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Passage of the Kentucky Education Reform Act of 1990 initiated ever-increasing state control over decisions affecting school districts and those who work in them (Browne-Ferrigno, 2009; Clements & Kannapel, 2010). Kentucky’s 1998 adoption of the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards for School Leaders (Council for Chief State School Officers [CCSSO], 1996) was the first catalyst for required redesign of principal-preparation programs and new performance-evaluation expectations for school administrators. Efforts by the Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB), the agency created by the Kentucky Education Reform Act that controls P-12 educator certification and program accreditation, and influence by The Wallace Foundation through grants to the Kentucky Department of Education and Jefferson County Public Schools initiated a second program-redesign mandate.

This article presents an overview of the events leading to new state policy and the response by faculty in the Department of Educational Leadership Studies (EDL) at the University of Kentucky to the redesign mandates. Their recent collaborative efforts resulted in a suite of new leadership-development opportunities for P-12 educators (http://leadership.uky.edu). The two certification-based programs featured in this paper reflect characteristics of effective preparation programs as defined by Orr and Pounder (2011).

State Context: Waves of Preparation-Program Redesign

Prior to 1998, EPSB offered three unique principal certifications based on school type—elementary school (Grades K–5), middle school (Grades 6–8), and high school (Grades 9–12). Educators seeking admission to preparation programs were required to provide evidence of their completing 3 years of full-time teaching and award of a graduate degree in an education-related field. Those who had not completed graduate coursework in research methods, school-level curriculum aligned with certification sought, or educational and psychological testing were required to complete additional courses. Those graduating from programs prior to 1998 typically earned a Specialist in Education (EdS) degree or a Rank 1, the Kentucky designation for completion of 30 credit hours beyond a master’s degree (Browne-Ferrigno & Fusarelli, 2005).

First Mandated Change: Introduction of Master’s Degrees in School Administration

After Kentucky adopted the ISLLC Standards in 1998, the EPSB changed principal certification to one covering Grades K–12 and dropped requirements concerning a graduate degree and completion of 3 years of full-time teaching experience prior to admissions. Programs redesigned after the ISLLC Standards adoption thus began awarding master’s degrees in school administration, which was unique for Kentucky. Novice teachers were...
allowed to enroll in principal-preparation programs provided they had completed the state-mandated induction program for 1st-year teachers.

In 2000 EPSB thus began awarding provisional principal certification to individuals who (a) held a valid Kentucky teaching credential, (b) had completed 3 years of full-time teaching, (c) presented a letter of eligibility from university stipulating applicant's successful completion of its EPSB-approved principal preparation program, and (d) achieved passing scores on the two required professional examinations (Educational Testing Service School Leaders Licensure Assessment and the Kentucky Specialty Test of Instructional and Administrative Practices). During program graduates' 1st year of service as school leaders, they were required to participate in the long-standing, state-mandated induction program called the Kentucky Principal Internship Program. Upon successful completion of the principal internship program, practicing school administrators became eligible for the professional certificate, renewable every 5 years through completion of approved professional-development hours or six credit hours of additional graduate coursework (Browne-Ferrigno & Fusarelli, 2005). The Kentucky Principal Internship Program was suspended in 2007 because state funds were not appropriated by the Kentucky General Assembly to support it.

Administrator Certified, but not Principal Candidates

Shortly after graduates of redesigned programs began to seek placements, Kentucky received a State Action Education Leadership Project (SAELP) grant from The Wallace Foundation. Kentucky Department of Education officials hired program-affiliated professors to conduct survey research to gather perceptions about administrator practice across the commonwealth. Surveys were administered in 2001 to 11 discrete groups of educators and stakeholders. Data revealed that 1,285 teachers had been awarded provisional administrator certification (Björk, 2002). Superintendents, however, reported on their surveys that the statewide principal-applicant pool at that time included only 630 potential candidates (Björk, Keedy, Rinehart, & Winter, 2002), suggesting that in 2001 over half of the graduates of the recently redesigned principal-preparation programs were not perceived by superintendents to be qualified to assume principalships.

Following the 2002 release of survey results, EPSB began tracking the career paths of graduates against its active principal-candidate pool. The number of teachers qualified to hold provisional certification but not seeking principal placement totaled over 3,000 by 2004 and doubled to 6,000 by 2008. Kentucky has 1,233 public schools serving students in Grades K–12 and each year needs about 300 new school administrators, evenly split between principals and assistant principals, to fill open positions (R. Brown, personal communication, November 1, 2011). The 2004 findings prompted EPSB to become an active agitator for program redesign to halt the overproduction of teachers completing principal-preparation programs to meet the Kentucky Education Reform Act (1990) requirement of a completed master's degree within the first 10 years of full-time teaching.

From Grassroots to Comprehensive Redesign Efforts

In the early 1990s professors of educational administration in Kentucky began gathering annually to strengthen ties among those preparing school and district leaders. In 1995 the group named itself the Commonwealth Collaborative for School Leadership Preparation (CCSLP) and thus became an identified entity among the many education-oriented groups within Kentucky. CCSLP thereafter held annual institutes where professors from all EPSB-approved preparation programs shared course syllabi, reported research findings, and discussed other issues relevant to their practice.

Professor discussions about program-design elements.

After hearing the results of survey research conducted by their peers, CCSLP members decided to draft white papers about program elements (e.g., admissions, cohorts, internships) to share at the upcoming annual fall institute. When the coordinator of the Kentucky SAELP grant and the project director of the Jefferson...
County Public Schools Leading Education Achievement in Districts initiative learned about the white-paper initiative, they offered to pool their Wallace-grant funds to pay all expenses for a 2-day CCSLP meeting at a hotel in Louisville—provided that individuals other than university professors could also attend and that the institute be held the following spring. The CCSLP co-chairs accepted the offer.

Participants at the April 2005 Leading Change Conference included 65 professors from the 11 institutions approved to deliver principal preparation as well as staff from the Education Development Center in Massachusetts, New York City Leadership Academy, Southern Regional Education Board in Georgia, and The Wallace Foundation. Others attending as speakers and observers represented the Kentucky Education Cabinet and Governor's Office, EPSB, the Kentucky Department of Education, and Kentucky Education Association.

Outsider discussions about Kentucky program redesign. Shortly after the Leading Change Conference, the Wallace-funded SAEIP and Leading Education Achievement in Districts initiatives were merged into a single entity called the Kentucky Cohesive Leadership System (KyCLS). The KyCLS director convened a meeting to which she invited representatives from the EPSB, Kentucky Department of Education, and Council on Postsecondary Education and the department chairs of the 11 approved programs to determine “how best to improve principal preparation” (KyCLS, 2008, p. v). This convening was a major turning point in Kentucky's redesign efforts: Thereafter, university professors—those directly involved in preparing principals—were no longer primary decision makers about program design.

The KyCLS director then organized a Principal Redesign Summit held in January 2006 to gain feedback on its proposal for improving principal preparation and development. Attendees included 70 individuals representing 33 state and national groups (e.g., Kentucky Chamber of Commerce, The Wallace Foundation). Representatives from the CCSSO, National Association of State Boards of Education, National Council of State Legislatures, and National Governor's Association were invited to facilitate four breakout sessions to gather participant perspectives about the KyCLS redesign proposal.

Nine months later the Kentucky General Assembly adopted a resolution sponsored by Representative Jon Draud, who at that time was also a member of the Southern Regional Education Board Legislative Advisory Board. The resolution directed the executive director of EPSB, in collaboration with the Council on Postsecondary Education president and the Kentucky commissioner of education, to “form a task force to present recommendations on the redesign of principal preparation and support” (Education Leadership Redesign Task Force, 2007, p. 7). The 35-member Education Leadership Redesign Task Force included 12 representatives of state agencies, five members of Kentucky education organizations, six practicing or retired administrators, a research consultant from the Southern Regional Education Board, and the 11 chairs of university departments approved to provide principal preparation.

Statewide exemplar-design efforts. After publication of the Education Leadership Redesign Task Force report, the KyCLS director convened a 47-member team composed of 23 professors representing the 11 operating preparation programs and 2 colleges that did not have programs. The other 24 members of the design team represented special interest groups and state agencies. Design team members as well as a paid consultant and occasional invited guests met monthly for 2 full days throughout a year to review documents prepared by previous KyCLS-sponsored groups and to design exemplars of performance assessments to guide university personnel during redesign activities. The exemplars were based on the six dimensions and corresponding functions created by Jefferson County Public Schools personnel for their Wallace-funded programs.

The KyCLS notebook developed by the design team was approved in May 2008 by EPSB as a resource for use by professors during program redesign. The 2008 revised Kentucky Administrative Regulation about preparation and certification of principals stipulates that “Dispositions, Dimensions, and Functions for School Leaders” (Professional Certificate for Instructional Leadership, 2008, § 3(2)) are to be used to document candidate performance during preservice preparation.

Second Mandated Change: Elimination of Master's Degrees in School Administration

The October 2008 revision of the Kentucky Administrative Regulation stipulates that all university-based preparation programs accredited prior to May 31, 2009, were no longer allowed to admit new students after December 31, 2011. Institutions wishing to provide principal preparation in Kentucky must submit their program proposals to EPSB no later than December 31, 2012, for review. The most significant change in statute was the elimination of master's degrees in school administration. Henceforth, all candidates admitted to approved, redesigned principal preparation programs must

- hold a graduate degree upon admission;
- present evidence of 3 years of documented full-time teaching experience in a public school or a nonpublic school that meets state performance standards;
- document their skills and understanding in three areas (ability to improve student achievement; leadership; and advanced knowledge of curriculum, instruction, and assessment); and
- present an agreement signed by a superintendent pledging support for the applicant to participate in a high-quality practicum experience.

Additionally, program proposals submitted to EPSB must include signed collaborative agreements with districts that specify (a) joint screening of principal candidates and (b) codesign and codelivery of courses. The proposal must also evidence (a) collaboration with academic disciplines and programs outside the field of education, (b) collaboration with districts in providing appropriate field experiences for candidates, and (c) a requirement for candidates to conduct a capstone project that is defended before a panel of program faculty and school administrators upon program completion (Professional Certificate for Instructional Leadership, 2008).

Potential Impediments to Full Implementation

The statewide redesign effort, which included field testing of two new programs delivered by a private college and by a regional university, was funded by The Wallace Foundation. The Kentucky General Assembly, however, did not allocate funds to support program development at any other institutions or release time for candidates to engage in mandated field experiences. Paying for the new
requirements is problematic because postsecondary institutions and districts have already made significant cuts in personnel and services due to decreased state funding for P–20 education. External funding from local sources is nearly nonexistent because Kentucky is predominately rural and poor:

Four in ten public school students in Kentucky attend a rural school, the 7th highest rate in the U.S. The state’s nearly 260,000 rural students are characterized by very high rates of poverty and of students qualifying for special education services. The educational policy context is not favorable.

The equitable distribution of funding among rural districts suggests that the low funding impacts nearly all rural districts in the state. Educational outcomes are among the lowest in the U.S., and concentrated poverty districts serving more than 24,000 students are more impoverished, less well-funded, and lower-performing than nearly all other states. (Johnson & Strange, 2009, p. 49)

Among the 174 school districts in Kentucky, only Jefferson County and Fayette County Public Schools serve children and youth living in urban areas (i.e., Louisville and Lexington, respectively). The 172 other school districts are relatively small—many having as few as one to three schools. More than one third of the districts have only one high school or one secondary school serving Grades 6–12.

Many rural districts in Kentucky are located in remote areas considerable distances from universities or colleges that offer approved principal-preparation programs. These rural districts must address many of the same challenges that Jefferson County and Fayette County Public Schools do, but they must find solutions without local support from social service agencies, businesses and industries, foundations, and charitable institutions or without benefit of local tax-generating properties. These conditions make it extremely difficult for rural districts to recruit and retain principals (Browne-Ferrigno & Allen, 2006) and nearly impossible for universities to deliver programs through university–district partnerships as envisioned by The Wallace Foundation (Orr, King, & LaPointe, 2010) and as specified in Kentucky policy (Browne-Ferrigno, 2011).

University of Kentucky’s Redesign Efforts and Outcomes

To inform program redesign efforts at the University of Kentucky, a comprehensive review of former students’ files was conducted in June 2010 to ascertain their career paths after graduation. The process began by identifying those admitted between 2000 and 2009 and then determining their program entry and exit dates, admissions status, current position and work site, and e-mail address. Data were gleaned from student files and from the EPSB-maintained, open-access database that displays P–12 educators’ employment status. Graduates in the database with working e-mail addresses were invited to complete the School Leaders Preparation and Practice Survey administered by the National Center for Evaluation of Educational Leadership Preparation and Practice sponsored by the University Council for Educational Administration.

A secondary database was created that included information only for those admitted to the preparation program between 2002 and 2006 and who completed coursework requirements by May 2008, which gave them time to assume a principalship by June 2010. Statistics based on racial and ethnic descriptors within this database were consistent with statewide diversity data reported by the U.S. Census Bureau: Eight (9%) are members of minority groups (i.e., 6 Black or African American, 1 Asian American, 1 Hispanic), and the remaining 77 (91%) are White, non-Hispanic. The group included 57 (67%) women and 28 (33%) men. The group’s average age when beginning the program was 33.5 years (range 23–54, median 32, mode 28), and average years of teaching experience was 7.7 (range 1–30, median 6, mode 7).

Among these 85 program completers, 54 (64%) hold either provisional or professional principal certification. Further, 51 (60%) of the 85 of the program completers held a graduate degree when admitted, and 43 (84%) had engaged in teacher leadership prior to admissions. Many within this group served in positions outside the classroom throughout their five-semester program, thus providing them diverse opportunities to interact with principals and to observe and engage regularly in school leadership. Most important, 39 (76%) of the 51 were serving as assistant principals (n = 18) or principals (n = 21). These data suggest that holding a graduate degree and having teacher-leadership experience prior to entry into a preparation program may be a predictor of future placement as a principal (Muth, Browne-Ferrigno, Bellamy, Fulmer, & Silver, in press).

Sadly, these data also suggest that those entering the program with only a baccalaureate degree and limited or no prior leadership experience did not benefit from participating in the principal-preparation program: Only 8 (24%) of the 34 in this subgroup were serving as assistant principals (n = 5) or principals (n = 3). Two others were teachers on special assignment outside the classroom. However, 24 (71%) within this subgroup were teachers—positions they held upon program admission. These findings and admission requirements for the mandated redesigned principal-preparation programs suggested to EDL faculty that teachers need unique leadership-development options.

After months of brainstorming sessions, comprehensive reviews of literature, and conversations with diverse P–12 leadership practitioners and university colleagues, EDL faculty produced its Teacher Leadership Program. Following critical reviews of the program proposal and course syllabi by multiple University of Kentucky faculty-governance bodies and by EPSB review committees and administrators, EDL received approval in May 2011 to deliver the Teacher Leadership Program and to recommend the addition of the Teacher Leader Endorsement to an existing Kentucky teaching certificate. Development of the Teacher Leadership Program also informed development of the new Doctor of Education (EdD) with Principal Certification Program, which is the University of Kentucky’s response to the 2008 redesign mandate. The following sections summarize core elements of the programs, which are scheduled to launch in Fall 2012.

Teacher Leadership Program

The overarching program goal of the Teacher Leadership Program is to prepare teachers to assume leadership roles and responsibilities that “support school and student success” (Harrison & Killion, 2007, p. 74). The theory of action for the program is the “Framework for School Leadership Accomplishments” (Bellamy, Fulmer, Murphy, & Muth, 2007, p. 34), in which student learning is the central focus accomplished through conditions that create a learning-centered school environment (i.e., learning goals, instruction, student climate, related services) and support the learning
Standards-based curriculum and continuous learning assessment. The Teacher Leadership Program is framed by the advanced-level Kentucky Teacher Standards, Educational Leadership Policy Standards: ISLLC.2008 (CCSSO, 2008), and National Educational Technology Standards for Administrators (International Society for Technology in Education, 2009). Candidates are required to complete self-assessments of their understanding and use of these standards at three points during the program (admission, retention, and completion). They must upload artifacts to their electronic portfolios with a corresponding coversheet in which they reflect about how the work products link to specific standards that they identify. Candidates’ electronic portfolios also include their observations and reflections about field experiences in diverse classrooms and their practicum log. All portfolio artifacts are reviewed by at least two EDL faculty. At program completion, candidates must defend their action-research report (capstone project) before a committee composed of program faculty and P–12 educational practitioners.

Individualized professional development. The Teacher Leadership Program provides flexibility in course selection to address candidates’ individualized professional development needs. All students admitted to the program must successfully complete the 15 credit hours of required coursework (i.e., ELS 600, ELS 608, ELS 620, ELS 621, ELS 624). Teachers holding a graduate degree upon program admission can earn Teacher Leader Endorsement by completing the Teacher Leadership core course and all elements in the continuous assessment plan. Candidates seeking the Master of Education (MEd) or EdS degree must complete the Teacher Leadership core courses, five elective courses (15 credit hours) selected from options inside and outside the program to meet their unique learning needs, and all elements in the continuous assessment plan. See Table 1.

Outcomes. The Teacher Leadership Program prepares teachers to assume school-wide leadership roles, both formal (e.g., school-governance committee member, department chair, grade-level team leader) and informal (e.g., instructional model, peer mentor, curriculum-design team member). Candidates work with principals and other educators to complete learning-focused activities that expand their knowledge about curriculum, instruction, assessment, and accountability issues and that develop their leadership skills. If graduates of the Teacher Leadership Program determine in the future that becoming a principal is an appropriate career choice for them, they will have the required graduate degree, leadership experience, and advanced knowledge of a school-wide academic program to apply for admission to redesigned principal preparation programs.

Principal Certification Program

After considerable discussion about various design options, the EDL faculty determined that principal preparation should be offered as a specialization within the existing EdD program. Those admitted to the EdD program with principal-certification specialization must meet requirements for the regular EdD program (e.g., GRE scores, graduate GPAs, writing ability, graduate-level basic statistics course, recommendations) in addition to all conditions specified in state policy (e.g., years of full-time teaching experience, leadership experience, knowledge of academic program). Admission is based on holistic reviews of applicants’ application files, performance during interviews with faculty, and dispositions about the principalship.

Guaranteed support for high-quality field experiences. One recommendation for admission to the program must be from the applicant’s superintendent. If the applicant is admitted, the superintendent must sign a memorandum of agreement pledging support for a high-quality practicum experience. The agreement must • specify how the district will assure that candidate has opportunities to observe and participate in school and district leadership activities,
• confirm that candidate will have access to school and district data to use when completing program assignments, and
• articulate the number of days that candidate will be released from work responsibilities to engage in practicum.

Comprehensive curriculum and embedded field experiences. Table 2 displays the scope of curriculum and sequence of courses for both the new EdD/EdS program and the previous MEd/EdS program. Each Level I course in the new program includes approximately 60 clock hours of required fieldwork, during which candidates observe, participate in, or lead school or district leadership activities. Before exiting the program, candidates must complete at least 600 clock hours of field experiences related to school leadership.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Fall Semester</th>
<th>Spring Semester</th>
<th>Summer Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ELS 600 Leadership in Learner-Centered Schools</td>
<td>ELS 608 School Law &amp; Governance for Teachers</td>
<td>ELS 612 Leadership for Technology and Innovation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELS 604 Leadership in Professional Learning Communities</td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>ELS 616 Leadership for Inclusive Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>ELS 620 Action Research for School Renewal I</td>
<td>ELS 621 Action Research for School Renewal II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>ELS 624 Leadership Practicum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Five new courses were added to the new program. EDL 661 School Technology Leadership presents an overview of principal responsibilities concerning technology adoption and utilization. The two-course sequence—EDL 706 Leadership for Learning-Centered Schools I and EDL 707 Leadership for Learning-Centered Schools II—assure candidates have content knowledge and skills specified in Dimension 1 (leading learning and teaching) and Dimension 2 (assessing instructional program and monitoring student performance) of the EPSB-approved KyCLS (2008) notebook. The MEd/EdS program did not have any courses dedicated to these two critically important responsibilities of principal leadership. The content in EDL 702 Leadership for Organizational Learning and EDL 703 Leading Organizational Change expands significantly the content of EDL 650 Leadership for School Program Improvement course in the previous program.

Formal performance assessments. The dissertation for the EdD with principal certification has three chapters—a format already approved by the University of Kentucky for the Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate affiliated EdD program for community-college leaders (Browne-Ferrigno & Jensen, in press). The proposed principal-certification program supports candidates who wish to complete the EdD requirements within 4 years. Chapter 1 of the dissertation is the written report of the capstone project required for provisional principal certification. Individuals who decide to exit the EdD program must defend their capstone project during a formal EdS oral examination conducted by university professors. Practitioners serve as nonvoting members of capstone-defense committees. All candidates who successfully defend their capstone projects receive a letter of eligibility for provisional certification, which makes them eligible to assume a principalship.

Table 2
Comparison of University of Kentucky Principal-Preparation Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Scope and sequence of new EdD with Principal Certification</th>
<th>Scope and sequence of previous MEd/EdS in School Administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>EDL 706 Leadership for Learning-Centered Schools I</td>
<td>EDL 601 Introduction to School Leadership and Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDL 751 Foundations of Inquiry</td>
<td>EDL 628 School Law and Ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>EDL 661 School Technology Leadership</td>
<td>EDL 625 School Safety and Discipline Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDL 707 Leadership for Learning-Centered Schools II</td>
<td>EDL 627 School Finance and Support Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>EDL 627 School Finance and Support Services</td>
<td>EDL 634 Leadership for Human Resource Development in Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDL 628 School Law and Ethics</td>
<td>EDS 613 Legal &amp; Parental Issues in Special Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Level I coursework complete</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>EDL 634 Securing and Developing Staff</td>
<td>EDL 669 Leadership for School Problem Solving (action research)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDL 646 Leadership for School-Family-Community Engagement</td>
<td>Elective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>EDL 625 School Safety and Discipline Leadership</td>
<td>EDL 646 Leadership for School-Community Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDL 702 Leadership for Organizational Learning</td>
<td>EDL 650 Leadership for School Program Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Defense of capstone project (Chapter 1 of dissertation, EdS oral examination for their exiting EdD program)</em></td>
<td><em>Level II coursework complete</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Level I coursework complete</em></td>
<td>MEd or EdS Oral Examination (defense of portfolio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>EDL 703 Leading Organizational Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EDL 704 Politics of Educational Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Level II coursework complete</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>EDL 771 Seminar in Qualitative Research Methods for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational Leaders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>EDL 771 Seminar in Quantitative Research Methods for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational Leaders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>EDL 792 Research in Educational Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Qualifying Examination (defense of Chapter 2 and proposed Chapter 3 of dissertation)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>EDL 767 Dissertation Residency Credit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>EDL 767 Dissertation Residency Credit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Oral Examination (defense of three-chapter dissertation)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Upon successful completion of the required 45 credits of doctoral coursework and with approval from dissertation chair, a doctoral student is eligible to sit for the qualifying examination (i.e., Chapter 2 of the dissertation and proposal for Chapter 3). After completing the UK-required two semesters of dissertation residency credit hours and submission of a complete dissertation approved by dissertation chair, a doctoral candidate is eligible to schedule the summative assessment (i.e., defense of the dissertation during a formal oral examination conducted by candidate’s advisory committee and an external reviewer representing the graduate school).

Closing Reflection

As an active participant in all phases of principal-program redesign efforts in Kentucky, I became disillusioned by the compliance orientation that intruded into the process immediately following the April 2005 Leading Change Conference. As critical decisions about program design were repeatedly made without analysis of data gathered from program graduates or program implementers, but instead perceptions by those far removed from principal preparation, I became quite disgruntled about the process and concerned about the outcome.

My attitude about program redesign changed during our department’s development efforts. We began by gathering data about our program graduates and about promising practices identified in diverse literature, and then we used that information while brainstorming ways to create unique teacher-leader development opportunities. Developing the Teacher Leadership Program stimulated our strategic and imaginative thinking and provided opportunities for design thinking that served us well: The framework for our new EdD program with principal-certification specialization emerged during an impromptu Saturday morning faculty meeting in late September 2011. Our formal proposal of the new principal preparation program was approved by the EPSB review committee and was recommended for formal approval during the May 2012 EPSB meeting. Once approved, our department will have a continuum of high-quality, certification-based programs for P–12 educators seeking leadership development through the University of Kentucky.
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The Common Core State Standards (CCSS) represent, for many, a long overdue attempt to map out what K-12 students need to know and be able to do to be successful in work and college. Although not without detractors, the CCSS have been adopted by 48 states, two territories, and the District of Columbia (Council of Chief State School Officers [CCSSO], 2012b). This adoption has significant implications for educators and educational leaders, implications that permeate preparation, practice, and professional development.

**The Common Core State Standards**

The standards, which were developed in collaboration with a variety of stakeholders including content experts, states, teachers, school administrators, and parents, focus on English language arts and math (CCSSO, 2012b). To ensure alignment with college and work expectations, inclusion of rigorous content, and application of knowledge through higher order skills, the National Governors Association and the CCSSO convened a 25-person committee composed of scholars and leaders in the education standards community (e.g., Linda Darling-Hammond, Kenji Hakuta, David Conley, David Pearson, Lauren Resnick) to review and validate them (National Governors Association, 2010).

Regardless of the care taken to develop the standards, some critics point out that focusing on a core set of standards is likely to narrow the curriculum in significant ways, making it difficult for teachers to provide students with a rich curriculum reflecting the perspectives and contributions of diverse scholars, communities and cultures. Other critics claim the CCSS are weaker than many state-established standards. Supporters, however, argue that the standards are necessary given increased student mobility, disparate standards across states, increased global competition, and shifting skill sets required by current and future jobs.

According to the CCSSO (2012a), the CCSS represent six key shifts:

1. The standards emphasize the development of knowledge through context-rich nonfiction and information texts.
2. Reading and writing assignments are to be anchored to evidence from texts.
3. The standards stress building students’ vocabulary and ability to read complex texts.
4. The standards narrow and deepen the focus on mathematics.
5. The standards are designed to support the progression of learning from grade to grade and across content areas.
6. The standards emphasize conceptual understanding, procedural skill, fluency, and application with equal rigor.

According to the National Governors Association (2010), unlike most state-generated standards, the CCSS are also internationally benchmarked and designed to prepare students to be college and career ready. Finally, while the intention is for all states to have essentially the same standards, states do have the option of adding additional standards (up to 15% more) on top of the core.

Although for some the adoption of a common set of standards for K-12 education seemed a sudden policy development, others view it as long in coming (Gewertz, 2012). Indeed, momentum for the development of a shared set of standards can be traced back at least to 1983, when A Nation at Risk assailed the public understanding of American education. Since, that time the federal government has made several attempts to institute national standards and tests (Carpenter, 2011).

It wasn’t until recently, however, that the stars have aligned for the federal government to successfully incentivize the development and adoption of a common set of educational standards. Though the states took the lead in defining and adopting the CCSS, many point out that the effort itself was driven by the federal government, foundations, and Washington-based organizations (Gewertz, 2012). For example, through the Race to the Top competition, the federal government offered a total of $4 billion to states who adopted common standards by August 2010 and $360 million in grants to two groups of states to develop tests for the new standards. Furthermore, Secretary of Education Arne Duncan, a strong and vocal advocate of the standards, has been known to criticize state leaders who contend the standards lower academic expectations.

According to advocates and critics alike, however, adoption of the CCSS will be merely symbolic if the standards are not fully embraced from the state office to the classroom (Gewertz, 2012). But before educators embrace the new standards, they will need to understand them, how they differ from current math and English standards, and what changes to current practice are needed to support their implementation. Currently, it is questionable whether there is strong enough familiarity and understanding of the standards among the vast community of educators to ensure successful implementation.

**Leadership and the Common Core**

Educational officials point out that the new standards require not only a new approach to teaching (e.g., teaching literacy skills across the curriculum), but also a change in the way that teachers are prepared. The same holds true for educational leaders. Research has demonstrated that leadership has a significant impact on student learning, second only to the impact of the quality of curriculum and instruction. There are many dimensions to effective school leadership, but having a solid grasp of curriculum, instruction, and assessment is fundamental to supporting the work of classroom teachers. To successfully implement the CCSS, leaders must be able to do the following: understand and effectively communicate the standards; understand their implications for teaching; use and support the use of data, access essential resources; lead effective instruction and instructional improvement; and develop a school culture, structures, and processes that support effective instruction.

From the Director: Considering the Common Core

Michelle D. Young
Just as leadership of student learning is a key theme within the Interstate School Leadership Licensure Consortium standards, it is central to the Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) standards for leadership preparation. The most direct emphasis is provided in ELCC Standard 2:

Candidates who complete the program are educational leaders who have the knowledge and ability to promote the success of all students promoting a positive school culture, providing an effective instructional program, applying best practice to student learning, and designing comprehensive professional growth plans for staff.

Ensuring that leaders are school-ready when they complete their university-based educational leadership programs includes preparing them to support and lead the implementation of state educational policies, like the CCSS. Key shifts, such as increased requirements for teaching literacy across the curriculum, will require that principals and their leadership teams build a school culture that supports necessary changes in curriculum and instruction. Furthermore, the requirements for the education of English Language Learners and students with learning disabilities will require that leaders have a deeper understanding of the programs, structures, and instructional strategies that most effectively meet these learners’ needs.

Efforts to prepare school leaders to support the CCSS are underway. Some University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) institutions, like the University of Kentucky, are engaged in conversations, curriculum audits, and course development efforts designed to ensure their programs will prepare leaders to successfully lead the kind of instruction and learning suggested by the new CCSS. Additionally, faculty members involved in UCEA’s curriculum module development initiative have designed a set of curriculum materials focused specifically on leading the learning of English language learners. These curriculum materials are available on the UCEA website and are free of charge for leadership preparation programs (UCEA, 2012). Similarly, professional associations are actively engaged in developing professional development for current leaders. The National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) and the National Association of Elementary School Principals are working with the Hunt Institute out of North Carolina to host principal summits focused on the new standards (NASSP, 2012). According to Dick Flanary of the NASSP, “Principals and other school leaders need specific, targeted professional development to create the appropriate conditions in schools that will allow them to lead the kind of instructional changes that the CCSS demand” (NASSP, 2012, p. 1).

UCEA is committed to supporting high-quality leadership preparation and development for school and district-level leaders. UCEA Headquarters staff are working to develop meaningful collaborations with professional associations, support conversations and resource sharing among leadership preparation faculty, and continue the development of high-quality preparation-curriculum modules. If you have an interest in engaging in or leading efforts around preparing leaders for the new standards, UCEA would welcome your involvement. Although conversations around the implementation of the CCSS have focused foremost on curriculum and teaching, it is time for leadership to be given greater consideration by all educational stakeholders.
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In this issue the Innovative Programs Column is featuring the Leadership for Learning (L4L) EdD at the University of Washington–Seattle. A cohort-based, modular EdD, L4L is designed to prepare system-level leaders whose practice is informed by inquiry, anchored in a commitment to equity, and focused on the improvement of teaching and learning in dynamic and demanding environments. Currently, L4L has one of the strongest completion rates in the United States, with over 87% of students graduating within 4 years.

**Background**

The L4L EdD is led by a six-member team of faculty from the University of Washington Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies. Team members develop curriculum, teach cohort modules, and advise students through the completion of a capstone portfolio. The team also meets monthly to forge connections across the curriculum and integrate assignments wherever possible. In the summer of 2012, the fifth L4L cohort will commence with 35 students from Seattle and surrounding rural communities.

The program was launched in 2002 when faculty redesigned the existing EdD to better distinguish it from the PhD offered at the University of Washington. A distinctive characteristic of L4L is its integrated curriculum built around the core values of social justice, inquiry, innovative organizational change, collaboration, and instructional leadership. Inquiry-focused instructional leadership is a core value that is both taught as a stand-alone module and woven throughout the curriculum. Rooted in the scholarship of practice, all coursework develops skills and knowledge for district leadership in the context of education reform, the politics of schooling, systems theory, organizational change, and instructional leadership to improve teaching and learning.

Most students in the program are practicing educational leaders in school-based and system-level roles who aspire to broader system-level positions in school districts, regional organizations, and state educational agencies. After successful completion of the program, students earn the University of Washington Education Superintendent Certificate. The following testimonial from a student in the fourth cohort, an elementary school principal, speaks to L4L’s aims:

“I think the first important thing that L4L intentionally did to benefit my school was to make the assignments not only relevant to my work but also embedded in my work. … For example, with my faculty, I developed an instructional framework. … The framework we developed has become the instructional framework for our building.”

**Distinctive Features**

**Admissions**

The L4L EdD has a competitive admissions process with an extensive interview involving two or more faculty and former students. To encourage members of historically underserved communities to apply, faculty provide outreach activities at meetings, conferences, and community events. In addition, the lead faculty member maintains an office at a high-poverty, urban high school that serves as a professional learning center.

**Advising and Cohort Development**

Throughout the program, students work closely with faculty advisors, both tenure-line professors and full-time practice-oriented scholars. Students also have ongoing access to the lead faculty member who accompanies students throughout their program. The lead faculty member hosts writing seminars and off-campus discussion groups, teaches a module entitled Community of Scholars, and co-teaches a module entitled Instructional Renewal that runs throughout the program.

In Community of Scholars, students apply theories of adult motivation and learning from the Instructional Renewal module to their doctoral experiences and provide feedback on teaching and learning within the program. This provides an opportunity to explore cohort development and theories related to communities of practice and professional learning communities. One student, an elementary school principal, described the benefits of the adult learning project in the Community of Scholars: “The adult learning project has led us to rethink how we conduct faculty meetings. We are more intentional about modeling instructional strategies that can be readily applied in the classroom.”

**Modular Coursework**

Courses, referred to as modules, are sequenced to promote exploration of common interdisciplinary themes related to authentic leadership challenges. Modules are offered on campus monthly in 2-day seminars and for 5 consecutive days in summer. The 3-year program also maintains web-based and e-mail support. Assignments are typically inquiry oriented, project based, and job embedded to allow students to explore leadership frameworks, tools, and strategies that they will need to be effective as leaders of change in educational systems.
An inquiry module threads throughout the entire program, requiring students to examine leadership practice through cycles of inquiry. A stand-alone inquiry module connects tightly to other modules, and assignments are frequently blended. One student, an elementary school principal, described the benefits of the focus on inquiry as follows:

I was already working on improving literacy instruction in my building. However, going at that improvement through the COI [Cycle of Inquiry] has made the work more deliberate, thoughtful, and effective. Principals from other buildings as well as outside education consultants regularly come to our building to see what reading instruction should look like and how to build a plan to get to that level of reading instruction.

Internships

Students complete 320 hours of personalized internship work with highly regarded, field-based mentors. A component of many internships is the submission of articles to practice-oriented journals. The most recent cohort published eight articles based on applications of coursework to their leadership contexts. Between 2008 and 2012, over 40 L4L students presented such research at state and national conferences.

Capstone Portfolio

Drawing upon insights from prior cohorts and scholarship in the study of the EdD (Levine, 2005; Shulman, Glode, Bueschel, & Garabedian, 2006), in 2009 L4L faculty replaced the then-culminating capstone requirement with a 3-year portfolio process. Through the portfolio process, students continuously construct, examine, and publically vet products from their coursework and leadership practice. A summative capstone portfolio is presented to a panel of faculty, peers, and expert colleagues from the field at the end of the program.

Graduate School Recognition

Having received approval for L4L to be offered as an official practice-doctorate program by the University Graduate School, L4L is not required to operate within its previous traditional doctoral parameters. This has allowed faculty to be more innovative in developing and continuously revising key aspects of the program.

Career Advancement and Impact

Approximately 90% of L4L students advance in their careers, with most of them serving in executive leadership positions within Washington State. Currently, 11 L4L graduates are superintendents in rural, suburban, and urban school districts. Approximately 30 L4L graduates have assumed director, executive director, or assistant superintendent positions. Other graduates have taken positions at the state educational agency, in professional development networks, or in postsecondary teacher preparation faculty.

One aspect of the program greatly valued by L4L faculty is the mutual positive regard between faculty, staff, students, and with the profession. Monthly evaluations from students provide growing evidence of a program whose stewardship of learning combines competence, integrity, and impact in schools and school districts. An example of this impact can be found in the quote below. This L4L graduate, an elementary school principal who currently designs the curriculum for an online university, described what happened after completing an assignment that required the shadowing of an English language learner (ELL) student.

After shadowing a student receiving English language services I discovered insight into how his (and all ELL students’) academic and social learning experience at school was impacting their ability to belong, engage, and connect with their peers, teachers, and curriculum. As a result we redesigned our ELL service-delivery model to include constructive play, curriculum purchases in students’ first and second language, and developed family game nights where students and families each brought a game from their culture to share with others. The learning was truly transformative for my leadership.

In the coming year, L4L faculty will conduct and disseminate results from a systematic evaluation of the program’s impact. For more information about the L4L EdD, please contact

Dr. Margery B. Ginsberg
Associate Professor in Educational Leadership & Policy Studies
313B Miller Hall, Box 353600
College of Education
University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98195-3600
ginsbm@u.washington.edu

http://education.washington.edu/degrees/edd.html
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UCEA Employment Resource Center

UCEA Job Search Handbook

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

UCEA Job Posting Service

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

Ting Wang  
University of Canberra, Australia

The educational challenge of the 21st century facing many countries is to achieve higher levels of learning for all students. While school reforms across different education systems target student learning outcomes, teaching is the most powerful influence on students’ achievement, and the key to achieving such outcomes is improvement in teaching quality (McKinsey & Company, 2007). Researchers have substantiated the strong influence of leadership on teaching and learning (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2008; Leithwood, Seashore Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004; Robinson, Lloyd, & Rowe, 2008). The leadership dimension that is most strongly associated with positive student outcomes is that of promoting and participating in teacher learning and development (Robinson et al., 2008). Peer-led learning and development within and across schools are increasingly popular and have been identified as a feature of the world’s most successful improving school systems (McKinsey & Company, 2010).

Over the past decade, the concept of professional learning communities (PLCs) has gained increasing attention from schools, education systems, and governments as a promising vehicle to secure improvements in teaching quality and thereby in student learning outcomes (DuFour, Eaker, & DuFour, 2005; Hipp & Huffman, 2010; Hord, 1997; McLaughlin & Talbert, 2006; Stoll & Louis, 2007). Evidence about the potential power of teacher collaboration comes from research syntheses on PLCs that suggest a positive and significant relationship between PLCs and student achievement and improvement in teachers’ practices (Lomos, Hofman, & Bosker, 2011; Timperley, Wilson, Barrar, & Fund, 2007; Vescio, Ross, & Adams, 2008). However, much of the existing literature on PLCs has focused on Anglo-American settings; the concept and practice of PLCs in other cultural contexts have been largely ignored. There arises a need to explore the diversity and complexity of PLCs in different cultural contexts and broaden our understanding of critical issues facing educational leaders in an interdependent world in the 21st century.

Project Summary

The Global PLC Network (GloPLCNet) was initiated in March 2011 in Taiwan by five researchers to conduct an international comparative study of PLCs and school leadership across mainland China, Taiwan, Hong Kong, Singapore, and the United States. The purpose is to study the PLC construct and practices in a globalized context in order to enhance the understanding of teaching, learning, and leadership through an intercultural perspective. This study will examine the present status of the PLC process in each system and compare similarities and differences of PLCs across all five systems. A conceptual framework will be developed to illustrate and portray the goals, constructs, and external factors of the PLC process in the five systems. The factors that inhibit the creation and sustainable development of PLCs in each system will also be investigated. In this study, PLCs are defined as communities of learning where educators engage in collective inquiry to generate, mobilize, and transfer knowledge for enhancing teaching practices and extending student learning.

This project was conceptualized initially as a three-stage study. Stage 1 involves contextual and literature reviews that map the status quo of PLC structure, processes, and practices in each system. This stage also involves the development and refinement of a conceptual framework that can address the key constructs of PLCs in each system and accommodate different contexts. Stage 2 encompasses a set of case studies conducted in each cultural setting that will capture qualitative insights from principals, department heads, teachers, and system administrators and district superintendents. Stage 3 involves the use of data gathered during the initial two stages to develop subscales of PLC constructs and create a common PLC survey instrument, which will be administered in each cultural setting. Survey data will be analyzed for the purpose of understanding the PLC concept and practices and improving teaching, learning, and leadership within and across cultural settings. Some preliminary findings of Stage 1 related to the PLC practices in different cultures have been presented at seminars and conferences at the Singapore National Institute of Education, the University of North Texas, and the UCEA Convention in 2011.

GloPLCNet

The GloPLCNet was initiated in March 2011 when the team members met in Taiwan to attend an international conference, “Enhancing High School Education Quality,” which has a particular focus on school improvement and PLCs. The researchers also visited several schools to gain an understanding of PLC initiatives in Taiwan. The team includes Professor Clive Dimmock (Singapore National Institute of Education), Professor Jane B. Huffman (University of North Texas), Associate Professor Ting Wang (University of Canberra, Australia), Professor Nicholas S. K. Pang (The Chinese University of Hong Kong), and Associate Professor Peiying Chen (National Taiwan Normal University). Drs. Dimmock, Huffman, Wang and Chen and Dr. Hairon Salleh worked collaboratively in Singapore to develop a conceptual framework and research design. They conducted a seminar on the PLC process across different cultures at the Singapore National Institute of Education.

In order to create opportunities to work face-to-face and progress the research project, the team members met again in the United States in November 2011. Prior to attending the UCEA Convention in Pittsburgh, Drs. Wang, Pang, Chen, and a PhD candidate from Taiwan, Alice Chiu, visited the University of North Texas in Denton and participated a range of activities organized by Dr. Huffman, which enhanced their understanding of educational contexts and PLC practices in the United States. They visited three public schools in Denton accompanied by the district deputy superintendent, met with the school principals to understand the evolving stages and PLC practices at their schools, and observed teacher PLC meetings in two schools.

The team presented a preconference workshop at the University of North Texas on PLC practices occurring in Mainland China, Hong Kong, Taiwan, and the United States. The workshop was well received, and participants and presenters had engaging conversations. The UCEA Convention provided another exciting opportu-
nity for the GloPLCNet members to share their experiences with American colleagues and international presenters. The team also met during the convention to conduct focused discussions on how to refine the conceptual framework and research design. A series of team meetings proved to be productive and instrumental to guide the next stage of research.

**Reflections**

Our experiences with the GloPLCNet have been overwhelmingly positive. As we work together and share our understanding of contextually based PLCs and leadership, we realize the importance of valuing indigenous perspectives as well as learning from each in order to develop an expanded global perspective on leadership. The diversity and dynamics within the team provide us with both intellectual challenges and synergy. We have benefited from open dialogue and honest feedback, peer support, and extended collegial networks. Throughout the collaborative process, we have developed strong, reciprocal professional relationships with the level of trust and respect growing over time.

Not all of our collaborative process has been smooth sailing. We need to address a number of challenges, such as acknowledging constraints of available resources and funding, sharing responsibility and workloads, determining commitments and availability (or unavailability) of certain team members at different stages, making difficult decisions while acknowledging different perspectives, and negotiating compromise. Gaining consensus on the conceptual framework and methodology, an iterative process, is no easy task.

Our framework has been reviewed and reconceptualized given the need of developing an inclusive framework and a common survey instrument that can be utilized across five education systems. To cope with the challenge of effective communication strategies among the members in five different locations, we have agreed to meet and present at an international conference at least once a year and keep regular communication via e-mails and Skype to sustain the project.

Despite these challenges, the GloPLCNet increases the opportunity for us to gain a broader appreciation of the worth of non-Eurocentric values and practices and to build our capacity of engaging in global conversations related to educational leadership in an interdependent world. Our experiences echo the observation that the pursuit and recognition of multiple perspectives as a result of global contributions is critical in developing an inclusive knowledge base that prepares scholars and practitioners for global understanding (Murakami-Ramalho & Barnett, 2008).

We would welcome inquiries for future collaboration on this project. More information about the GloPLCNet can be obtained by contacting globalplcnetwork@gmail.com, Ting Wang at ting.wang@canberra.edu.au, or other members of the research team.
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The Roots and Forms of Academic Advocacy

Mónica Byrne-Jiménez
Hofstra University

The notion of advocacy in the academy—and the question of academics as advocates—has begun to permeate our collective consciousness and professional organizations. For some it is a long-overdue discussion at the core of maintaining our “relevance” in light of the political quicksand that surrounds schools and educational reform. For others it is an irritating reminder of a decision made long ago to stay above the “fray” of educational realities and focus on our work. And still for others, it is a recognition of the work they have been engaged in and with communities from the beginning of their careers. Personal stances notwithstanding, it is clear that current attacks on public schools, educators, and communities and children demand a more unified response from the academy.

Gone are the days of looking on from afar and waiting for others to lead. Flexible organizational structures and networks that can be galvanized quickly are required now more than ever. And yet, to create these complex and elegant webs of action, we must grapple with some fundamental questions. Questions of advocacy for what and advocacy for whom must be carefully considered and brought to the center of our discussions. If we are not careful we can easily privilege ideas and programs over people, thereby replacing one system of oppression with another. Another important question is advocacy by whom? In order to prepare educational leaders to advocate for children, teachers, and communities, we must recognize our own potential, and power, as advocates.

To help with these challenging questions we asked Dr. Miguel Guajardo, Associate Professor at Texas State University—San Marcos, and Dr. Edward J. Fuller, Associate Professor at Pennsylvania State University, to share their experiences as advocates in preparing educational leaders to be advocates. Dr. Guajardo introduces the concept of the political imagination as central to the evolving understanding of advocacy. In a “roundtable” hosted by Dr. Guajardo, he and his colleagues share the roots of their political imagination and how this frames their work in community development. Dr. Fuller highlights the need for faculty to take on advocacy roles and offers numerous opportunities to engage in research, policy, and practice. Whether we explore the roots of our political imagination or embrace the possibility of becoming educational advocates, Drs. Guajardo and Fuller challenge us to actively engage with the realities of children, schools, and communities. My hope is that each of us will boldly take up that challenge.

The Political Imagination

Miguel Guajardo
Texas State University—San Marcos

with Francisco Guajardo (University of Texas—Pan American), John Oliver (Texas State University—San Marcos), & Mónica Valadez (Texas State University—San Marcos)

At a recent Community Learning Exchange in Central Texas, a convening of over 70 students, teachers, principals, professors, and community advocates, a young school principal shared his work with teachers and students to map the assets in their community. Another principal presented a dual-language program her school is developing. A third talked about the process of negotiating equity in his community. These issues, in addition to discussions on testing and accountability, led to conversations on advocacy. Critical questions arose, such as, “What is the role of school leaders as advocates? What do we advocate for? And how do we prepare leaders for this role?” The Learning Exchange forced university professors, K-12 teachers, students, and community partners to reflect on their work, particularly as it related to advocacy and action. It’s an opportune time to engage in this conversation with the UCEA family, particularly as the network continues to grapple with questions of policy, equity, and action. This thought-piece is an attempt to provoke our thinking on the political imagination of educational leaders and its role in advocacy.

We have learned a great deal through our work with the Community Learning Exchange to build awareness and nurture skills and sentiments that educational leaders need to engage in advocacy work in a community context. The ideas and propositions described herein are for practitioners, but in our brand of the political imagination, we view educational leadership faculty as veritable practitioners. In building the frame, we borrow from Mills’s (1959) seminal work, The Sociological Imagination, particularly as he delineated the role of researchers in a democratic society as the kings of ideas, the advisors to the kings, or the more autonomous role of disseminators of ideas and training to both the power brokers and the political actors in diverse communities. Our conversation in this article focuses on the idea of the third role; we propose the practice of an engaged scholarship where actors participate in a public political education project highlighted by the work of the Community Learning Exchange (Guajardo & Guajardo, 2010).

Advocacy is a product of the political imagination; the imagination is a necessary condition that encourages and inspires advocacy and action, ideally toward the public good. We see a political imagination rooted in our individual ontology, in trusting and open relationships, where conversation is a vehicle for creating and sustaining this relationship and where political action/advocacy is neither a singular action nor a one-person act. If sustainable action is to prevail, we must act differently, and with a different consciousness. Understanding, acting, and questioning as a product of this level of awareness, is at the core of an advocate’s political imagination.

The process for nurturing of one’s political imagination is a social endeavor. We are cognizant that often the prescribed struc-
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were educated in the lessons of life. In essence, they were my first professors.

My parents may have never used the terms political imagination, political awareness, or advocacy. However, as I reflect upon my childhood, I understand that their actions were grounded in the spirit of each. They often shared stories of struggle, survival, resiliency, and resistance, associated with growing up in South Georgia during the Jim Crow era. Their stories and actions were their mettle and more informative than any definition they could have provided. The added power in their knowledge was that what they learned in their homeland in the South was applicable for raising their African American children and grandchildren in the urban Midwest.

That Community Learning Exchange redirected my learning. It privileged my childhood lessons. It gave me permission to cite and reference the greatest scholars of my life, my parents. As an assistant professor, I now use those questions to create opportunities and provide space for individuals to give themselves permission to also privilege an understanding of self. I encourage learners to search for the core, and understand three questions: What's your story? Where are you from? Who are your people?

Mónica: Not too long after settling down in a small town in Central Texas, having emigrated from Guanajuato, México, mi mamá sought out the only local public school district in the area and enrolled her children. She might not have known it at the time, but she would make her way back to the school offices countless more times in her daily battle to ensure that we were afforded the same educational rights as our peers. Mi mamá did not attend formal education beyond elementary school, yet she understood its potential impact on us as individuals, family members, and community citizens. She not only spoke to, but also modeled that it was in the service of others that we are fed, and willingly embraced all sacrifice. Yet, it wasn’t until I began my own journey as a bilingual educator that a new consciousness of how intricate a tapestry mi mamá had woven began to form. Awakened by profound pláticas with my students’ mothers about their own journeys to provide their children greater opportunities, I gained a greater understanding and humble appreciation for the imaginative nature of the education that mi mamá had ensured us. All along, throughout my childhood and adolescence, it had been not only about receiving a formal education, but also about la educación that would prepare us to live meaningful and fulfilling lives. My teachers taught me many lessons, but it was mi mamá who showed me how to infuse those lessons with our language, values, beliefs, stories, and wisdom and employ them for the greater good.

Miguel: I grew up on the Texas Mexican border, a political boundary that was a permeable line we crossed regularly. Having to negotiate border crossing, both figuratively and literary, prepared me and my siblings to see the world through different vantage points. My parents prepared us for these multiple realities so we could navigate the daily challenges as well as those that were out of the ordinary. My father is a master storyteller and prided himself on the fact that until his retirement, he was never unemployed in this country. He prides himself on being un hombre bonrado (an honest person). My mother raised us at home; she being at home facilitated a warm meal after school and a spiritual foundation that informed us of a higher power; this was never a given, but rather a regularly contested proposition, as we searched for the meaning of this higher power. Questions were plentiful at the kitchen table.

Our parents prepared us for life and the challenges that came with the life experiences. The identity formation and resistance they taught us helped us survive our undergraduate experiences and then make sense of the world of work. The ability for us to dream was also informed by the border crossers who were our ancestors. This willingness to cross boundaries also introduced us to imagine the possibilities of what we can create through education, work, and an understanding of the social context and its rules. This was not so we would acquiesce, but so we could navigate through it.

The lessons from the home took a different meaning, and the questions were deepened when I was introduced to the definition of politics, borrowed from Lasswell (1950), as “who gets what, when, and how.” The combination of formal training in my educational leadership program with the values of community, respect, dignity, and relationship from home helped me construct a different way of making sense of the world. This way of knowing became theoretically robust (formal training), ethically grounded (father’s contribution), and deep in caring for each other and community (lessons from mother). This training has become my navigational tool as I work to make sense of the world around me, while simultaneously bring the necessary voices together so we can collectively construct a vision for the future and an action plan that will get us there.

***

As we complete the circle, we reflect on common themes that speak to the construction of our own political imagination. It is clear that our parents exercised courage and imagination when they uprooted their families and moved far distances in search of a better life. They crossed borders that were real and metaphorical. Their willingness to pursue those acts allows us to look at issues and ideas from multiple perspective and disciplines. The issue of action and equity modeled by our parents as they advocated for their children, and by extension for everyone else, is a core value for us. This unconditional support and caring have been part of our social DNA and complement the technical elements of our formal training in the academy. Also core are the willingness and ability to engage in the reimagining of our work as learners, teachers, and researchers as we work to respond to the public good within our local communities. Just like we learned how to modify our thinking and actions to survive in different social contexts, we have begun to reimagine how our learning and teaching is rooted in community. It’s about how we imagine modeling advocacy work that we want our students to practice, just as we want our children and the rest of the community to be an engaged citizenry.

In this spirit we invite readers to share the roots of their emerging political imagination. What informs it, how do you sustain it, and how does it inform your advocacy work?

Special note: See Mónica Valdez’s digital story on the mind-set of a traditional classroom teacher who works in schools and communities and the emergence of her political imagination at https://vimeo.com/21498349
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**The Work of Faculty-Advocates**

**Ed Fuller**
Pennsylvania State University

Recently, the New York State principals association published a letter opposing the proposals of New York policy makers with regard to teacher evaluations. In Texas, nearly half of school boards have signed a petition calling for state policy makers to reduce the emphasis on testing and the up to 45 instructional days associated with testing. Parents are choosing to opt-out their children from testing and test preparation days. Students in Houston Independent School District are calling on the school board to allow them a greater opportunity to learn by reducing test preparation and testing days.

All of these efforts are signs of increased advocacy on the part of students, parents, teachers, and principals. Even school boards are advocating for a reduced emphasis on testing. Note I did not mention faculty members or researchers, which leads us to the following critical questions: Should faculty be engaged in such efforts? If so, how should faculty engage in advocacy efforts?

The answer to the first question seems glaringly obvious to me—the answer is a resounding “Yes!” Yet, conversations with my colleagues and engaging with others at UCEA on these issues have left me with the belief that far too many faculty believe that advocacy is not part of the job description. Technically, such faculty would be correct. Indeed, I suspect few of us have job descriptions that mention advocacy in any form.

However, as a student in my policy and advocacy course said, engaging in advocacy efforts is “not a right—it is a duty.” Many members of UCEA feel this same call of duty and engage in advocacy efforts as part of their job. UCEA has been engaged in policy and advocacy efforts for some time and has formalized that commitment further with the selection of two Associate Directors for Policy and Advocacy (Sheneka Williams from University of Georgia and myself). Yet others shy away from advocacy and actively argue that faculty should not be involved in advocacy efforts.

If UCEA faculty do not advocate for improving policies and realities at the local, state, and national levels, what is the purpose of our profession? To just teach classes and advise students? To write journal articles that neither influence policy nor are even read by policy makers at any level? Although these tasks are certainly important and part of the professional call of duty, the reality of today’s world requires that faculty engage in more efforts than teaching, research, and advising students. Indeed, while focusing solely on such activities might have been acceptable in times past, the world has changed dramatically. Increasingly, there are calls to privatize education, from K-12 to higher education. Further, many policy makers are now calling for stringent accountability mechanisms for teacher and leader preparation programs, mechanisms that have no basis in research or reality. Some policy makers are even questioning the need for colleges of education if private entities can train teachers and school and district leaders. Politically connected and influential organizations such as New Leaders for New Schools, the George W. Bush Center, and the Rainwater Alliance are pushing for preparation to occur outside traditional colleges of education.

Perhaps more important, even the relevancy of our scholarship is being questioned. Most of the current calls for reform efforts are based on non-peer-reviewed (and, frankly, very shoddy) “research” from the multitude of think tanks that have proliferated over the last decade. Policy makers rarely, if ever, read peer-reviewed journal articles and, in most cases, there is little else to read that is produced by scholars in our field.

Frankly, because our work is not seen as relevant and we don’t make a concerted effort to ensure our work is relevant, education leadership programs within colleges of education may simply cease to exist in the next decade or so. From a policy maker’s perspective, why should states fund our programs when outside entities can prepare leaders and think tanks can provide research? For these reasons, and others, our field must engage in advocacy efforts while concomitantly endeavoring to ensure our work is seen as relevant.

How can faculty engage in such efforts? There are a number of ways individuals can become involved at the local, state, and national levels, and they differ according to the time limitations and abilities of faculty. The important point is that everyone must get involved in some manner. Here are some ways in which faculty can work as educational advocates.

**Research.** The easiest way to engage in these efforts is to engage in high-quality research. But, not just any high-quality research, but research that addresses topics considered important by policy makers and practitioners. Some examples of some current efforts are examinations of the efficacy of principal preparations program efforts, investigations into the contextual effects that influence principal behaviors, the relationship between principal behaviors and teacher retention, and other related efforts.

Further, rather than (or in addition to) disseminating the findings through peer-reviewed journal articles, scholars need to write abstracts for policy briefs to be placed on websites, sent to media, and provided to policy makers so that the findings enter into policy discussions. This is not to say other research is not worthwhile or necessary, but we need far more research on issues that are policy relevant.

**Providing information.** Another easy way faculty can engage in advocacy and policy efforts is to stay abreast of the research on topics that are being discussed in the policy world and inject research-based information into the conversations about such topics. For example, when the results of the last international assessment were announced, media stories were replete with “the sky is falling” descriptions of how America’s education system was descending into failure. How many knew that, on average, U.S. students had never performed above average on any international assessment? How many knew that the United States scored dead last on the first international assessment? How many knew that there is no correlation between scores on the international assessments and economic well-being and, in fact, a negative relationship between scores and measures of economic equity and measures of democracy? When faculty members are aware of such research, they can inject research-based findings into daily conversations with the public, write editorials and comments in the local paper, and e-mail policy makers with such information.
Engaging with the media. A strategy that does not require a large time commitment is to engage with local and state media. This involvement can be as simple as e-mailing local and state education writers and offering to be a resource for them. Acting as a resource can include providing relevant research, discussing issues as background information only, providing contact information as an expert in the field, or providing a quote for a story.

Working with policy makers. For those with the time and the skills, perhaps the most effective manner to engage in the policy world is to interact with policy makers. Simply meeting with one’s local state legislator and sharing views on important issues can be extremely helpful. In addition, meeting with staffers and providing information can be one of the most powerful tools that faculty members have at their disposal.

Building coalitions. Those of us in the education leadership field are not going to change the world by ourselves (although we should certainly try). We are outnumbered and clearly outspent. The only way to make progress, then, is to build coalitions with other groups. This is needed at the local, state, and national levels, so any faculty can reach out or respond to groups such as opt-out, save-our-schools, teacher, and principal organizations. There is always greater power in numbers.

Teaching policy and advocacy courses. While we need current faculty to become engaged in this work, we also need to encourage, support, and train students to do so. What is truly wonderful about working with students in this area is their high level of commitment and resolve to work for social justice and better policies. They are heavily committed to such work and desperately want classes and mentoring in this area. They see policy and advocacy work as a primary function of faculty members, and I think they are correct.

Supporting new promotion and tenure policies. Currently, promotion and tenure policies emphasize publications and, well, publications. Sure, teaching and service are mentioned, but we all know that publishing is the primary criterion. This creates a serious disincentive for faculty to engage in meaningful policy work because such policy work detracts from the duties that are rewarded in the academy. Unfortunately, this laser-like focus has largely rendered universities irrelevant to policy makers at all levels. And, as I stated in the beginning of this essay, if those with power see university researchers as irrelevant, there is not much incentive for them to support or fund our efforts.

There are multiple ways faculty can help our field become more relevant to the policy world. To be effective, we all must share the load and engage in this effort. To not do so may be the death knell for our profession.
Recent emphasis on student testing as a major component of teacher and principal evaluation has ignited dissatisfaction among teachers and principals across the nation. Neither principals nor teachers disagree with the notion of being held accountable; however, they want the accountability measures to be fair and accurate. In expression of deep dissatisfaction with recent evaluation policy, Principal Carol Burris of the Southside High School in Rockville Center, New York, and colleagues staged what has now become known as “the principal revolt.” I interviewed Dr. Burris regarding the origin, purposes, and next steps in the principal revolt.

LB: Please state your position.

CB: I am the principal of Southside High School in Rockville Center, New York.

LB: I understand that you are a participant in a principal revolt currently occurring in New York.

CB: Ok. I don’t know that it’s a revolt per se. It has been nicknamed that in the press. And that’s fine. But it certainly is a strong protest.

LB: Please describe this movement.

CB: What happened was that a new teacher and principal evaluation system was put into place for the annual professional performance review. It was put into place both in statute and as well as regulation by the state education department. The reason it came to be was because New York was second-round winner of Race to the Top. And the original application, which did not win, had a teacher evaluation system in it in which—I don’t know all the facts, but learned through a colleague that in the original application, 10% of the performance evaluation was to be based on student achievement, but that that proposal was rejected. Then they came back with a proposal for a new system of teacher and principal evaluation in which 20% of a teacher or principal’s evaluation would be based on student test scores, going up to 25% where a calculation for value added was included, and that would be the gross score. Then, there would be an additional percentage that would be based upon student achievement. However, the district had some latitude of what that student achievement would be.

Then they created a bell curve in which essentially what they said was that any teacher or principal who had a score of 64 or below out of 100 would be rated ineffective. The reason they set it at that spot is because what it guarantees is that no matter how well you did with the principal-rated portions and even if you received the full points possible—which is difficult—you are guaranteed to be rated ineffective overall if you did not do well on the student-test-score and value-added portions. We had a lot of problems with that. Our biggest problem with this formula was the primary use of student data to drive what is considered to be effective performance. We felt, and still feel, that this was not a valid way to evaluate teachers or principals.

LB: Why do you believe this to be the case?

CB: First, student scores are all over the place, and there is nothing to tell us why. Students move in and out of schools, there are special needs students. . . . We felt it was not an accurate way to rate teachers. It’s terribly inaccurate. There is a lot of research available that tells that story. We also understood as principals all of the unintended consequences that would occur when teachers believed that their job depended upon how well students did on tests. We believe that the impact between students and teachers would be altered as teachers felt more job insecurity. We also felt that the curriculum would be further narrowed if teacher were forced to teach to the test. Teachers would be worried about having high-risk students in their classes as well as students who were truant.

LB: Yes, I could imagine this posing dilemmas for teachers who wanted to help high needs students, yet who want their performance ratings to accurately reflect their performance. Are there other issues that come into play?

CB: A lot of equity issues also come into play. This was actually my major concern; a lot of really good equity issues come up. For example in my school, we have a policy whereby we opened the IB program up to all students. These type of equity policies would cause teachers to start saying, “Wait a minute, why are we taking a chance on IB courses when we are at an increased risk of failure, and when I could lose my job if students do not do well on the test?” We are starting to see it happen in New York already. Teachers are starting to request early primary classes where they don’t have testing yet, rather than teach the grades and classes they enjoy most and where they are experienced.

The other worry is that the philosophy behind the reform practices has not been tested or proven. None of this has been proven! There has been no research that says having this type of evaluation would result in higher achievement for kids. Actually, there was a study that was done recently that puts a lot of cold water on this. There has not been any research that says that this type of evaluation would be the best for student achievement. They put the cart before the horse on this one. We argue that they would not put a drug put on the market without testing it first. So why are you really changing the landscape of schools without knowing what is best for student achievement? So we ask that there would be a pilot period before fully launching the evaluation system.

The third objection we have is putting teachers on a bell curve and assigning them a number. This is so unprofessional to me! We had people rated in the newspaper. These numbers went into the Times, the Post. We said that If you are going to rate people, rate them with their substance; rate them by using a narrative rather than a number. Don’t assign a number and say, “This teacher’s a 62,” or “this teacher’s a 70.”
LB: So given your obvious dissatisfaction with what was proposed, what was your course of action?

CB: So we wrote our letter, and we sent it out and were surprised at the support we got. We decided to send it statewide. We sent it out online where people could add. We have had close to 1,160 principals sign it.

LB: Wow. That is a big number!

CB: This represents about a third of all principals in the area who have signed on in support. If you move away from the city, where everyone is afraid to speak up, if you look at the suburbs, it’s off the chart. Like if you look at Nassau and Suffolk, I think we’re about 80% of principals and teachers signing in approval. We would have more, but there are politics and fears of job security. You have some untenured teachers who are worried about their lack of stability who will not sign, but we are pleased overall with the support we have seen.

LB: Are there those who oppose your efforts? What is their reason for not signing?

CB: There are principals who have stood up and said this is wrong, and that it won’t work. And yes, we have been ignored by some who are not in support of our efforts. We have been ignored by the governor. But we keep on fighting. We’re not giving up!

Unfortunately the local teachers’ union is not with us. The teachers’ union maligns us.

LB: That is surprising. The teachers’ union?

CB: Yes! They signed up for all of this in the beginning. They went along with us early, but now they are not willing to stand up. That being said, we still have thousands of teachers who have signed our letter despite the lack of support on behalf of the teachers’ union. As I have said, we will not be stopped.

We took out an ad in the Education Gazette, and we’re continuing our efforts.

LB: What do your efforts entail?

CB: We recently developed and distributed a survey to parents on parents regarding their views on the issue of student testing. We had over 17,000 responses from parents on testing. This is the result of e-mail blasts and things like that. We’re going to be analyzing the data in the upcoming weeks.

Though we haven’t yet analyzed the data, we can already see that parents are not happy about it, just as teachers are not happy about it. The tests keep getting longer and longer. They are even talking about evaluating colleges of education based upon how well students do on the tests.

LB: Yes, I have heard about similar initiatives being undertaken in the near future to evaluate educational leadership programs by the performance of our students as well.

CB: If we keep testing, this will all fall like a house of cards. And what was great for us to help prove our argument was that this last round of testing was absurd and ridiculous. There was mass confusion on many levels as schools attempted to administer testing as directed by the state. We must see this extreme focus on testing come to an end!

LB: When you say “we,” are you talking about principals?

CB: Yes, we principals have been working towards this goal.

LB: Do you feel your efforts have been worthwhile and effective?

CB: What’s happened really is it’s been great. It started with Sean Feeney of the Wheatley School and I, and now we have an advisory board. We have six or seven of us that get together and work the issues through. We have a strong and focused team that works well together to pinpoint the problems and to raise awareness.

LB: Do you consider your group to be a formal task force or formal organization?

CB: Though we are not a formal organization, we are a strong informal organization, and we are certainly grassroots.

LB: What are your goals, and how will you know when to stop your efforts?

CB: We are not going to give up! We are not going to stop. They won’t wear us down.

LB: Do you think this message will reach principals nationally and spur them to action?

CB: Yes. However, I’m surprised at the advocacy occurring in Tennessee that there’s been little stand up on this. Diane Ravitch has been very supportive. There are a lot of good national people who are paying attention to people. A lot of the press takes press releases.

LB: So what are your next steps?

CB: We are going to analyze the parent survey. We think that when we analyze the survey that our beliefs about parents’ feelings regarding test will be confirmed. These feelings along with similar feelings held by teachers and principals will serve to strengthen our position.

Next, we’re hoping to write about it. We will include teacher, principal, and parent voice in our publications. The Washington Post has been really good about allowing us to write and blog. Also we have maintained our website throughout the movement and continue to add to it.

LB: Thank you for your persistence in advocacy and for your time. With advocacy such as what you have proven, there is hope for change!
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Building on a long tradition of successful special education law conferences, Lehigh University offers an intensive, week-long Special Education Law Symposium June 24–29, 2012 on its Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, campus. The symposium aims to provide an exploration of cutting-edge legal topics for the ultimate benefit of students with disabilities.

Leading special education attorneys from across the country serve as faculty presenters, representing both parent and district perspectives. Last summer over 80 special education administrators, attorneys, hearing officers, parents, teachers, psychologists, advocates, charter school officials, and graduate students converged at Lehigh University in June for one of the university’s most successful symposia ever. The participants represented more than 15 states and Japan.

To facilitate balanced tailoring and sharing of previous experience in special education law, the symposium offers two tracks, with an opening keynote and closing update for the total group. In the Basic track, the sequential sessions explore the legal dimension of eligibility, free appropriate public education (FAPE), least restrictive environment (LRE), discipline, remedies, and autism. Two attorney-presenters lead each session, one from a district and the other from a parent perspective. The Advanced track addresses various current hot topics, which this June will include the legal nuances of response to intervention (RTI), disability-related bullying, child find, and a mock manifestation determination scenario.

The symposium is available alternatively for Lehigh University graduate credit or on a noncredit basis. For attorneys, it also provides CLE credit from the Pennsylvania Bar.

**Participants**

The symposium is designed for individuals

- experienced in special education administration and expected to have up-to-date and in-depth knowledge, including the implications of the latest and significant cases under the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act (IDEA);
- new to special education supervision but expected to understand the basics (and beyond) of the IDEA and Section 504 regulations and case law concerning eligibility, FAPE, LRE, discipline, and remedies;
- seeking a comprehensive binder that contains relevant laws, regulations, and detailed presenter outlines of case law developments; and
- wishing to gaze into the special education “crystal ball” to prepare for challenges just now on the horizon.

**Hot Topics**

Brand-new topics for this June’s symposium are issues at the forefront of current litigation under the IDEA and Section 504 of the Americans With Disabilities Act:

- compensatory education and money damages,
- tuition reimbursement awards and limitations,
- bullying of and by students with disabilities,
- independent educational evaluations,
- child find of the “invisible” students with disabilities, and
- parent participation and preferences.

**National Faculty**

Dr. Alexa Posny, Assistant Secretary, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services (OSERS), U.S. Department of Education, will provide the keynote at the Sunday evening opening dinner: “Special Education Law From Policy to Practice: A Conversation With Stakeholders.” As OSERS chief, Dr. Posny is perfectly positioned to provide a national perspective on the state of special education policy as it affects special education administrators on the cutting edge.

The Symposium faculty for 2012, who have a healthy infusion of prominent new members, include Dan Ahearn (Massachusetts), Laura Anthony (Ohio), Lynn Daggett (Washington State), Andrew Faust (Pennsylvania), Darcy Kriha (Illinois), Michele Kule-Korgood (New York), Jennifer Laviano (Connecticut), Ruth Lowenkron (New Jersey), Deborah Mattison (Alabama), and Dr. Perry Zirkel (Pennsylvania).

**Further Information**

Registration is now open for this exciting symposium. The Lehigh Valley also offers numerous opportunities for fun and recreation in the evenings and adjacent weekends, including proximity to the Pocono Mountains, New York City, Philadelphia, Bethlehem’s new Sands casino, and the family-oriented Crayola Factory. For detailed information about the program, faculty, registration process, lodging, and recreation, please see the comprehensive symposium website: [www.lehigh.edu/education/law](http://www.lehigh.edu/education/law)

For those desiring a personal contact, please contact Tammy Bartolet at (610) 758-3226, or tlp205@lehigh.edu.
Virginia Roach, L. Wes Smith, and James Boutin Receive EAQ’s William J. Davis Award

Linda Skrla
Editor, Educational Administration Quarterly

The editorial board of Educational Administration Quarterly (EAQ) announced its choice for the most outstanding article published in the 2011 Volume Year. The winning article is “School Leadership Policy Trends and Developments: Policy Expediency or Policy Excellence?” The article, written by Virginia Roach, L. Wes Smith, and James Boutin, appeared in Volume 47, Issue 1, pp. 71-113. The article is online at http://eaq.sagepub.com/content/47/1/71

The William J. Davis Award is given annually to the author(s) of the most outstanding article published in EAQ during the preceding volume year. The article selection is made by a three-member panel, chosen from the EAQ editorial board members who have not published in the volume being reviewed. This year's panel included Chair Sarah Nelson, Texas State University; Michael Owens, Wayne State University; and Samantha Parades Scribner, Indiana University-Purdue University–Indianapolis. They regarded the article as addressing a timely and significant issue by providing a framework through which to analyze current and future policy trends shaping leadership preparation. The sophisticated framework is comprehensive without overreach, staying well within reasonable inferential bounds. This piece, which is part of a special issue, is an exemplar of the outstanding scholarship contained in that special issue of the journal. We anticipate this article will be frequently cited and will inform future scholarship related to educational leadership policy.

Article Abstract

Background
Institutional theorists suggest environmental stakeholders in the organizational field have a symbiotic relationship with governing agencies, leading to institutional isomorphism. Hence, state policy makers copy the work of their colleagues across states to create a sense of legitimacy, certainty, and professionalization rather than developing policy based on metrics of efficiency and/or effectiveness. It can stifle innovation. The purpose of this study was to investigate the trends in state policy for school-based education administrators as an indicator of institutional isomorphism.

Research Design
A “cohesive leadership system” for school leaders has been operationalized by researchers through a five-segment continuum of standards, preparation program approval, assessment and licensure, mentoring and induction, and ongoing professional development coupled with licensure renewal. Researchers in this study reviewed published state regulations in all 50 states with respect to each of these five segments.

Findings
Key trends include universal standards-based preparation, continuous renewal, increasing assessment and accountability, a wider breadth of providers for administrator development, tiered licensure, and renewal linked to school improvement as measured by student standardized assessments. The establishment of the continuum itself as well as the trends within each facet of the continuum reflect high degrees of field conformity (isomorphism) and diminishing policy space for alternative paradigms.

Conclusions
This trend is likely to continue because of the tight coupling of the environmental field related to educational administration. The conclusions suggest methods for injecting change into state policy to ensure advances in the field rather than simply replication of the status quo.

About the Authors
Virginia Roach is dean of the Graduate School of Education at Bank Street College. Dr. Roach previously served as Bank Street's project director of the Teachers for a New Era Project. Prior to her work there, she was an associate professor of Educational Administration and Policy in the Department of Educational Leadership at George Washington University, Washington, DC. Dr. Roach also acted as deputy executive director of the National Association of State Boards of Education, where she conducted research and provided technical assistance to local, state, and federal policy makers. Her research interests include the development of school leaders, state policy related to educator development and school reform, and developing leaders to support students with disabilities in the general education program. In addition to teaching and research, Dr. Roach is on the board of the International Society of Educational Planning and serves as the editor of its journal, Educational Planning.

L. Wes Smith is an early college high school principal in Currituck County, NC. Previously, he served for 20 years in the U.S. Army as a military Instructor of Music and Service School Administrator. He also served as a Junior ROTC instructor and high school assistant principal for 5 years. His current research interest is the effect of educational philanthropy on student achievement in high schools and policy on the development of school administrators.

James Boutin earned his master's in secondary social studies education at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, and has taught in public schools in Tennessee, the District of Columbia, New York City, and Washington State. He currently teaches in a small school associated with the Coalition of Essential Schools in SeaTac, WA.

The EAQ editorial team and the UCEA Executive Committee join the selection committee in congratulating Drs. Roach, Smith, and Boutin on their outstanding contribution to scholarship in the field of educational leadership and policy. The authors received recognition for the 2011 Davis Award at the 2012 AERA Division A Business Meeting on April 15 in Vancouver, British Columbia. A list of previous Davis Award recipients can be found on the next page and at http://www.ucea.org/the-william-j-davis-award/
Previous Award Winners

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 UCEA, University of Virginia, Curry School of Education, 405 Emmet Street, Charlottesville, VA 22942-0265.
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The best tool you’ll ever use in your educational leadership courses.

Journal of Cases of Educational Leadership
Relevant. Practical. Timely.

JCEL publishes peer-reviewed cases appropriate for use in programs that prepare educational leaders. Cases presented in the quarterly review cover the tangled, complex world of educational leadership, for graduate students as well as professionals in the field. Case study criteria:

• Focus on pertinent and timely issues of educational leadership.
• Present a practical and realistic problem that requires the integration of knowledge within or across disciplines.
• Stimulate self-directed learning by encouraging students to generate questions and access new knowledge.
• Describe a problem that can sustain student discussion of alternative solutions.
• Describe the context in a rich fashion, including the individuals in the case.
• Encourage the clarification of personal and professional values and beliefs.
• Authenticate the connection of theory to practice.
• Include teaching notes that facilitate the use of the case for leadership development.

For example, recent issues have featured cases exploring the struggles of a new principal, homophobic bullying of students, teacher recruitment, the extremes schools go to to meet standardized testing requirements, full inclusion issues, the change in administrative priorities following a school shooting, and using JCEL case studies to meet ELCC standards.

Editor: Richard Fossey, The University of North Texas: Richard.Fossey@unt.edu

http://jcel.sagepub.com

UCEA members have free access through the members-only site at www.ucea.org.

A Sage Publication sponsored by the University Council for Educational Administration
UCEA invites applications for three new Graduate Student Representatives to serve for 2 years as members of the UCEA Graduate Student Council (GSC). The GSC is a student-led body whose purpose is to increase the presence and the voice of graduate students in UCEA. To do so, the eight members of the GSC work to generate opportunities for graduate student development within UCEA; develop student-led seminars, forums, and workshops at the UCEA Convention; and maintain and contribute to the UCEA graduate student webpage (www.ucea.org/graduate-student-resources) and graduate student columns in the UCEA Review (www.ucea.org/ucea-review1).

Being a member of the GSC offers a unique opportunity to work closely with members of the UCEA leadership team to shape opportunities for graduate student involvement and development within UCEA. Other benefits of the position include working with a dynamic group of graduate students, connecting with a talented group of scholars from around the world, and honing leadership skills.

Criteria
To be considered, applicants must be:
1. A graduate student at a UCEA member institution through October 2014;
2. Able to demonstrate leadership skills;
3. Thoughtful, creative, and critical thinkers; and
4. Willing to dedicate time to the GSC.

GSC representatives are expected to attend and assist at the Graduate Student Summit (www.ucea.org/ucea-gssummit) and the Convention each fall. Representatives receive a travel stipend to support their travel to the convention and are provided complimentary convention registration.

Application Process
Graduate students who are interested in applying for the position should complete the online application at www.ucea.org/graduate-student-council-appli/ by July 15, 2012. Applicants will be required to submit the following materials:

1. A one-page statement of interest that explains why the applicant is interested in serving, describes relevant prior experience, and details specifically what the applicant can contribute to the GSC; and

2. Current curriculum vitae.

In addition, applicants will need to request a letter from an institutional representative, such as a department chair or plenary session representative, which recommends the applicant and ensures financial support for travel to the convention. This letter can be e-mailed directly from the institutional representative to uceagradconnex@gmail.com.

The eight current GSC members will review applications and make a recommendation to the UCEA executive director and the senior associate director, who will ultimately select the three new GSC representatives. The appointment will be made by August 30, 2012, and all applicants will be notified via e-mail by this date.

Please contact Madeline Mavrogordato (madeline.mavrogordato@vanderbilt.edu) or Bradley Davis (bwdavis@austin.utexas.edu) with any questions. Thank you for your consideration of this call.

www.ucea.org/graduate-student-council-appli/
Deadline: July 15, 2012

The 26th Annual UCEA Convention
Denver, Colorado
November 15-18, 2012
For information, see p. 37-41

NEW for 2012:
UCEA Graduate Student Summit
November 14-15. The UCEA Graduate Student Summit will provide a space for graduate students to engage in authentic dialogue about their scholarly work. This summit will offer opportunities to meet and network with graduate students and faculty, to participate in presentations, and to potentially publish in an online journal.

www.ucea.org/ucea-gssummit/
The Clark Seminar is sponsored by the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA), Divisions A and L of the American Educational Research Association (AERA), and SAGE Publications. A special thank you to all the faculty and scholars who joined us at the 2012 David L. Clark Seminar, April 12-13, in Vancouver, BC.

This long-standing and well-respected seminar has been jointly sponsored by AERA Divisions A & L and UCEA for close to 20 years and this year celebrates the 28th anniversary as a research seminar. The seminar brings emerging educational administration and policy scholars and noted researchers together for 2 days of presentations, generative discussion, and professional growth. This seminar allows a select group of graduate students who are initiating their dissertation research the opportunity to interact with a distinguished group of scholars in order to receive valuable feedback on their dissertation research. It was a valuable time of exchange, networking, listening, and sharing. 40 scholars and 14 faculty members were brought together for 2 days of presentations, generative discussion, and professional growth.

Congratulations to the Clark scholars who attended this year’s seminar:

- Maysaa Barakat
- Michael Evans
- Demetricia Hodges
- Lucy Wakiaga
- Angela Urick
- Angela Scott
- Eva Ross
- Yi-Jung Wu
- Michael Thorson Jr.
- Jonna Beck
- Patricia Hanna
- Catharine Biddle
- Eryka Charley
- Theresa Nixon
- Diane Elizondo
- Matthew Linick
- Cara Jackson
- Nathaniel Malkus
- Lok-Sze Wong
- Carrie Sampson
- Patricia Simons
- Matthew Tossman
- Julie Zoellin Cramer
- Michael DeArmond
- Jason Salisbury
- Terrance Green
- Jessica Brown
- Michael Thorson Jr.
- Jonna Beck
- Patricia Hanna
- Catharine Biddle
- Eryka Charley
- Theresa Nixon
- Diane Elizondo
- Matthew Linick

The 2012 David L. Clark Faculty Participants included:

- Courtney Bell, ETS & University of Connecticut
- Dominic Brewer, University of Southern California
- Colleen Capper, University of Wisconsin-Madison
- Michael Dantley, Miami University of Ohio
- Erica Frankenberg, Penn State University
- Kathryn McKenzie, Texas A&M
- Joanne Marshall, Iowa State
- Joseph Murphy, Vanderbilt University
- Sara Nelson, Texas State University
- Yongmei Ni, University of Utah
- Donald Peurach, University of Michigan
- Cindy Reed, Auburn University
- Terah Venzant Chambers, Texas A&M
- Monica C. Byrne-Jimenez, Hofstra University
- Michelle Young, University of Virginia, UCEA
During the 2012 AERA annual meeting in Vancouver, UCEA and Division A of AERA hosted a workshop for members of the Barbara L. Jackson Scholars Program. Students and Mentors focused on grant writing, research agendas, and scholarly publication. UCEA thanks UCEA Associate Director Cristobal Rodriguez, the Jackson Scholars Advisory Board, and Jackson Scholars Mentors for their efforts.

**Students:**
- Sabrina Zamora, New Mexico State University
- W. Chris Lee, University of Texas-Austin
- Timothy Salazar, University of Utah
- Leah Dardis, University of Arizona
- Joshua Childs, University of Pittsburgh
- Danielle Tome, Vanderbilt University
- Ty Douglas, University of North Carolina-Greensboro
- Maritza Lozano, University of California-Los Angeles
- Chryssa Delgado, University of Texas-San Antonio
- Kimberley Stiemke, University of California-San Diego
- James Vines, Clemson University
- Cedelle Niles, University of Tennessee-Knoxville

**Faculty:**
- Colleen Larson, New York University
- Pamela Angelle, University of Tennessee
- Kent Seidel, University of Denver
- Fernando Valle, Texas Tech University
- Hanne Mawhinney, University of Maryland
- Ernestine Enomoto, University of Hawaii-Manoa
- Jim Scheurich, Texas A&M University
- Anthony Normore, California State-Dominguez Hills
- Jeff Brooks, Iowa State University
- Muhammad Khalifa, Michigan State University
- Mark Gooden, University of Texas-Austin
- Kristina A. Hesbol, Illinois State University

**At a Crossroads: The Educational Leadership Professoriate in the 21st Century**

by Donald G. Hackmann & Martha M. McCarthy

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

www.infoagepub.com/products/At-a-Crossroads
Call for Nominees

2013 Excellence in Educational Leadership Award

Deadline: March 1, 2013

The Award

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

The Procedure

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

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

http://www.ucea.org/the-excellence-in-educational/

Nominations due March 1, 2013

Questions? Call UCEA Headquarters at (434) 243-1041

Journal of Research on Leadership Education

UCEA wishes to thank the following outgoing members of the JRLE Editorial Board for their service to JRLE and the UCEA consortium:

- Adrianna Kezar – University of Southern California
- Donald Hackmann – University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
- Bradley Portin – University of Washington
- James Earl Davis – Temple University
- Elizabeth Murakami-Ramahlo – University of Texas at San Antonio
- Diana Riccardi – Clemson University

JRLE is an electronic peer-reviewed journal that focuses on articles from multiple epistemological perspectives. JRLE serves as an international venue for discourse on the teaching and learning of leadership across the many disciplines informing educational leadership. JRLE is edited by Gail Furman and Michele Acker-Hoevevar, Washington State University, and sponsored by the UCEA and SAGE Publications.

Sign up for e-mail alerts of new issues of your favorite journals at SAGE:
http://online.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts
The Excellence in Educational Leadership Award is for practicing school administrators who have made significant contributions to the improvement of administrator preparation. Each year, the UCEA Executive Committee invites member university faculties to select a distinguished school administrator who has an exemplary record of supporting school administrator preparation efforts. This is an unusual award in that it affords national recognition, but individual universities select the recipients. It provides a unique mechanism for UCEA universities to build good will and recognize the contributions of practitioners to the preparation of junior professionals.

Sally Alturki is distinguished by her commitment to the development of education in Saudi Arabia. She began her career as an international educator, teaching at various levels from primary school through university in Egypt, Hong Kong, Japan, and the U.S. In 1975, she founded an Early Childhood Center in Saudi Arabia, which serves as a laboratory for the preparation of preschool teachers. Initially its principal, Dr. Alturki is still actively involved in the preschool and has made major contributions to the development of culturally appropriate curricula and training materials. In 1977, her passion for improving education in her adopted country was extended, with the founding of the Dhahran Ahliyya Schools. The schools, which serve both boys and girls, have the mission of integrating Islamic beliefs with student development goals that emphasize personal and emotional growth and the capacity to participate actively in the global, modern world. Her dedication is made apparent through her engagement with the schools and her commitment to ensuring that they could become a model for educational reform in Saudi Arabia. Since receiving her doctorate from the University of Minnesota in 2000, she has continued to serve in the position of deputy president, which is roughly equivalent to a superintendent of a small district in the United States.

David E. Axner began his tenure as superintendent of Dublin City Schools August 1, 2007. Prior to this time, he served as assistant superintendent and superintendent of Chagrin Falls Exempted Village School District, in northern Ohio. He also served that district as a high school and middle school principal. His earlier years were spent with the Sandusky City Schools as a principal, assistant principal, athletic director, special education teacher, and coach. After receiving his superintendent certificate, he pursued his EdD from the University of Akron in 1997. He received both his BS in Education in 1978 and MS in Education in 1984 from the University of Akron. Dr. Axner has served as an adjunct professor for the University of Akron, Ashland University, and Ohio State University. His professional involvement includes the Ohio Schools Council, Buckeye Association of School Administrators, Ohio School Boards Association, American Association of School Administrators, Ohio Association of Local School Superintendents, Ohio School Leadership Institute, and Alliance for Adequate School Funding, as well as being a past member of the Ohio Educators Standards Board. Dr. Axner has formed several community groups designed to facilitate and enhance communication with the community. These include the Senior Citizens Council, Superintendent’s Teachers Advisory Committee, Superintendent’s Student Advisory Committee (made up of high school and middle school students), Dublin City Schools Today Television, and the Dublin City Schools Alumni Association, including a Hall of Fame, and most recently, a university partnership with Miami University of Ohio to prepare administrators in a district-based principal preparation program. Additional memberships include the Dublin Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors, the Dublin Education Foundation Board of Directors, Dublin Counseling Center Board of Directors, and the Dublin AM Rotary.

Vicki Balentine received her PhD in reading and educational leadership from the University of Arizona in 1986. She is currently in her 12th year as superintendent of the Amphitheater School District in Tucson, Arizona. She has been instrumental in securing funds for the district through a $180 million bond initiative to renovate aging facilities and a $29 million Teacher Incentive Fund Department of Education grant to implement a Pay for Performance Program at Title 1 sites. Dr. Balentine received the Arizona School Administrators Association’s All-Arizona Superintendent of the Year for large school districts for 2008. The governor twice appointed her to the Arizona State Board of Education. She has served two terms (2008 and 2010) as president of that statewide body. She also currently serves as an Executive Committee member and treasurer of the Arizona Business and Education Coalition.

Keith E. Ballard has served as superintendent of Tulsa Public Schools (TPS) since the fall of 2008. His more than 36 years of service in public education began in 1972 as a reading specialist. Working his way up the administrative ladder, Ballard was awarded his first assignment as superintendent in Oologah, OK, in 1986, where he served until 1992. He was then named superintendent of Claremore Public Schools until 2000 before taking the helm as executive director of the Oklahoma State School Boards Association. His commitment to education earned him the honor of NSBA’s Executive Educator 100 in 1988, Who’s Who Among Top Executives, and a member of Oklahoma’s Education Hall of Fame. Dr. Ballard has served as president of the United Suburban Schools Association and as president of the Oklahoma Association of School Administrators. Additionally, Dr. Ballard has also been active in shaping policy with the state legislature, meeting regularly with key legislators and serving on numerous task forces on education. Dr. Ballard was named COOSA District Administrator of the Year in 2010 and served as a 2011 Brock International Prize in Education Juror. Most recently, he was named the 2012 Tulsa of the Year. Dr. Ballard serves as professor on leave of Educational Leadership at the University of Oklahoma. He also serves on the state Superintendent’s Advisory Council and oversees a host of leadership preparation initiatives. Locally, he oversees and advises the redesign of the TPS Aspirant Leaders Academy, the TPS Teacher/Leader Effectiveness Initiative, as well as the Professional Development Leadership Academy at the University of Oklahoma. Internationally, Dr. Ballard worked with USAID and the government of the People’s Republic of Georgia to train its first school board members as it entered a new democracy.

Catherine Brown has been teaching in urban, public, secondary schools for nearly 20 years. She began her career in New York City, working with the New Visions Project for small schools.
Kelly K. Crook spent 10 years in corporate marketing and finance before returning to college to pursue teaching certification. Dr. Crook has been an educator for the past 17 years. She taught English and ESL for Grades 6-8 in Dallas ISD and Frisco ISD while working on her master's degree. Upon completion, she moved to Leander ISD as an assistant principal for Running Brushy Middle School. After acceptance into the University of Texas Cooperative Superintendency Program (CSP), Kelly joined the Accountability Evaluations team at the Texas Education Agency and conducted DEC visits for both special education and federal Title programs. Upon completion of her PhD, she joined Del Valle ISD to serve as director of accountability and instruction. Del Valle ISD serves over 11,000 students on 14 campuses. In 2005, she was appointed assistant superintendent of finance and business services. Kelly served 6 months as the interim superintendent while continuing to serve in her position as the assistant superintendent for finance and operations at Del Valle ISD. In December 2011, the Del Valle ISD Board of Trustees named Dr. Kelly K. Crook as its first female superintendent in district history. For the past several years, Dr. Crook has coordinated the Assessment Center for the CSP. Her ongoing contributions guide recommendations in the selection of each cohort of CSP doctoral students. Dr. Crook engages practicing superintendents, state-level leaders, university professors, and current CSP students in the selection process. Her efforts support the continuation of a rigorous selection process to identify equity-driven district-level leaders.

Richard D. Daubert has served the Tuscarora Intermediate Unit in a variety of capacities since 1984. He is currently the executive director, a position he has held since 2005. Prior to that time he has been the deputy executive director, director for management services, business manager, and special education fiscal assistant. As the executive director, he is the chief executive officer of the organization and is responsible for administering the Intermediate Unit's extensive program of services to school districts and their students. Among his duties are to execute contracts on behalf of the Board of Directors, recommend professional and nonprofessional staff for employment by the Board of Directors, supervise the preparation and implementation of the various program budgets of the Intermediate Unit, serve as the chairperson of the Superintendents' Advisory Council, provide leadership to the statewide programs operated by the Intermediate Unit, create and administer policy for the effective and efficient use of resources, represent the Intermediate Unit on various boards of directors associated with educational and community endeavors, and represent the Intermediate Unit as a member of PAIUnet.

Ed Diden is the Morgan County, Tennessee, director of schools. As director he began a Leadership Academy for his school administrators as well as implemented professional learning communities in all schools throughout the district. He has also served as the Cannon County, Tennessee, director of schools; a supervisor of K-12 instruction; a secondary school principal; and a high school teacher and coach. Dr. Diden has presented at several conferences including the LEAD Conference, the Appalachian Regional Meeting of the Rural School and Community Trust, and the AEL Academy for Leadership in Technology. Diden's research has been presented internationally at the University of Hull, England, and Bourgas Free University in Bulgaria. Dr. Diden has been the recipient of several awards including Morgan County, Tennessee, Administrator of the Year; the NASSP Excellence in Technology Award; the TSSAA Principal of the Year, Class A Division; and the University of Tennessee Field Award for Excellence in Secondary School Leadership. As a doctoral student at the University of Tennessee, Diden was selected as a David L. Clark National Graduate Research Seminar participant. In addition to his work as a director of schools, Dr. Diden co-teaches leadership preparation classes as a practitioner partner with the University of Tennessee.

David Dixon gained his EdD in Educational Leadership from Lincoln University in 2009, preceded by an MS in Education Management from Anglia Polytechnic University. His teacher education was through a BEd (Hons) at North Worcestershire College. All these qualifications were gained while also in full-time work as a teacher. His initial BEd was 3 years full time at Ilkley College of Education. His teaching career began in 1979 as a class teacher at two schools, before becoming a deputy principal in 1990, first specializing in early-years education but later expanding into all the elementary grades as his interests expanded. From
this, he progressed to the principalship at two schools since 2001. Both these primary schools (K-6) have extended facilities to serve the local community with schooling extending from breakfast to early evening and other agencies supporting families made available. His current school also has a special language unit in view of the numbers speaking English as an alternative language. One of his major interests is preparing the students for sustainability in a period of climate change by involving staff and pupils and by training other principals. He has piloted residential courses for school leaders, which has led to a new project called Connected Leaders. He also has emphasized the need for partnerships with communities, parents, businesses, and other organizations to give schools the support they need.

Samuel Fancera began his career as an educator by teaching as a substitute teacher in Woodbridge Township School District in New Jersey. After a short hiatus as both a sports trainer and assistant research physiologist, Dr. Fancera returned to Woodbridge to teach middle and high school science. Dr. Fancera went on to become the high school science department supervisor and later the principal of a K-5 school. Currently he works as a part-time lecturer at Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, where he teaches courses in educational administration. His professional experience in schools and as a district administrator enables him to pinpoint students’ learning needs and provided targeted learning experiences necessary to deepen their understanding of core educational challenges.

John M. Folks, superintendent of Northside ISD since 2002, heads one of the largest and fastest-growing school districts in Texas. A native of Oklahoma who earned his bachelor’s, master’s, and doctorate degrees from the University of Oklahoma, Dr. Folks began his teaching career in Port Arthur, Texas. He has been an educator for 41 years, and the Texas Association of School Boards named him the 2011 Texas Superintendent of the Year. He is the former superintendent of Spring ISD in Houston. He also has served as superintendent of the Midwest City-Del City Public Schools in suburban Oklahoma City and as Dean of the School of Education at Southwestern Oklahoma State University. As the Oklahoma state superintendent of public instruction, he was responsible for the development of policy and implementation of comprehensive plans for education from early childhood through high school. He also served on the Board of Regents for Oklahoma colleges and universities. A vocal advocate for public education, Dr. Folks is past president of the Texas Association of School Administrators and serves on the Executive and Legislative committees. He currently serves on the Steering Committee of the Fast Growth School Coalition, on the Board of Directors of the Texas Academic Decathlon, and the Texas Education Reform Foundation/Texas Education Reform Caucus. He has been president of the Texas School Alliance and the Association of Suburban/Mid-Urban Schools. He is active in the Greater San Antonio Chamber of Commerce and serves on two of its Public Affairs Council committees: the State and Federal Legislative Committee and the Education Committee. He is a member of the P16Plus Council of Greater Bexar County and serves on the Board of Directors of the Alamo Public Telecommunications Council.

Lorenzo Gonzales began his education career in 1973 as a science and reading classroom teacher in Cuba, New Mexico. His many accomplishments over nearly 40 years include becoming a Master Teacher for the Intel Accessing Computers in Education Project, serving as the site coordinator for the Regional Educational Technology Assistance Center, and experience as a teacher professional development specialist with Santa Fe Community College and Northern New Mexico College. For several years, he served on statewide and national teams that provided extensive pre-service and in-service professional development for teachers and schools leaders on the integration of technology into classrooms. Dr. Gonzales is currently a professional staff developer with the Northern New Mexico Math and Science Academy (MSA) at Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL). He assumed a key leadership role in the establishment of an EdD cohort in Educational Leadership at the University of New Mexico that is designed to help meet the leadership needs of primarily Hispanic and Native American serving schools and districts in Northern New Mexico. He is an essential member of a cross-agency team composed of representatives from the MSA at LANL, the Educational Leadership Program and Native American Studies at University of New Mexico, and the Northern and Southern Line Offices of the Bureau of Indian Education that is collaborating in the design of an innovative MA in educational leadership, Native American studies, and math and science education. Dr. Gonzales is a licensed New Mexico teacher with multiple certifications and holds state K-12 Administrative Licensure. He earned his PhD at New Mexico State University and is the recipient of numerous state and national awards, including the EEO & Diversity Best Practices Award for the MSA Program from the Secretary of Energy.

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

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

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

www.ucea.org/publications
**René Gutierrez** was born in Mexico, immigrating to the U.S. as a preteen. His doctoral dissertation (2008) is entitled, *Factors Contributing to the Academic Achievement of Mexican-Origin Immigrant High School Students*. His interest in this topic was generated by his own experiences as a non-English speaker in school. His family settled in McAllen, Texas where René attended public schools and graduated from McAllen High School. After high school, René attended Texas Southmost College at Brownsville where he received an associate degree in Applied Science and went on to receive a Bachelor in Business Administration from Texas Pan American University in Edinburg, Texas, in 1987. He completed a Master of Education degree in 1993 and a doctoral degree in Educational Leadership in 2006; both degrees were earned at The University of Texas-Pan American. Dr. Gutierrez holds Texas Educator Certificates for the superintendency, mid-management administration, counselor, and secondary mathematics. His work experiences include serving as assistant superintendent for administration and finance, director of federal programs, elementary school principal, migrant program coordinator, facilitator, counselor, and a high school math teacher. As an elementary school principal, Dr. Gutierrez led his school to be a Texas Education Agency Recognized and Exemplary campus 5 consecutive years. The school, Patricio Perez Elementary in La Joya ISD, was also honored during that time with Migrant Performance Award, Five Star School by Texas Monthly in both 2001 and 2002, and various other awards. In June 2009, Dr. Gutierrez was named superintendent of schools for Edinburg Consolidated ISD.

**Mark Hansen** was recently hired as the district administrator for the **School District of Elmbrook**. He most recently served as the chief academic officer for Pewaukee schools. Prior to his work in Pewaukee, he was the assistant superintendent for curriculum and instruction in the Waukesha School District. His has served as principal of Waukesha South High School, assistant principal of Waukesha North High School, assistant principal of Brown Deer High School, and assistant principal of Pewaukee Middle School. Currently, Hansen is pursuing his doctorate at Cardinal Stritch University, where he expects to complete his dissertation in May 2013. Hansen received his superintendent certification from Cardinal Stritch University in 2001. He earned a master's degree in educational leadership from Marian College in 1997 and a BS from the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater in 1993. Hansen serves as an adjunct professor at Cardinal Stritch and serves on the board of the Wisconsin Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

**James T. Jeffers** served as superintendent of the **Tallassee City School System** in Alabama for 16 years. Prior to becoming superintendent, Dr. Jeffers held positions as an elementary school principal, a staff associate for the Alabama Leadership in Education and Administration Development Academy, a headmaster, a teacher, and a coach. He was selected by the Alabama School Superintendents to receive training as a coach by Corporate Coach U and is well known for the excellent coaching and mentoring he provides to new administrators. Dr. Jeffers has served on the State Superintendent of Education Advisory Council and was selected to serve as director of the District IV School Superintendents of Alabama. He was elected to serve on the Board of Directors of the American Association of School Administrators and the Alabama Association of School Administrators. The National Organization on Legal Problems of Education presented Dr. Jeffers with the Outstanding Dissertation Award in recognition of his exemplary dissertation in Education Law, titled, *An Analysis of Selected Federal Court Decisions Regarding Special Education Administration: Public Policy and Principles*. He has won numerous awards for his dedicated efforts to education. Among them are the School Superintendents of Alabama Outstanding Legislative Session Service Award, the Alabama Music Education Association Outstanding Administrator Award, the District IV nomination as the Superintendent of the Year, and the University of Alabama-Birmingham Outstanding Alumni in Educational Leadership Award. Dr. Jeffers has been a consistent supporter of the training and development of educational leaders in the state and nation. His school system has excelled under his leadership, and he has established a statewide reputation for generously sharing his time and talent to help others to become excellent leaders.

**Nancy Kiltz**, a single parent, began her dream of going to college to become a teacher in 1980 while still working full time. She graduated from Kansas Wesleyan University in December 1983 cum laude and accepted a position as school secretary for 1 year, which taught her a tremendous amount about school systems in general. Her teaching experience totaled 7 years before she moved into administrative positions. During that time, she completed a master's degree in Educational Leadership at Kansas State University. She has intentionally experienced different administrative positions to learn more about educational systems and advancement. She spent 4 years in staff development leadership positions before starting on her doctorate at Kansas State University. While working on her doctorate, she accepted a position of elementary principal in Coffeyville, Kansas. Two years later, USD 305 Salina Schools asked her to return to her home district as assistant director of school improvement, which included staff development, Title I coordination, and accreditation. She completed her doctorate from Kansas State University in 1999. To broaden her horizons, she accepted the

---

**Grad Student Column Online**

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

www.ucea.org/graduate-student-column/

www.ucea.org/graduate-student-blog/
position of director of state and federal programs for the Palm Springs (CA) Unified School District (2001), with 23,000 students. In 2005, she accepted the position of associate professor at Bethany College and returned to Kansas, for 1 year in Lindsborg, before returning to USD 305 Salina Public Schools. She has continued with USD 305 since 2006, serving as director of at-risk programs (2006-2008), then executive director of administrative and student support services (2008-2011), and now as executive director of human resources (since 2011). During this time in Salina, she serves on the Planning Committees for two KSU/USD 305 Leadership Academies (STLA 1 & 2) as a way to build the leadership capacity for the district.

Howard Benjamin (Ben) Kiser has successfully served as superintendent of the Gloucester County Schools since 2003 and has been a school administrator since 1980. During his tenure as superintendent, he has served on an advisory committee that provided input as they restructured their graduate program in Educational Administration. His support in the form of internship opportunities, tuition reimbursement, and sites for local workshops to support school leaders enhances the development of practicing and aspiring administrators. Ben gives unselfishly of his time, serving as an interviewer in mock school-improvement reporting sessions, guest lecturer, and providing guidance to our graduates as they seek positions in various school districts. He currently serves as chair of the advisory committee to the School University Research Network and has been an active participant for over a decade. Ben provides invaluable service to the School of Education at the College of William and Mary.

Ranelle Lang grew up on a family farm in Nebraska with her four siblings. Her childhood was filled with 4-H, county fairs, and lots of chores. Along the way she learned lessons on hard work and personal responsibility that have echoed throughout her education career. She was the first in her family to graduate from college, earning a bachelor’s degree in special education from Kearney State College, Nebraska. She followed that up with two master’s degrees, one in educational psychology and another in educational administration. In 2000, she earned her doctorate in educational administration from Wichita State University. Dr. Lang has been a teacher and a counselor at schools of all levels, from preschool to college. She was also an assistant dean of the education college at the University of Colorado at Boulder. She’s been an instructional leader and administrator for school districts in Kansas and Colorado. She began at District 6 in 2005 as deputy superintendent and was appointed as superintendent in 2008. Constantly guiding her work for students are Dr. Lang’s educational principles: All students can achieve, and it’s the responsibility of the adults in the system to make sure this happens; schools exist for student learning; student success is measured by achievement; educators have a moral responsibility to help every student achieve; and high expectations lead to high performance.

Joseph P. Liberati was superintendent for the Southern Lehigh School District as well as chief executive officer for the district. He was appointed as superintendent in 2003, and under his leadership, the district excelled in academics, athletics, and extracurricular activities. Before that, he served as assistant superintendent (2001) and substitute superintendent (2002). He was an alumnus of both King’s College and the University of Scranton. Additionally, he held close affiliation with Lehigh University and was an active mentor and long-time member of the Lehigh University School Study Council. Early in his career, he became a certified reading specialist and worked for the next 12 years in Easton Middle School. He served as the Southern Lehigh Middle School assistant principal and as principal of Hopewell and Lower Milford Elementary Schools. Joseph also served as the director of special education and Assistant superintendent. For the past 10 years, he was the superintendent of schools. Joe served many years as a dedicated educator and was a true advocate for children. Liberati was with the school district 22 years. On November 8, Southern Lehigh school board accepted his resignation, and he was set to retire in March. On November 28, 2011, Joseph Liberati passed away. He started his career as a special education teacher and ended with sharing specialized education for all students, staff, peers, and community members. We will miss his presence.

Elizabeth Marrufo has served as the director of elementary instruction of Las Cruces Public Schools since 2008. She previously served as the administrator-in-charge of the district November 2006 through February 2007. She also served as an elementary principal for 13 years and as a teacher for 16 years. She holds a PhD in Educational Administration and Curriculum and Instruction, which she earned in 2009. Her dissertation was entitled A Case Study of a District Central Office in the Borderland: Roles, Structures, and Functions Relative to Impacting Student Achievement. Her advisor was Dr. Azadeh Osanloo. Dr. Marrufo has completed her Educational Specialist degree in Educational Administration; her thesis was entitled A Study of the Impact and Implementation of the Public School Reform Act upon the Hatch, Gadsden and Las Cruces School Districts. Dr. Marrufo holds a MA in Curriculum and Instruction and a BS in Elementary Education. Dr. Marrufo holds certification as a Level 111-B Administrator and is a member of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, the New Mexico Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, and the New Mexico Coalition of School Administrators. She has received awards for the YWCA REACH, signifying her as the Outstanding Woman Who Makes a Difference in the Las Cruces Community (K-12 Category); the New Mexico School Boards Association for Improving Instructional Performance; and the Las Cruces Chamber of Commerce Crystal Apple for Improving Instructional Performance. Her community involvement is extensive. Highlights include her membership on the New Mexico Public School Critical Capital Outlay Task Force, as well as on the Las Cruces Public School Administrators and Faculty Student Teaching Endowed Scholarship Committee for New Mexico State University, and as an Executive Board member of the Dona Ana Arts Council.

James P. McIntyre began his tenure as superintendent of the Knox County Schools in July 2008. In his 1st year as superintendent, Dr. McIntyre led the school system and the community through a process that produced a focused vision for the future of the Knox County Schools and a 5-year strategic plan designed to achieve Excellence for All Children. Prior to his appointment in Knoxville, Dr. McIntyre served as the chief operating officer for the Boston Public Schools, where he was responsible for the day-to-day operations of the district. Jim had also served as the budget director for 7 years. During Dr. McIntyre’s tenure, Boston Public Schools was named one of the top-performing urban school systems in the nation. As a teacher at Vincent Grey Alternative High School in East St. Louis, Illinois, early in his career, McIntyre...
taught English, anatomy, and physical education to a diverse group of at-risk students. In 2010, Governor Phil Bredesen invited Dr. McIntyre and three others to join him in presenting Tennessee’s Race to the Top proposal to the U.S. Department of Education. Tennessee was one of only two states in the country to be selected in the first round of this national competition and was awarded $501 million for school reform and improvement. As a parent of two Knox County Schools students, Dr. McIntyre is honored that the statewide Parent Teacher Association has named him the Tennessee Outstanding Superintendent of the Year for 3 consecutive years (2009-2011). Dr. McIntyre holds a BA in English from Boston College, a MS degree in Education Administration from Canisius College, a Master of Urban Affairs from Boston University, and a PhD in Public Policy from the University of Massachusetts.

Barbara Meloche is an instructor at Michigan State University in the Department of Educational Administration and the Department of Teacher Education. She is fortunate to teach face-to-face and online courses while serving as a research associate for projects related to mentoring beginning teachers in urban school districts. Her history includes teaching in elementary and middle schools as well as serving as a literacy consultant and then as an elementary school principal. Most recently she collaborated on curriculum for intensive mentoring in urban schools. She has been fortunate to help teacher leaders develop mentoring skills and strategies that go beyond buddy mentoring to intensive mentoring work related to the teaching of content. Simultaneously, she supports principal’s leading in schools with intensive mentoring projects. The compelling interest that drives her work is support for beginning teacher leaders and principals that results in professional success in two ways. The first goal is to recruit and retain the best and the brightest of our colleagues in schools where they are most needed by providing a rich support system of induction. The second goal is to find ways to support them through mentoring so their leadership qualities and skills directly affect increased student achievement. She and her husband save a portion of their energy during the week and spend it each Friday on their 1-year-old grandbaby twins, Owen and Olivia, who provide motivation to continue to help create the best school environments for all children.

Cameron Morton has been a student, practicing administrator, and colleague for more than a decade. He earned his EdD at the University at Buffalo. His dissertation, which focused on the effectiveness of school boards in New York State, earned him an EdD in Educational Administration in 2009. Prior, during, and subsequent to his academic studies, Dr. Morton has had a wealth of administrative experience in NY, including assistant superintendent for human resources and administration at Orchard Park (the position he currently holds), assistant superintendent for human resources and administration at Kenmore-Town of Tonawanda, and school business official for Cleveland Hill. Because of his depth of knowledge in these managerial areas, he has been invited frequently to guest lecture in school business and human resource courses and to supervise the clinical internships in the Leadership Initiative for Tomorrow’s Schools program, a program that leads to administrator certification, particularly for those students seeking the New York State School District Business Leadership Certificate. Subsequent to his completion of the doctorate, he was appointed adjunct clinical status and has taught several courses in School Finance and School Business Administration, all of which have received high marks from students on their course evaluations.

Lisa Nieuwenhuizen is currently the assistant principal at Rock Bridge High School in Columbia, Missouri. An advocate for children of poverty for over 20 years, Dr. Nieuwenhuizen has continuously worked for social justice in public education. Dr. Nieuwenhuizen chairs Rock Bridge’s multicultural committee, which works to expand teacher knowledge of equity and social justice. She serves as the mentor for secondary assistant principals in Columbia Public Schools. As part of this mentoring, she conducts monthly workshops on how to address challenging issues, including gangs and drugs, increasing social justice in assistant principal pedagogy, developing collegial support networks, improving instructional practices, and decreasing the achievement gap in her district. Dr. Nieuwenhuizen coauthored a successful A+ Program grant for Hickman High School in Columbia, Missouri, and began the tuition reimbursement program within Columbia Public Schools. This program provided the opportunity for students who might not have been financially able to attend college to do so. During her tenure in this position, she enrolled over 1,000 students in the program.

Jack Parish serves as the executive director of the Georgia Association of Educational Leaders (GAEL). GAEL is the umbrella organization for six affiliate organizations, which include the Georgia Association of Elementary, Middle, and Secondary Principals; Georgia Association of Curriculum and Instructional Supervisors; Georgia Council for Administrators of Special Education; and the Georgia School Superintendents Association. Dr. Parish began his work in education as a teacher at Riverdale High School in the Clayton County School District. After working at Riverdale High School for 7 years, Dr. Parish made the decision to continue his professional career in Henry County where he was educated. Dr. Parish spent 22 years in the Henry County School District serving the school system in the positions of assistant principal; principal; assistant personnel director; assistant superintendent for curriculum and instruction; and superintendent, a position he held for 8 years.
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Upon his retirement from the Henry County School District in June 2008, Dr. Parish immediately joined the faculty of the College of Education (COE) at the University of Georgia. As a faculty member in the Department of Lifelong Education, Administration & Policy, Dr. Parish has taught master’s and specialist degree courses and coordinated the supervised residency courses as part of the EdS and EdD performance-based programs in Educational Leadership. Dr. Parish has directed the GAEL/COE Early Career Principal Residency Program since its inception. Dr. Parish has been involved in state educational organizations for many years. He is a past president of the Georgia School Superintendents Association. He has also served as a member of the GAEL Board of Directors and the Georgia School Boards Association’s Superintendents’ Advisory Board. He currently serves on the board of directors for the Georgia Partnership for Excellence in Education and on the steering committee of the Georgia Educational Leadership Faculty Association.

**Garrick Peterson** is principal of Lakeridge Junior High School in Orem, Utah. Under his leadership, Lakeridge faculty came together as a professional learning community (PLC) to raise the school from one of the lowest performing schools in the state to a high-performing one. Garrick is an active speaker with the Solution Tree Network, drawing from this frontline experience to help teachers and administrators become high-functioning PLCs, with a specific focus on making the connection between assessment and intervention. In the past few years, over 50 schools from nine states have visited Lakeridge to experience how the faculty works collaboratively to improve student learning. Richard DuFour, Rebecca DuFour, Robert Eaker, and Gayle K-Warneck discussed the PLC efforts at Lakeridge in *Raising the Bar and Closing the Gap: Whatever it Takes*. Lakeridge was named the best among K-12 public and private schools in Utah in 2008 and 2009. For his leadership, the Utah Association of Secondary School Principals awarded him the 2010 Principal of the Year for middle-level schools. Garrick attended Brigham Young University, where he earned a bachelor’s degree in history teaching and a master’s degree in educational leadership; he recently completed his doctorate from the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. Garrick Peterson epitomizes the ideal instructional leader. He was able to turn around a large junior high school in just a few years. Lakeridge is now a thriving PLC focused on student learning. Dr. Smith also serves on the boards of the following organizations: Pennsylvania Association of School Administrators, Board President of the Dauphin County Mental Health/Intellectual Disabilities Advisory Committee, Dauphin County Children’s MH/ID Committee, Penn State Educational Outreach Advisory Committee, Lower Dauphin Falcon Foundation, and Lower Dauphin Communities that Care Foundation. In collaboration with the Pennsylvania Department of Education and PASA, she assisted in the development of a course for superintendents, Leadership for Teaching, and travels the state to present two components of this course, on Global Perspectives and the Role of the Administrator.
in Educational Change. She has also taught several graduate courses over the past 3 years for up-and-coming administrators at both Wilkes University and Shippensburg University. An important aspect of her life is family: her daughter, Allison, currently a student at Juniata College; son, Zach, senior at Lower Dauphin; and husband, Don.

Tai Hay-Lap is a graduate of the Chinese University of Hong Kong. He served as a teacher in secondary school and was appointed as a school principal at the age of 33. Mr. Tai has played a central role in local educational reforms. Serving as a member of the Education Committee, he has masterminded the direction for the education reforms in Hong Kong. The Educational Reform Blueprint, “Lifelong Learning,” released by the Hong Kong government in 2000 was much attributed to his contributions. Mr. Tai has also served a number of advisory policy committees in Hong Kong, including the University Grant Committee and the Basic Law Promotion Steering Committee. He has also contributed significantly to leadership development. Since the introduction of the Principalship Certification Programme in Hong Kong by the Education Bureau in 2003, Mr. Tai has taken an active role in the design and delivery of the programme. It is estimated that over 1,000 aspiring school principals have benefited from Mr. Tai’s teaching and mentoring. His enthusiasm and commitment has not only helped chart the direction for leadership development in Hong Kong but also inspired many principals to join for the benefit of the local educational community. In additional to his contributions to the educational community, Mr. Tai has successfully practiced what he preaches in his school. Under his leadership, his school has ranked top among Hong Kong high-performing schools in terms of student academics. More importantly, his school is well known for nurturing the best principal candidates. Many school principals in Hong Kong have worked in his schools prior taking a leadership role.

Tim Taylor is the superintendent of Ames Community School District in Ames, Iowa. He has over 40 years of educational experience in Iowa, beginning as a social studies teacher and varsity basketball and baseball coach in Janesville, where he began an innovative social studies curriculum in Street Law and Contemporary Affairs. He also served as the director of Driver and Safety Education in Winterset before beginning a doctoral program at Iowa State University. During his time at Iowa State University, he served as a consultant with various schools and projects, such as working with Marshalltown on a needs assessment and with West Des Moines on job-performance targets. He researched whole-grade sharing and school climate and authored the Iowa Department of Education Employee Handbook. Dr. Taylor also worked with the Iowa Department of Education as an Educational Program Consultant, which included developing statewide, strategic planning processes; planning and coordinating statewide efforts for recruiting women and people of color to educational leadership positions; and planning and delivering professional development. Dr. Taylor came to Ames in 1992 as the deputy superintendent of Ames CSD, where he served for 18 years working in human resources. His responsibilities included coordinating and supervising staff selection and evaluation and facilitating collective bargaining procedures. He also supervised the district’s technology program, facilities planning, and leadership of the elementary school buildings. In 2010 he was appointed as superintendent, where he serves as an instructional leader and administrator across the district.

James J. Tolle graduated from St. John's College in 1959 with a Bachelor of Science. He earned his MS in Secondary Education from Hofstra in 1963 and a Doctor of Education from St. John's in 1975. In 1959, Dr. Tolle commenced his 20-year commitment to the Uniondale School District in Nassau County. His service to Uniondale School District included teacher of science, high school assistant principal and principal, and assistant superintendent for curriculum and instruction. In 1979 he was appointed Superintendent of the Malverne Public Schools. He held this position until his retirement in 1993. During his superintendentcy, he served as president of the Nassau County Council of School Superintendents 1987-1988 and was an adjunct associate professor of Educational Administration at St. John's. After his official retirement, Dr. Tolle continued to serve in a wide variety of leadership positions. He was the executive director of Reform Educational Financing Inequities Today, a consortium of high-tax/low-wealth districts on Long Island, from 1992 to 1999. Dr. Tolle currently serves as the executive director of the Nassau County Council of School Superintendents. In this role, he provides the administrative support for the professional organization, which includes the 57 superintendents in Nassau County. Dr. Tolle’s leadership experiences also included serving as president of the New York State Public High School Athletic Association 1994-1996. Working as a member of administrative leadership search teams, Dr. Tolle has assisted over 40 boards of education in their efforts to recruit, screen, and appoint new superintendents, principals, and central office administrators. Dr. Tolle was designated Educator of the Year in 1984 by the St. John’s Chapter of Phi Delta Kappa and was honored with the St. John’s Leaders in Education Award in 2006.

Thomas Tramaglini has served in a variety of roles in his career as an educator. He taught history and worked as the football coach at Monroe Township High School in New Jersey. Later, he went on to serve as the director of curriculum and instruction in the Freehold Borough Public School District. He presently serves as the director of curriculum and instruction in the Keansburg Township School District. He is a frequent part-time lecturer at Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, where he teaches courses related to education administration to graduate students.

Benjamin Villarruel has worked in public education for the past 26 years in a number of school districts in Wisconsin, including 15 years as a superintendent, 4.5 years as school business manager and 2.5 years as an assistant principal. For the past 10 years, he has been employed as the superintendent of the Unified School District of De Pere, which has an enrollment of approximately 3,900 students. He has served on the Northeast Wisconsin Technical College Board as a Trustee for the past 6 years. He also served on the Board of Trustees for Northland College in Ashland, WI, 2000-2003. In 1996, he received his doctorate degree from the University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee under the guidance of Gail Schneider and James Gibulka. Since 1997, he has taught public education finance courses at the University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee in the Administrative Leadership Department for graduate students.
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UCEA Headquarters
405 Emmett Street, Charlottesville, VA 22904
Ph. 434.243.1041  Fax 434.924.1384
Call for Volunteers: Session Chairs and Discussants

"Volunteerism is the voice of the people put into action. These actions shape and mold the present into a future of which we can all be proud." - J.F. Kennedy

What is the value of volunteering? Volunteering is about giving, contributing, and helping other individuals and the community at large. It is working with others to make a meaningful contribution to a better community. The UCEA community needs volunteers for our 2012 Convention.

The quality of the UCEA Annual Convention depends on education researchers with appropriate expertise who serve as reviewers, chairs, and discussants for proposal review and paper sessions. Researchers are encouraged to volunteer and, when doing so, to provide sufficient information on their backgrounds and expertise to enable program chairs to create sessions with persons appropriate to serve in these roles.

The 2012 Call for Volunteers is open and can be accessed on the UCEA proposal website http://convention2.allacademic.com/one/ucea/ucea12/; to volunteer, log in with an existing account or create a new one. Once you have logged in from the main menu go to "Call for Volunteers" and complete the required fields. You can volunteer for various roles even without submitting a proposal of any kind.

Persons interested in serving are encouraged to volunteer early. The portal for volunteers will remain open until May 15 for Reviewers and September 15, 2012 for chairs and discussants.

In volunteering, please keep in mind that the 2012 Annual Convention will be held from Thursday, November 15, through Sunday, November 18, in Denver, Colorado. Also please review the roles and responsibilities of chairs and discussants, as set forth on the UCEA Convention 2012 page. Serving as a chair or discussant is an important and substantive role. The quality of sessions is enhanced by the participation of persons with appropriate backgrounds and facilitative skills. Thank you for supporting this effort and being a part of our 2012 annual convention.

"Not everything that counts can be counted. And not everything that can be counted, counts." - Albert Einstein

Special Thanks to UCEA Convention Sponsors:

Stewart Foundation
University of Denver
Texas A&M University
The Wallace Foundation
Information Age Publishing
Pennsylvania State University
Emerald Group Publishing, Ltd.
Brock International Prize in Education
UCEA 2012 KEYNOTE SPEAKERS
November 15-18, 2012    Denver, Colorado

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

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

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

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

JOHN H. JACKSON – Jackson Scholars Workshop & Evening
John H. Jackson became President and CEO of the Schott Foundation for Public Education in 2007. In this role, Dr. Jackson leads the foundation’s efforts to ensure a high-quality public education for all students regardless of race or gender. Dr. Jackson joined the Schott Foundation after 7 productive years in leadership positions at the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). Dr. Jackson served on the Obama-Biden transition team as a member of the President’s 13-member Education Policy Transition Work Group.
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REGISTER TODAY:
http://www.regonline.com/ucea2012convention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registrant</th>
<th>Early Bird (until Aug. 15)</th>
<th>Regular</th>
<th>Late (beg. Oct. 15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UCEA Faculty</td>
<td>$ 185</td>
<td>$ 210</td>
<td>$ 225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-UCEA Faculty</td>
<td>$ 200</td>
<td>$ 225</td>
<td>$ 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCEA Graduate Student</td>
<td>$ 75</td>
<td>$ 90</td>
<td>$ 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-UCEA Graduate Student</td>
<td>$ 90</td>
<td>$ 105</td>
<td>$ 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practitioner</td>
<td>$ 195</td>
<td>$ 195</td>
<td>$ 195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$ 210</td>
<td>$ 210</td>
<td>$ 210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Summit*</td>
<td>$ 30</td>
<td>$ 30</td>
<td>$ 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In addition to applicable Graduate Student registration rate listed above

It is the policy of UCEA that all persons in attendance at the 2012 UCEA Annual Convention and Exhibition, including participants who plan to attend one or more sessions, are required to register. Registration is not transferable. Rates increase after August 15th at 5:00 p.m. EST. Early bird registration provides several advantages: a discount on registration fees, hotel accommodations at special guaranteed group rates, and no delay or inconvenience on site.

**International Scholars**

In keeping with UCEA’s longstanding tradition of an international focus and collaboration with aligned organizations worldwide, we welcome international attendees to the 2012 Annual Convention. If you require a letter of invitation to travel to the UCEA Convention, please e-mail your request to rmd6b@virginia.edu

**NEW for 2012: UCEA Graduate Student Summit**

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

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

Denver Marriott City Center
1701 California Street
Denver, Colorado 80202


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

  Single/Double: $ 165.00
  Double:            $ 165.00

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

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

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

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

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

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

The 26th Annual UCEA Convention
City Center Marriott in Denver, Colorado
November 15-18, 2012
Call for 5-Minute Video Submissions

General Information
The 2012 UCEA Convention will include an opportunity for submissions of 5-minute videos that explore broadly the landscape of quality leadership preparation, including our research and engaged scholarship, our preparation program designs and improvement efforts, our policy work, and the practice of educational leaders. Video submissions may relate to the conference theme or share educational leadership program features, innovations, and impacts such as:

- strong vision,
- active learning, and
- integrative internship.

Selected videos will be posted on the UCEA website and featured prior to the general sessions at the 2012 UCEA Convention in Denver, Colorado, November 15-18, 2012.

Video Submission Guidelines

- Video running time: 5 minutes or less
- Deadline for video submissions: July 31, 2012
- Video quality: Filmmakers are encouraged to create the videos using High-Definition (HD) video (higher resolution than Standard-Definition or SD video).
- Audio quality: Filmmakers are recommended to use a high-quality microphone to capture sound, such as a lapel or lavaliere microphone for individual speakers or a boom microphone to record group interviews or classroom instruction.
- Rights & clearances: Filmmakers must secure all rights, licenses, clearances, and releases necessary for participants, music, and locations for conference exhibition and web streaming.
- Format: Videos must be submitted on a DVD formatted in MPEG video Region 1/North America. Each DVD must be accompanied by a completed and signed Submission Form. Mail DVD and Submission Form to:
  
  Jennifer Friend, Ph.D.
  Educational Leadership, Policy and Foundations
  University of Missouri
  328 Education Building
  5100 Rockhill Road
  Kansas City, MO 64110

Filmmakers will be notified of the videos selected for the 2012 UCEA Convention by September 1, 2012. Video submission materials will NOT be returned.

Note: In order to create a video with high production value (professional filming, clear audio, editing, and postproduction), we suggest partnering with the film studies program at your institution or with students in specialized high school film production programs.

Judging Criteria
Videos will be judged by an independent panel of reviewers using a 5-point scale (1 = not acceptable, 2 = below average, 3 = average, 4 = above average, 5 = exemplary) for each of five areas:

- connection to conference theme, The Future Is Ours: Leadership Matters;
- representation of educational leadership program features, innovations, or impacts;
- video production quality (video—camerawork, lighting; audio—clarity, consistency of audio levels, music);
- postproduction (editing, transitions, graphic design, pacing); and
- insights into leadership preparation (potential impact on viewers and the field).

Video reviews will occur August 1–15, 2012, via a secure website for online video sharing.

Contact Information
Jennifer Friend, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Program Coordinator, pK-12 Educational Administration
Educational Leadership, Policy and Foundations
University of Missouri-Kansas City
Phone 816-235-2550
E-mail friendji@umkc.edu

Submission deadline: July 31, 2012
See next page for Submission Form
UCEA Convention 2012 - Video Submission Form

Video Title: _________________________________________________________________________________

Video Running Time (must be 5 minutes or less): __________________________

Contact Person: ______________________________________________________________________________

Email: _____________________________________________  Phone: _________________________________

Institutional Affiliation: ________________________________________________________________________

Name of Educational Administration Preparatory Program Featured in Video: ______________________________

_____________________________________________________

Video Producer(s): ____________________________________________________________________________

Video Director: ________________________________________________________________________________

Brief Synopsis of Video: _________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________________________

Mail completed submission form and DVD by July 31, 2012 to:

Jennifer Friend, Ph.D.
Associate Professor, ELPF
University of Missouri
328 Education Building
5100 Rockhill Road
Kansas City, MO 64110

• Rights & Clearances – Filmmakers must secure all rights, licenses, clearances and releases necessary for participants, music, and locations for conference exhibition and web streaming.

• Videos must be submitted on a DVD formatted in MPEG video Region 1/North America.

• Filmmakers will be notified of the videos selected for the 2012 UCEA Convention by September 1, 2012. Video submission materials will NOT be returned.

• Selected videos will be posted on the UCEA website and featured prior to the general sessions at the 2012 UCEA Convention in Denver, Colorado.
Contributing to the UCEA Review

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

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

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

Interview Editor:
Lisa Bass (University of Oklahoma)
dr.bass@ou.edu

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

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

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

2012 Calendar

June 2012
UCEA Convention registration opens, early-bird rates, June 5
NPBEA meeting, Washington, DC, June 7
Convention Planners meeting, June 10-14
Special Education Law Symposium, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA, June 24-29

July 2012
Graduate Student Council application deadline, July 15
BELMAS Conference, Manchester, England, July 20-23
Film submissions to UCEA Convention due, July 31

August 2012
UCEA FIPSE module development meeting, Charlottesville, VA, Aug. 6-8
Dean’s PSR Designation Forms due, Aug. 15
UCEA Convention early-bird registration cut-off (regular price begins), Aug. 15

September 2012
Volunteer deadline for convention chairs, discussants, Sept. 15

October 2012
UCEA Convention regular registration cut-off, late registration begins, Oct. 15

November 2012
Clark Seminar nominations due Nov. 1
NPBEA meeting, Nov. 3
2012 UCEA Graduate Student Summit, Denver, CO, Nov. 14-15
2012 UCEA Convention, Denver, CO, Nov. 15-18