren Drake is the superintendent of the Zachary Schools. The Zachary School District is an independent school district which began operation on July 1, 2003 as a “break off” school district from the greater Baton Rouge area schools and has approximately 4,000 students in five schools. It is the fastest growing and one of the highest performing school districts in Louisiana. As the first-ever superintendent, Dr. Drake has provided excellent leadership in establishing a vision, eliciting public support, and ensuring fiscal and academic integrity.

William Harrison- Dr. William C. Harrison has served as Superintendent of the Cumberland County School System for the past ten years. After receiving his doctorate from Vanderbilt, he served as superintendent of three districts in North Carolina. For the past thirteen years, Dr. Harrison has taught courses in school law in the principalship and superintendent programs at NC State. As superintendent, Bill is highly regarded for his efforts to promote greater equity. While superintendent in Hoke County, NC, he was instrumental in initiating a class action lawsuit (the Leandro decision) that changed the state’s system of financing schools, leading to greater equity for students attending low-wealth school districts.

Constantine Hatzidimitriou- Dr. Constantine Hatzidimitriou received his B.A. (1973) from Colgate University in history and education; M.A. (1975) Teachers College in Social Studies Education (with a full fellowship); M.Phil (1980) and Ph.D. (1988) from Columbia University in Byzantine, Ottoman and Balkan history. As a Gennadius Fellow of the American School of Classical Studies in Athens (1978-9), he discovered the “lost” manuscript of the Chronicle of Galaxeidi and returned to Greece (1981-1985) as the Educational Counselor of the U.S. Consulate and Fulbright office in Thessaloniki, headmaster of Anatolia College’s English Language Center, and an assistant professor at the American College. In 2007, he received the distinguished Social Studies Educator award from the Greater Metropolitan Social Studies Association of New York.

James Hawkins- Dr. James Hawkins, Superintendent of the Ypsilanti Public School District, returned to the Ypsilanti superintendent in 2004, after holding leadership roles in Michigan, Illinois, and Indiana. Recently, he has collaborated to develop a multi-faceted partnership with University of Michigan School of Education, featuring a summer nanoscience program for middle school students and a high school intergroup relations program, both of which address key issues and develop future educational leaders. Hawkins’ previous honors include the Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Humanitarian Award from Eastern Michigan University and the Marcus Foster Distinguished Educator of the Year from the National Alliance of Black School Educators.

Clyde Hornberger- Dr. Clyde Hornberger is the Executive Director of Lehigh Career & Technical Institute, one of the largest career and technical schools in the Nation. He has spent 36 years in education, earning his Doctorate of Education from Temple University. He has brought dynamic leadership to LCTI for the past ten years. He has expanded program offerings to over 45 options, made technical skills standards and state and national skill certification a priority, instituted a competency-based curriculum model, which includes a Pennsylvania academic standards component. In addition, Dr. Hornberger serves as a special consultant to the Secretary of Education for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Audrey Jackson- Ms. Audrey Jackson is Program Coordinator of the Wallace Foundation-Leadership Development Grant for St. Louis Public Schools. Mrs. Jackson assists the executive director in developing, training, managing and coordinating programs supported by the Foundation. The grant supports an aspiring administrator academy co-constructed with the University of Missouri-Columbia. Funding also provide professional development for principals and assistant principals. Before joining SLPS, Audrey was principal of Claymont Elementary School in Parkway School District. Currently, Audrey is on the Board of Directors for the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. Audrey holds a BA from Saint Louis University and an M.Ed in School Administration from the University of Missouri-St. Louis.

Kevin Keeley - Dr. Kevin Timothy Keeley is an exceptional instructor, mentor, and educational leader. He teaches Advanced School Law for the Educational Leadership Department and Administrator Licensure Program in the College of Education at the University of Oregon. He also assists other instructors in various law courses. Tim’s experience as a superintendent, assistant superintendent, and director of special services combined with his knowledge of school law and personnel issues enable him to effectively instruct students in both policy and law in the context of real school situations. Tim consistently offers his time and expertise to mentor current and future school administrators. His professional contributions to administrative candidates are greatly appreciated.

Susan Makosy- Dr. Susan Makosy has been the Superintendent of Central Cambria School District since 2002, and has worked in varied capacities in schools, including Assistant Superintendent, Elementary Principal, Director of Curriculum, Middle School Guidance Counselor, High School English Teacher, and adjunct professor. She earned a D.Ed. in Educational Administration from Pennsylvania State University in 1998. In that year, she represented PSU at the AERA Graduate Student Seminar, presenting her dissertation research, The Politics of Academic Standards - Setting: The Confluence of Problem, Politics, and Policies. She is the president of the Penn State School Study Council, and past regional president of PA ASCD.

Michelle Means-Walker- Dr. Michelle Means-Walker earned her doctorate in Educational Administration from the University of Cincinnati (1984). She currently serves the Great Oaks Institute of Technology and Career Development as the Director of Human Resources. Dr. Means-Walker has a career of contribution to local school districts and the state of Ohio in the areas of special education and human resource management. She developed a reputa-
tion in the area as an expert in special education. She is nominated for her commitment to student success in our region and the state through her work in recruiting the best staff available, supporting them to enhance their performance and engaging in education at the university level to ensure that qualified candidates are available.

William Montford III- Mr. William J. Montford, III is CEO of the Florida Association of District School Superintendents. Prior to holding this position, Mr. Montford served Leon County Schools in Tallahassee for over 37 years, beginning his career as a math teacher in 1969 and concluding his career with the district as Superintendent. He attended Florida State University, where he earned a Bachelor of Science Degree in Mathematics Education and a Master of Science Degree in Administration and Supervision. In 2002, Mr. Montford was named by the Florida Association of District School Superintendents as Florida’s Superintendent of the Year.

Michael Owens- Mr. Mike Owens is currently Assistant Superintendent of Human Resources in the Littleton Public Schools in Littleton, Colorado. He has been a teacher, principal, and Director of Human Resources before his current position. Mr. Owens has served on the Steering Committee for the Denver-UNC Partnership for six years. He has been instrumental in the work of the university-school partnership and has played a key role in strengthening leadership preparation.

Jennifer Parish- Dr. Jennifer Parish graduated from the University of Virginia with a B.A. and a Masters Degree in 1990. She began her career as a middle school teacher in York County, Virginia. She soon realized that she was interested in becoming a principal and began her studies at the College of William and Mary, where she completed her doctorate. Jennifer left the classroom in 1996 to do an internship as an assistant principal. In 1998, she was appointed as a middle school principal and four years later became an instructional Director for York County Schools. In 2006, Dr. Parish was named the district’s Chief Academic Officer. She also teaches leadership courses at the College of William & Mary.

Jim Puckett- Dr. Jim Puckett received a Bachelor of Arts Degree in Political Science from Emory University and three graduate degrees from the University of Georgia, including a doctoral degree in Educational Administration. Jim has provided distinguished service to the state’s public schools as a teacher, coach, assistant principal, principal, and superintendent, as well as serving as the Director of Research and Leadership Development with the Metropolitan Atlanta Regional Educational Service Agency (RESA), the Director of the Georgia Education Leadership Academy, the Director of Training and Development for the Georgia School Boards Association, the Deputy Director of the Georgia School Boards Association. He is currently the Executive Director of the Georgia Association of Educational Leaders (GAEL).

Sharon Richardson- Dr. Sharon N. Richardson is the Director of Legislative Services and Grant Development for the Montgomery County, Pennsylvania Intermediate Unit. From 1993-2007, Dr. Richardson served as Superintendent of Schools in Pottstown, Pennsylvania. Sharon has also been an adjunct faculty member at Temple University since 1985. Sharon’s formal preparation for educational leadership is most impressive since she not only holds a doctorate in Educational Administration but also holds the J.D. degree, both from Temple. Dr. Richardson serves as leader of the Educational Administration alumnus association and is known throughout the region as an innovative and highly respected leader.

Diane Rutledge- Dr. Diane K. Rutledge is Superintendent of Schools, Springfield Illinois District 186. Upon retiring June 30th, 2007, she will become executive director of the Large Unit District Association, which provides professional development for 50 of the state’s largest school districts. As Superintendent, Dr. Rutledge forged a relationship between Illinois State University and the Springfield School District that benefited both organizations. She also collaborated with the Educational Administration and Foundation Department at Illinois State University to develop a site-based principal preparation program that includes imbedded professional practice and district-University shared responsibility for the curriculum. In addition, Dr. Rutledge helped established a Professional Development School for elementary education majors in Illinois State’s Curriculum and Instruction Department.

Valeria Silva- Ms. Valeria Silva is the Chief Academic Officer of the Saint Paul Public Schools (SPPS) in Minnesota. Ms. Silva has been with the SPPS in various capacities, including classroom teacher, program coordinator, principal, Director of English Language Learner Programs. She also served as a Standards and Accommodation specialist at the Minnesota Department of Education. Ms. Silva’s expertise and accomplishments in developing inclusive ELL programs is a nationally recognized. In 2006, SPPS was identified by the Council of Great City Schools as one of the top districts in the nation for closing the ELL achievement gap. Its collaborative instructional models for ELL students were also featured the Journal of Staff Development in 2006.

Sheila Smith-Anderson- Ms. Sheila Smith-Anderson is Executive Director of Leadership Development for St. Louis Public Schools, the office responsible for the professional development of principals and assistant principals and creation of an aligned system of leadership development for the district. In partnership with the University of Missouri-Columbia, the district initiated a principal preparation program fashioned after the New York City Leadership Academy in 2005. The program is proving successful for SLPS placing 14 of 22 graduates in administrative positions. In education since 1972, Sheila worked with the Collaborative for Teaching and Learning as an educational programs consultant, the Kentucky Department of Education as a Distinguished Educator, a professional developer, principal, and teacher.

Veronica Waterman Stalker- Dr. Veronica Stalker is the Interim Superintendent an the Ankeny, IA and has served as a Clinical Professor at Iowa State University, and Superintendent of Waukee Community School District. During her tenure, WCSD tripled in size and she became known for her creative contributions to school leadership and the recruiting and development of staff. Dr. Stalker is a strong advocate for Iowa State University’s Education Administration program where she has served as a adjunct professor, guest lecturer, practicum host and mentor to many students. In addition, she has provided great service as a member of the ISU Department of Educational Leadership an Policy Studies.
Thomas Sullivan- Mr. Tom Sullivan has been involved in public education since earning his BA from Fordham University in 1970. After relocating to New Mexico, he worked as a classroom teacher and building principal in the Moriarty, NM Municipal Schools from 20 years, while earning both his MA and Administrative Certification from the University of New Mexico in Albuquerque. Tom then worked for 10 years with the Farmington Municipal Schools serving as Superintendent from 1996-2004. Tom is currently the Executive Director of the New Mexico Coalition of School Administrators, a statewide umbrella organization affiliated with AASA. In each of these roles Tom has been active in numerous projects affecting policy and legislation for educators in the State.

Valerie Truesdale- Dr. Valarie Truesdale served for four years as superintendent for the School District of Oconee County. She will begin service as superintendent in Beaufort County Schools in 2007-08. Also, she has served as teacher, principal, and state department administrator during her career in education. During her time in Oconee County, she was instrumental in helping to establish collaborative university and district leader preparation programs. She generated support from other superintendents in the region and even instructed in the cohort, modeling the values and skills that she seeks to develop in aspiring principals. She is well-linked to state and national educational leadership efforts and was recently elected as President-Elect of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, a worldwide organization of over 180,000 members.

Michael Winstead- Dr. Mike Winstead is the Director of Curriculum and Accountability for the Knox County Public School System in Knoxville, Tennessee. Prior to moving into this position, he worked as a high school math teacher and school administrator. In his current role, his primary focus is on working with school and district level personnel on how to assess the instructional program by analyzing student data and then make data driven recommendations for the alignment of curriculum, instruction, and resources. Dr. Winstead also works as an adjunct associate professor at the University of Tennessee, where he primarily teaches statistics and math methods courses.

UCEA Members Only Site

Membership in UCEA is a significant marker of program quality, but the benefits of membership extend beyond being apart of a scholarly community. UCEA member faculty have long enjoyed discounted prices on hard copies of the Educational Administration Quarterly (EAQ). Each year faculty and graduate students are provided with special forms for ordering EAQ at a steep discount off individual subscription rates. Additionally, for the last eight years, UCEA members have also enjoyed free access to the Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership (JCEL) and the UCEA Review. UCEA member faculty continue to enjoy these benefits, though they have been enhanced. JCEL has been included, along with EAQ, in the SAGE online education collection. UCEA member faculty can access the entire bundle through the UCEA Members Only site. The bundle includes all of SAGE’s education journals and allows cross-journal searches. Unfortunately, UCEA can only offer this access to UCEA member faculty. Thus, individuals who are not UCEA member faculty will no longer have free access to JCEL, unless they or their institutions subscribe to the journal/bundle through SAGE.

Check out the 2006 UCEA Conference Proceedings website at:

http://coe.ksu.edu/ucea

Special Interest Group Meetings at UCEA

If you provide leadership for a special interest group that has met or would like to meet at UCEA's 2007 Convention in Washington, DC, please contact Wendi Prater at UCEA Headquarters by July 30th. UCEA will be providing a limited number of slots to SIGs on a first come basis. You can reach Wendi by email at wcprater@austin.rr.com.
EAQ is Interested in Publishing Book Essay Reviews!

EAQ has recently received the following books for which we would like to receive written reviews (see guidelines below). Published book reviews provide a valuable service for our field. If you would like to provide a review for a book on the list, please send an e-mail to Marilynn Howard, EAQ Managing Editor, at eaq@ed.utah.edu. In your message please include the following:

- a one paragraph description of your professional background along with complete contact information,
- title of the book you wish to review,
- an indication of whether you have the book or whether a copy must be obtained, and
- a tentative date by which you would be able to submit the book review.

If the Editorial team approves you as the reviewer, we will contact you confirming the date by which the review is due and will provide a copy of the book (if needed). We look forward to seeing the latest books of relevance to our profession reviewed by you in our upcoming issues of EAQ. Please contact Diana Pounder for a list of books EAQ is interested in having reviewed.

Diana G. Pounder and Bob L. Johnson, Jr.,
Co-Editors, EAQ

For more information on the publication or subscribe to Educational Administration Quarterly (EAQ), please visit:

http://eaq.sagepub.com/

New from Rowman & Littlefield Education

Forthcoming

Research and Educational Leadership
Navigating the New National Research Council Guidelines
Fenwick W. English and Gail Furman

“I commend each of the authors in this book for stimulating the dialogue in our profession on the relevance and rigor of educational research. They all have contributed to the continuing purpose of UCEA to inform and improve research that benefits all students, families, and educators.” —Gary M. Crow, UCEA Executive Committee member and chair of the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy at The University of Utah.

Co-published with the University Council for Educational Administration

Preparing School Leaders
Defining a Research and Action Agenda
Joseph Murphy

“Murphy argues persuasively that reconceptualizing school leadership and leadership preparation is an essential step in achieving collaborative and continuous school improvement...[He] makes us think seriously about the condition of leadership preparation and steps that can be taken to enhance its quality...instead of simply lamenting what is, Murphy moves us to what can be. He outlines bold strategies to make research on leadership preparation more meaningful and visible. For this we are in his debt. Faculty members, policymakers, and practitioners must read this monograph and, more importantly, respond in thoughtful and purposeful ways.” —Martha McCarthy, Chancellor’s Professor, Indiana University

Co-published with the University Council for Educational Administration

4501 Forbes Blvd., Ste. 200 Lanham, MD 20706
www.rowmaneducation.com • 1-800-462-6420
Order Online Anytime and Save 15%!
What is UCEA’s “Day on the Hill”?
UCEA’s Day on the Hill, Wednesday, November 14, 2007, brings together educational leadership faculty and students from across the United States. You will meet your legislators (or members of their staff) face-to-face at the Capitol, and share UCEA’s and the field’s legislative priorities concerning quality leadership preparation, as well as positive stories about your programs’ impact on the quality of leadership preparation.

What if I have never participated in a “Day on the Hill”?
No background or experience is necessary. The only requirements are that you (1) attend the training workshop, (2) inform legislators about issues important to the leadership preparation field, and (3) participate in a debriefing session.

Tentative Schedule
(Final schedule TBD by September 14, 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00-11:30 am</td>
<td>• Convene for Training Session at Hilton Alexandria Mark Center Hotel to include guest speakers and interactive learning exercises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Depart for the Capitol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Boxed Lunch and transportation provided as part of registration fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00-3:00 pm</td>
<td>• Hill visits in pairs/small groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00-5:00 pm</td>
<td>• Visit with members of Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00 pm</td>
<td>• Option 1: Join your colleagues for a debriefing and reception near the capitol before making your way back to the Hilton Alexandria Mark Center Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Option 2: Make your way back to Hilton Alexandria Mark Center Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, November 15</td>
<td>“Day on the Hill” Report to UCEA Plenary Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00 am</td>
<td>• Discussion and sample activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, November 16</td>
<td>• Debriefing Presentation and Conversation on UCEA “Day on the Hill”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00-9:20 am</td>
<td>• Open to all convention participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday, November 17</td>
<td>• Day on the Hill workshops and special sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30-1:50 pm</td>
<td>• Day on the Hill workshops and special sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00-3:20 pm</td>
<td>• Day on the Hill workshops and special sessions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How we will help:
Members of the “Day on the Hill” committee will make appointments for you and provide the preparatory training. You may or may not be assigned to visit the elected officials who represent your state. The required training will focus on the legislature, an overview of the issues that we will be sharing, as well as tips on how to field tough questions, and hands-on practice drills. We will mail you preliminary briefing materials prior to arriving in D.C. to help set the foundation for the workshop.

What you can do:
Want to make a bigger impact? Bring a team with you to D.C.! This could include your dean, members of your faculty, candidates enrolled in your programs, program graduates, and principals in your local school districts.

You won’t want to miss this event!
Registration for the “Day on the Hill” is $30 per person.
Final reservations must be made by September 14, 2007.
For additional information, email Katherine Mansfield at kmansfield@mail.utexas.edu

Sign up online at the UCEA Convention Website (www.ucea.org)!
UCEA CONVENTION 2007
Fostering Compassion and Understanding Across Borders: An International Dialogue About the Future of Educational Leadership

As countries across the globe become increasingly interdependent, it is surprising how little we know about the educational systems of other nations. For example, how do educational leadership and policy address issues of equity and excellence? How are educational leaders prepared to support teacher quality and student learning?

This UCEA Convention theme serves as an invitation to participants from diverse geographic, cultural and political contexts to share their perspectives on theory, research, policy and practice in educational leadership and administration.

Moreover, this convention is intended to be an opportunity for members of an expanding UCEA community to engage in dialogue that promotes compassion for and understanding of schooling among educators across international borders.

Speakers Include:
- Dr. Jonathan Jansen, University of Pretoria, November 15, 5:15-7:00 pm
- UCEA President, Dr. Fenwick English, November 16, 9:30-10:50 am
- Texas A&M University Social Justice Lecture, Dr. Gloria Ladsen Billings, November 16, 2:00-3:20 pm
- Penn State Mitstifer Lecture, Dr. Jane Hannaway, November 17, 11:00-12:20 pm
- International Panel and Sunday Breakfast, November 18, 9:30-10:50 am

Events include:
- “Day on the Hill” visit with legislators: November 14, 9:00 am -8:00 pm [Cost is $30.00 and includes transportation and lunch]
- Annual Plenum Session, UCEA PSRs only, November 15, 7:30 am-4:30 pm
- Opening Convention Reception in Honor of UCEA Past Presidents, November 15, 7:15-9:00 pm
- Jackson Scholar Reception by invitation only, November 16, 6:30-9:00 pm
- UCEA Annual Banquet at the George Washington Memorial Masonic Temple in Old Town Alexandria with jazz multi-media performance, American Musical Landscapes, November 17, 6:00-10:30 pm. Cost is all-inclusive at $75.00.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Early (thru 8/10)</th>
<th>Regular (thru 10/26)</th>
<th>Late (thru 11/17)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UCEA University Faculty</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$115</td>
<td>$130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-UCEA Faculty</td>
<td>$135</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicing Administrator</td>
<td>$125</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
<td>$45</td>
<td>$55</td>
<td>$65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$135</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td>$165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UCEA would like to express its sincere appreciation to the following sponsors of the 2007 Convention:

The University of Virginia
Texas A&M University
Pennsylvania State University
Duquesne University
Old Dominion University
The University of Utah

The University of Kentucky
North Carolina State University
University of Buffalo, SUNY
University of Maryland
Information Age Publishing

Thank You!

www.ucea.org
In 2007 we meet within 10 minutes of the US Capital. Our convention hotel is located in the West End of Historic Alexandria at the Hilton Alexandria Mark Center Hotel. This elegant and modern facility with a unique lakeside setting is within view of the nation’s capitol and just ten minutes from the Smithsonian, the historic monuments of Washington D.C. and the quaint waterfront galleries, restaurants and shops in Old Town Alexandria, VA.

The Hilton Alexandria Mark Center’s offers the best of both worlds – minutes from the Capital, while adjacent to the Winkler Botanical Preserve; a 44-acre collection of plants and trees indigenous to the Potomac River Valley offering access to winding trails. The hotel also offers free local shuttle service to guests, making the use of the Metro system simple and affordable. Nearby places of interest include:

- Reagan National Airport 4 MI
- Washington, DC 6 MI
- Smithsonian Museums 7 MI
- Washington Monument 7 MI
- Arlington Cemetery 5 MI
- White House 7 MI
- US Capitol 8 MI
- Pentagon City Mall 4 MI
- Old Town Alexandria 3 MI
- Pentagon 4 MI
- Mt. Vernon Estate 12 MI

The Alexandria Mark Center Hotel has a towering glass atrium and Italian marble clad lobby. The guest rooms are lovely and offer all of the quality that one expects from a Hilton property.

Best of all, this is a hotel geared towards conference attendees, with over 46,224 square feet of meeting rooms off of the open and bright lower lobby area of the hotel, as well as a separate Executive Meeting Center. The EMC features non-glare tables, ergonomic chairs and individual climate control! There is also a state-of-the-art business center available for those last minute changes or copy needs. WiFi is available onsite, as well.

For meals and entertainment, Finn & Porter Restaurant is available for breakfast, lunch, and dinner, as well as other nearby restaurants. Lunch and dinner feature sushi, steak, and seafood; special happy hour prices are available. The lobby bar is an ideal place to meet and catch up with friends and colleagues alike.

To make hotel reservations at the UCEA Convention rate of $129, go to the convention home page on the UCEA website (www.ucea.org) and look under “Hotel and Travel”. You will also find information here on the official over-flow hotel. For more hotel information, please visit http://www.alexandria.hilton.com on the web.
Dr. Jonathan Jansen is the Dean of the Faculty Education at the University of Pretoria, South Africa, and is closely involved in forging a new order in South Africa, building a multi-cultural education system to underpin a multi-cultural society. A curriculum change evaluator and teacher education specialist, he has undertaken more than twenty international commissioned research and evaluation projects including a review of USAID curriculum support to the Namibian Government after independence and an assessment of curriculum change in Zimbabwe since independence. He obtained his PhD at Stanford University and MS in Science Education from Cornell University. He received a Fulbright Senior Africa Research Scholar Award in 2000-2001.

Dr. Gloria Ladson-Billings is the Kellner Family Professor of Urban Education in the Department of Curriculum & Instruction at the University of Wisconsin-Madison and the 2005-2006 president of the American Educational Research Association. Ladson-Billings' research examines the pedagogical practices of teachers who are successful with African American students. Her work has won numerous scholarly awards including the H.I. Romnes faculty fellowship, the Spencer Post-doctoral Fellowship, and the Palmer O. Johnson Outstanding research award. In 2002, she was awarded an honorary doctorate from Umeå University in Umeå, Sweden and, in 2003-2004, was a fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences at Stanford University. She is the 2004 recipient of the George and Louise Spindler Award for ongoing contributions in educational anthropology, given by the Council on Anthropology & Education of the American Anthropological Association.

Dr. Fenwick English is the UCEA President and serving a second term as a member of the Executive Committee. He also serves UCEA as Chair of the Publications Committee, where he took the lead in the development of a contract between UCEA and Roman and Littlefield for the publication of UCEA monographs and books in the future. Fen is the R. Wendell Eaves Distinguished Professor of Educational Leadership at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Formerly, he served as a program coordinator, department chair, dean, and vice-chancellor of academic affairs, the latter two positions in the Purdue University system at Fort Wayne, Indiana. As a K-12 practitioner, he has been a superintendent of schools in New York, an assistant superintendent of schools in Florida, and a middle school principal in California. He also had a stint as an associate executive director of AASA and served as principal (partner) in Peat, Marwick, Main & Co. (now KPMG Peat Marwick) where he was national practice director for elementary and secondary education, North America. Fen recently served as editor of the SAGE Handbook of Educational Leadership (2005) and as Editor of the SAGE Encyclopedia of Educational Leadership and School Administration (expected publication date is February 2006). He has published in the Educational Researcher, Educational Administration Quarterly, Journal of School Leadership, Leadership and Policy in Schools, Education Leadership Review, and the Division A of AERA Newsletter.

Dr. Jane Hannaway is currently principal research associate and director of the Education Policy Center at the Urban Institute, where she oversees the work of the center and is a member of the Institute’s senior management team. In addition, Dr. Hannaway is the overall principal investigator for the National Center for Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Education Research (CALDER - see http://www.caldercenter.org/). Supported by a five-year, $10 million grant from the Institute for Education Sciences at the U.S. Department of Education (http://www.caldercenter.org/about/Funding.cfm), CALDER is one of the new federally funded National Research and Development Centers http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/projects/randdcenters/index.asp. She has primary responsibility for the running of the center and determining with colleagues in the management/strategic planning group the focus and design of studies, the quality of the research products, as well as other CALDER activities.

Dr. Hannaway is an organizational sociologist. Her recent research is heavily focused on effects of various accountability policies. This work includes a large-scale, multiyear evaluation of the Florida educational accountability plan, and an NSF-funded longitudinal analysis of shifts in staffing and financial resource allocation at the school and district levels as a consequence of standards-based and performance accountability reforms. As is typical of her work, both studies include large-scale data analysis as well as case studies.

Dr. Hannaway also previously served on the faculty of Columbia, Princeton, and Stanford Universities. She has authored/co-authored six books, numerous papers in education and management journals, and has held a number of national positions. Dr. Hannaway currently serves on the Executive Board of the American Education Finance Association. She received her doctorate from Stanford University.

www.ucea.org
Contributing to the UCEA Review

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

Feature Editor:
Rose Ylimaki (SUNY- Buffalo)
rylimaki@buffalo.edu
Andrea Rorrer (University of Utah)
andrea.rorrer@ed.utah.edu

Interview Editors:
Gerardo Lopez (Indiana University)
lopezg@indiana.edu
Mark Gooden (University of Cincinnati)
Goodenma@ucmail.uc.edu

Point-Counterpoint Editor:
Julie Mead (University of Wisconsin-Madison)
jmead@education.wisc.edu

Innovative Program Editor:
Kanya Mahitivanicha (University of Texas)
kanya@post.harvard.edu

Managing Editor:
Chad Sayre (University of Missouri-Columbia)
cws422@mizzou.edu

2007 Calendar

July, 2007...UCEA-AASA Duquesne University Sponsored International Women in Leadership Conference
Rome, Italy

August, 2007.............................UCEA Convention Program Available Online
www.ucea.org

August, 2007.............................UCEA Leadership Meeting
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

July 15, 2007.............................Early Bird Registration for UCEA Convention Ends
UCEA HQ

October, 2007........UCEA Center on Values and Ethics in Educational Leadership
British Columbia, Canada

November 12-13, 2007............................UCEA Executive Committee
Hilton Alexandria Mark, VA

November 14, 2007.............................UCEA “Day on the Hill” Visit
Washington, DC

November 15, 2007.............................UCEA Plenum Meeting
Hilton Alexandria Mark, VA

November 15-18, 2007............................UCEA Convention
Hilton Alexandria Mark, VA

November 1, 2007.............................David L. Clark Nominations Due
UCEA HQ

December 14, 2007.............................NPBEA Meeting
Washington, DC

UCEA Review

The UCEA Review is published three times a year (winter, summer, fall) and distributed as a membership benefit by the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA). Address changes and other corrections should be sent to UCEA at the above address.

Michelle D. Young....................... Executive Director
Catherine Lugg..................Associate Director of Publications
Linda Tillman..................Associate Director of Graduate Student Development
Julian V. Heilig..................Associate Director of Program Centers
Ed Sharpe..........................Senior Advisor
Christopher A. Ruggeri........Executive Assistant and Events Manager
Lisa Wright, CPA............Financial Director
Pei-Ling Lee..................Graduate Assistant
Katherine Mansfield...........Graduate Assistant
Cristobal Rodriguez...........Graduate Assistant
Wendi Prater..................Graduate Assistant

The University of Texas at Austin
The University Council for Educational Administration
1 University Station-D5400
Austin, Texas 78712-0374
Ph: 512-475-8592
Fax: 512-471-5975
www.ucea.org