



Volume XL Number 1

Review

The University Council for Educational Administration

Located on the campus of the University of Missouri at Columbia

Winter 1999

Resource and Pupil Performance Implications of Increased High School Graduation Requirements

*David H. Monk
Cornell University*



I write to share the results of some research that bears on an important topic in the contemporary debate about the future of public education. My focus is on efforts being made to raise system standards and pupil performance within public schools. This is hardly a new area of interest for policy makers, but the level of ambition that can be found among the 50 states today is perhaps without precedent. New York State provides an example of one of the more ambitious state-based efforts to raise standards and pupil performance, and New York State's experience with this reform initiative is the subject of my reflections on the uses of empirical research for policy making.

New York provides an interesting setting for this kind of inquiry given its practice of offering State created achievement examinations primarily for college-bound students in specific areas of the secondary curriculum. The Board of Regents in New York has long made these tests available to districts within the State, and students passing the exams have been entitled to a Regents endorsement of their high school diploma. For years these Regents diplomas existed in tandem with so-called "local" high school diplomas which have not required passing grades on any the Regents achievement exams.

This long standing practice is coming to an end. Beginning with the class of 2003 (entering freshmen in September 1999), high school graduation will become contingent upon passing five Regents achievement examinations (mathematics, English, science, global studies, and U.S. history). These increased graduation requirements are an important part of the Regents' effort to raise performance standards throughout the public schools of the State. The bottom line result is that high school graduation in New York State will require

passing a battery of examinations historically taken only by the college-bound population of New York State high school students.

The Regents have begun to implement this reform and invited a group of researchers to participate in a symposium with the title: *Educational Finance to Support High Learning Standards*. I was a member of the panel that was convened, and along with the help of Samid Hussain, an advanced graduate student in educational administration at Cornell, contributed a paper that was focused around the costs and consequences of these increased high school graduation requirements. Hussain and I took advantage of the fact that between 1992 and 1996 some districts have been moving on their own initiative to increase the percentage of students taking the Regents examinations. The experiences of these districts were of great interest to us since we believe that they offer insight into what other districts can expect when they are required to move in this direction. We took advantage of statewide data to estimate models of the effects of increases in Regents exam participation rates on pupil performance as well as on district spending and resource allocation. We also took advantage of a set of case studies that were conducted as part of this study.

I report below a brief summary of the findings from our statewide analyses. Readers interested in greater detail including the results of the case studies should obtain the Regents publication of the symposium. A more technical version of the study will also be published in a forthcoming issue of the *Economics of Education Review*. I conclude with some observations about the implications of these findings for public policy.

MONK continued on p. 2

MONK *continued from p. 1*

Results

During the 1992-1993 school year, on average 65 percent of students enrolled in grades 9-12 in New York State high schools participated in the Regents achievement exam testing program. By 1996-1997, this figure had increased to close to 76 percent, better than a ten percentage point gain.

We also found quite a large amount of variation surrounding both of these mean percentages. In fact, we found that while on average the districts increased their levels of student participation, no fewer than 107 districts registered decreases in participation rates over the period. We became interested in seeing if we could find patterns explaining why a district increased its participation a lot, a little, or not at all, and estimated a series of regression models that were designed to identify correlates of changes in the percentage of participating students during the period. We were struck by how unsystematic the change in participation variable turned out to be. The districts with large increases in participation included small as well as large districts, property rich as well as property poor districts, and high spending as well as low spending districts. The only variable that had explanatory power was our measure of the incidence of poverty which was based on the free and reduced

price lunch count. We found that higher levels of poverty were associated with lower participation rates at the outset of the period as well as with smaller increases in participation during the period.

We were also interested in the effects of increases in participation rates on pupil performance. We examined two indicators of the impact on pupils: changes in the percentage of test takers who passed the exams and changes in drop-out rates. For the State as a whole, the average passing rate increased by 2.76 points between 1992 and 1996. However, we also found that the percentage passing was smaller in the districts that increased their participation the most. In particular we found that among districts that increased participation by better than 25 percentage points, the passing rate went down by 3.6 points. Thus, we found evidence of a negative relationship between increases in participation and the percentage of test takers who passed the exam.

The negative direction of this relationship is not surprising. Increases in participation percentages are likely to occasion the arrival of students with greater learning difficulties into the testing program. These students historically have been working toward "local" rather than the more demanding Regents high school diplomas. What is of more interest is the modest strength of the negative relationship. It is worth stressing the fact that for the state as a whole the passing rate went up by better than two percentage points in the face of more than a 10 percentage point increase in the participation rate.

We also examined the relationship between changes in Regents exam participation rates and drop-out rates. We found no relationship between these two variables. Districts with very different levels of change in their Regents exam participation rates reported similar drop-out rates over the period we studied.

Finally, we were interested in learning what we could about the effects on cost of increases in Regents exam participation. We reasoned that district responses might include reducing class size (hiring more teachers), increasing the amount of time classes met, providing extra help in various ways as they moved students into the curriculum as-

sociated with the Regents achievement exams. We found that on average districts in the State increased their spending by \$1,240 between 1992 and 1996. We also found that this magnitude was remarkably similar among districts regardless of how much they increased their participation rates. In other words, we found no tendency for increases in Regents participation to be associated with higher increases in spending over the period. This is a remarkable finding that is quite different from what we were expecting to find.

We also took advantage of statewide staffing data to see if we could discern relationships between participation rate changes and the distribution of staff across assignments. Here we did find relationships. In particular, we found that larger increases in Regents exam participation rates were associated with increased numbers of professional staff per pupil. In particular, we found that for the state as a whole the average professional staffing level increased by 2.26 personnel per 1,000 pupils, and that this increase was largest in those districts with the largest increases in their Regents exam participation rates. We also found evidence of shifts in resources away from "remedial" courses in the academic area of the curriculum and toward more "regular" and advanced versions of these courses. We reached the conclusion that districts increased their Regents participation rates not by increasing their spending but by reallocating existing levels of resources.

Implications for Policy

Between 1992 and 1996, districts that moved increased numbers of their students into the Regents achievement exam testing program (and by extension into a high school curriculum that leads to a Regents rather than a "local" diploma) enjoyed a noteworthy degree of success. While there was some evidence of decline in the percentage of students passing the exams, the magnitude of the decline was modest and there was no evidence of increases in drop out rates. Moreover, the districts appeared to be accomplishing these results largely by reallocating existing resources rather than spending at higher levels. We were also struck by how many different types of districts succeeded at increasing their participation rates (small, large, property

MONK *continued on p. 5*

In This Issue . . .

FEATURE ARTICLE

David H. Monk.....1

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

Paula A. Cordeiro.....3

MITSTIFER LECTURE

Robert J. Sternberg.....4

CULBERTSON AWARD

C. Cryss Brunner.....6

CAMPBELL AWARD

Norman J. Boyan.....8

UCEA DIRECTOR

SEARCH BEGINS.....9

CONVENTION '99

Theme.....14

Call for Proposals15

A Balcony View: UCEA Membership and the Preparation of Educational Leaders Presidential Address, 1998

Paula A. Cordeiro
University of San Diego



Thank you President Pounder, members of the Executive Committee and Patrick for inviting me to be here today. As it states on the Plenum agenda I am now working at an institution that is not a member of UCEA so I resigned from the Presidency in July. Diana and the EC were kind enough to invite me here today and I am most appreciative because this organization has been important to me and I will always feel extremely fortunate to have worked in a UCEA member institution.

There's one other thing I would like to say before I begin. If you do not like my comments and you do not clap at the conclusion I will not take it personally. I greatly value this community in which I have been an active member, but I would like us to consider what parts of UCEA we need to take forward with us, and what we need to leave behind in the 20th century.

I will begin with a balcony view and then consider an analogy with this organization and the New York Stock Exchange. I know educators loathe comparing themselves to the world of business, but bear with me. Then, I will discuss administrator preparation programs and how we must alter them, gradually, but radically.

Ron Heifetz in his 1994 book *Leadership without Easy Answers* talks about the importance of having both a balcony and ballroom view. When you are on the ballroom floor dancing, you are moving quickly with the music sweeping you along. It is difficult to step back and see the patterns. One way to do that is to get to the balcony. But, in order to get to the balcony you have to ask the right questions. Since I have entered a non-UCEA institution and since I am wondering if we should consider applying for UCEA membership, I believe I have a balcony view. So, let's step back. First, a view from the balcony; later we'll take the

ballroom floor view.

View from the Balcony

I was recently asked to review the promotion papers of a professor who is a member of a UCEA institution. Under the category of service to professional organizations, UCEA was listed first. Among other things, the faculty member wrote "...The UCEA began and continues as an elite consortium of research universities..." Indeed, this is true. We are, and we continue to be, an elite consortium.

Elitism was not always on the agenda of the UCEA Plenum. In his fall 1989 address to the Plenum, then UCEA President Bob Stout discussed the issue of membership. You'll recall that I brought this same issue to you last year, but failed to convince you of the importance of changing our criteria. President Stout stated, "As we give serious thought to our membership criteria, I would want us to remember that UCEA was not intended to be an exclusive club. In 1980 the plenary session had what I take to be heated debates about membership criteria. The three proposed were:

1. that the institution have an identified program in educational administration.
2. that the institution express a commitment to the improvement of training programs in educational administration.
3. that the institution be willing to pay the organizational dues."

President Stout further stated, "...I hope that our debate will be guided by our heritage as a self-help organization concerned with the preparation of professionals. I hope that we do not rely overmuch on such easy criteria as "research output" or whether or not the institution awards the doctorate. (UCEA Review, 1990, p. 5) Well, the plenum dashed President Stout's hopes, because not only did research output enter the language of the sabbatical review process, but the doctorate—and not just any

doctorate—but one from a Research I or II or Doctoral I institution became a requirement.

Jack Culbertson in his historical overview of UCEA *Building Bridges: UCEA's First Two Decades* (1995), describes several barriers faced in effecting change within the organization. "Professors believed that "elite" UCEA universities generated the most research, had the most knowledge, and trained the most outstanding school leaders" (p. 319). He went further and wrote that resistance to change was "Implicit in questions professors sometimes posed as, for example: "Having achieved our current status after decades of effort, why should we opt for other alternatives?" (p. 319).

And now let me quote one more past president of UCEA. In his 1990 address to the plenum, President Jay D. Scribner cited Isaiah Berlin's wonderful essay *The Hedgehog and the Fox*. "The fox knows many things and the hedgehog knows one big thing." Scribner maintained that, "if we look at individuals among UCEA's membership we are likely to see the fox, but if we look carefully at what our collective membership has accomplished over the past few decades, I believe we are more likely to see the hedgehog. We indeed believe in our exclusivity, our commitment to a unitary vision of what is essential to a rigorous leadership development program.... However, by concentrating on one big thing, we have tended to look inward, to engage in convergent thinking about what ought to be—to think like the hedgehog" (Scribner, 1991, p. 4).

An Analogy: NASDAQ and the New York Stock Exchange

As we stand on the balcony, let's consider an analogy. There are numerous analogies outside of the world of education that reflect what our orga-

CORDEIRO continued on p. 7

What School Administrators Need to Know About Human Intelligence



Robert J. Sternberg
Yale University
1998 Penn State/UCEA
Mitstifer Lecture

Try this simple test question: Make a list of the attributes you believe a school administrator needs to succeed on the job. Now make a list of the attributes a school administrator needs to succeed in a conventional introductory course on school administration. What is the amount of overlap between the two lists? What would be the amount of overlap for ANY job?

During what is rapidly approaching a quarter of a century, I have been concerned with the difference between the attributes that lead to job success and the attributes that lead to success in schools as they are traditionally structured. If it were to turn out that there is a substantial difference, our society and others like it would be in trouble. Why? Because (a) they would be wasting the talents of those who have the ability to succeed but are not given the chance and (b) they would be valuing talents that do not necessarily lead to success in life. And at some level we all know that many of the most successful administrators (or contributors to other fields) are not IQ kings (or queens) and that many people who are IQ kings (or queens) make terrible administrators. Their main accomplishment seems to be success in taking tests.

We exist with the paradox that we know that high test scores—whether on statewide mastery tests or college admissions tests or admissions tests for graduate schools of education—are not terribly predictive of success in the world and yet we act as though they are. Of course, one might say that these are only intuitions. But the data confirm the intuitions. Alexandra Wigdor and Wendell Garner formed a committee at the request of the National Academy of Sciences. The conclusion of this committee was that conventional tests of abilities account for only about 10% of the individual-differences variation in who succeeds in life and who does not. Hank Levin came to the same conclusion in analyzing test scores and economic productivity. And even Richard Herrnstein and Charles Murray, vigorous proponents of conventional tests in their book, *The Bell Curve*,

came to just the same conclusion. In a study I did with Wendy Williams at Yale, we found that the Graduate Record Examination did little more than predict first-year grades.

It is not surprising that conventional notions and tests of intelligence work primarily in the conventional classroom. These notions had their origins at the beginning of the twentieth century, when Alfred Binet was asked by the Minister for Public Instruction in France to devise a test that would predict performance in school, and in particular, would separate out children who were mentally retarded from those who were behavior problems. The test was designed to predict academic performance—nothing more. The tests predict about 25% of the variation among students in academic performance, which is good but certainly is not great. And they predict even less of the variation among people in various measures of life success.

So isn't it time to act on what we already know—that conventional tests predict primarily academic performance? I think it is. To this end, I have been interested in replacing conventional notions and tests of academic intelligence with notions and tests based on a theory of successful intelligence. Successful intelligence is the ability to achieve success in life, based on one's own goals, given one's sociocultural context. In other words, success differs for each individual. But it has to be within some kind of sociocultural context because intelligence has no meaning outside such a context. It is achieved by an individual's figuring out his or her strengths and weaknesses and then finding ways to make the most of the strengths to correct or compensate for the weaknesses. No one is good at everything, really. Rather, people who succeed figure out what where their talents lie, and make the most of them. At the

same time, they figure out what they don't do well, and find ways around these weaknesses. These individuals then figure out how to adapt to environments (change themselves to fit their environments), shape environments (change the environments to fit them), and select environments (leave environments in which they just cannot or do not want to succeed). They do so by a combination of analytical, creative, and practical abilities. The reason that conventional tests are limited is that they measure only analytical abilities, and even those abilities are measured only in a limited way.

We are not content just to be arm-chair speculators, or to propose theories that are never seriously tested but whose support relies solely on "testimonials." Thus we have designed careful empirical tests of our theories.

In order to verify our claims, my colleagues and I developed a test that measures analytical, creative, and practical abilities. We have one version for upper elementary school students and another version for high school students. The test measures analytical, creative, and practical abilities via both multiple-choice and essay questions. We have found that analytical, creative, and practical scores are relatively independent. In other words, conventional tests of analytical abilities are pretty much useless in predicting students' creative and practical potentials. Should we be surprised? Is there any reason to expect a conventional test to tell us who will be creative and who won't be? Or who has common sense and who does not?

We also devised a summer program at Yale for high school students who were identified as high in analytical, creative, or practical abilities, or high in all three or low in all three.

We then either taught students in a

continued ➤

way that primarily matched their pattern of strength or primarily mismatched their pattern of strength. We discovered that students who were better matched to their pattern of strength outperformed students who were largely mismatched. In other words, if creatively and practically oriented students are taught at least some of the time in a way that fits them, their achievement improves. We also found—incidentally—that whereas high analyticals tend to be primarily white and middle to upper middle class, high creatives and high practicals tend to be much more diverse racially and socioeconomically.

In a follow-up study, we used a much simpler design. We taught third-graders and eighth-graders of a wide range of socioeconomic classes either primarily for memory, or primarily for critical thinking, or for analytical, creative, and practical thinking. They were taught either social studies (third graders) or science (eighth graders). We then looked at their achievement both via performance assessments (analytical, creative, and practical) and via standard multiple-choice assessments (which they were already using and which we did not modify at all). We found that the students taught for successful intelligence outperformed the other groups not only in the performance assessments but even in the traditional measures of memory achievement. In other words, students taught for successful intelligence even do better in straightforward memory assessments. Why? Because they are taught in a way that enables them to capitalize on their strengths, that enables them to encode material in multiple ways, and that simply is more motivating.

In other work, we have found that measures of practical intelligence predict on-the-job performance as well as or better than do conventional tests of academic intelligence. In other words, to the extent one wants to predict job success, one can do better than just to use tests such as the SAT, GRE, and their brethren.

What's the conclusion from all this? The conclusion is that it is time to move on from our conventional notions of abilities. It is time to stop wasting talent. It is time to move on to a notion of successful intelligence.

MONK *continued from p. 2*
rich, property poor, high spending, and low spending).

While these early signs are encouraging, there are at least four reasons to be cautious. First, despite their diverse appearance, the districts moving early toward increasing Regents participation rates are not necessarily representative of other districts. These districts moved voluntarily in this direction. Their experiences are instructive but may be a poor guide to what will come when more reluctant districts are forced to increase participation due to regulations. Recall that we also found that the incidence of poverty within the district was related to the willingness/ability of the districts to increase participation.

Second, it stands to reason that early experiences will be more positive than later experiences. There is no doubt that the marginal costs of increasing participation rates will increase, perhaps dramatically, as districts reach higher levels of participation. Moving a participation rate from 40 to 50 percent is something quite different from moving it between 70 and 80 percent. The hardest cases will presumably be the last to enter the program, and these students' experiences could be quite different and less encouraging from what the 1992-1996 data reveal.

Third, students during this period could continue to meet graduation requirements even if they performed poorly on the Regents examinations. In the future this option will be curtailed and this could have significant effects on students' willingness to persist with their studies.

And finally, the fact that increases in Regents exam participation were not associated with increased levels of spending should not be interpreted to mean that these gains were costless to the districts. We found evidence of shifts in how resources are used in addition to reports of influxes of new resources that are not captured by district financial statements. For example, our case studies revealed insights into the volunteer efforts of parents and teachers who were reported to be working harder for little or no additional compensation and these both constitute new resources that entered the system in ways that are difficult to measure precisely. The fact that

these new resource flows are difficult to measure should not detract from a recognition of their significance.

Even so, our results suggest that the schooling system in New York State enjoys some capacity to increase pupil performance in response to a decision to raise standards. It will be important to monitor this capacity carefully as more districts come into compliance with the new higher standards and to provide the resources that will become necessary to maintain the early gains that have been revealed by these data.



UCEA Seeks Campbell Award Nominations

The Roald F. Campbell Lifetime Achievement Award was instituted by UCEA in 1992 for the purpose of recognizing senior professors in the field of educational administration whose professional lives have been characterized by extraordinary commitment, excellence, leadership, productivity, generosity, and service. At the same time, the award celebrated the remarkable pioneering life of Roald F. Campbell, whose distinguished career spanned many years and exemplified these characteristics.

The criteria to be used in selecting the recipient include:

- Longtime distinguished service as teacher/researcher in the field of educational administration;
- Superior contributions to the field's body of knowledge;
- Recognized leadership efforts to improve the field, especially the preparation of educational administrators and/or professors of educational administration.

Nominations should cite evidence responsive to these criteria and may be sent to UCEA, 205 Hill Hall, Columbia, MO 65211. Deadline for nominations is May 15, 1999. (Note: The UCEA Executive Committee chooses the recipient and is not obligated to make the award every year.)

Donations to the Campbell Award Fund are welcome and tax-deductible.



Brunner Receives '98 Culbertson Award

C. Cryss Brunner (University of Wisconsin-Madison) was chosen as the 16th recipient of the Jack A. Culbertson Award. She was honored at the '98 UCEA Convention for her outstanding contributions to the field of educational administration. Michael Martin (U. of Colorado-Denver), former Associate Director of UCEA, made the presentation during the convention banquet.

Brunner was nominated for her examination of research into issues of power, decision-making, and educational leadership. Her particular focus is the leadership of school superintendents. She has authored two books, *Sacred Dreams: Women and the Superintendency* and *Principles of Power: Women Superintendents and the 'Riddle of the Heart.'* Her work also appears in such scholarly and professional publications as *Journal for a Just and Caring Education*, *Policy Studies Journal*, *Educational Policy*, *The School Administrator*, the *Journal of School Leadership*, and *Educational Considerations*.

Brunner also received a National Academy of Education Spencer Postdoctoral Fellowship for 1996-1997 for a research project entitled, *Profiles of Power: Superintendents, Decision-making, and Collaboration* which is indicative of the quality and potential of her line of inquiry.

In addition to her outstanding research record, Brunner is also an accomplished classroom teacher. In her courses she combines pedagogical expertise, scholarly rigor, and a caring relationship with students.

Established in 1982, the Culbertson Award has been a means of recognizing unique contributions of outstanding junior professors and a way to honor Jack A. Culbertson who inspired many young professors during his tenure as UCEA Executive Director of the consortium.

Previous Culbertson award winners are **Patrick B. Forsyth** (1983, Oklahoma State), **L. Dean Webb** (1984, Arizona State), **Jeri Nowakowski** (1985, Northern Illinois), **Joseph Murphy** (1986, University of Illinois), **Walter H. Gmelch** (1987, Washington State), **Charol Shakeshaft** (1988, Hofstra), **Carol A. Veir** (1989, Texas-Austin), **Paul V. Bredson** (1990, Penn State), **Kent D. Peterson** (1991, Wisconsin-Madison), **Ann Weaver Hart** (1992, Utah), **Paula M. Short** (1993, Penn State), **Steven K. Jacobson** (1994, SUNY Buffalo), **Neil Theobald** (1995, Indiana University), **Frances C. Fowler** (1996, Miami U.), and **Patsy E. Johnson** (1997, U. Kentucky).



Culbertson Nominees Sought

Nominations for the 1999 Jack A. Culbertson Award are now being accepted. At the discretion of the review committee, the award is presented annually to an outstanding junior professor of educational administration, in recognition of his/her contributions to the field. Nominations should include four copies of: (a) the work for which the professor is being nominated and a brief (1-2 page) description of how this work meets the award criteria, and (b) the nominee's vita. Submissions should total no more than 25 pages, including the nominating letter and vita. The letter of nomination must clearly state the contribution(s) to be evaluated and the support materials sent should pertain specifically to this contribution. Books and other costly materials will be returned on request, after the review committee completes its work. Individuals may be nominated more than once, provided they continue to meet the criteria.

Individuals nominated must have been professors for six years or fewer, and currently serve in a UCEA university. Contributions for which an individual may be nominated include, but are not limited to the following:

- an innovation in training
- a published book
- instructional materials produced
- a new course or program developed
- a completed research project and/or other related project

Criteria used in selecting the outstanding contribution are:

- innovativeness
- originality
- generalizability
- potential impact
- relation to UCEA goals
- significance with respect to the training mission at the individual's institution,
- degree of effort required to produce the contribution
- extent of support for the effort provided by the candidate's employing institution.

Send nominations to UCEA, 205 Hill Hall, Columbia, MO 65211. **Deadline for nominations is May 15, 1999.**

CORDEIRO continued from p. 3
nization faces by excluding whole segments of our profession. Two that come immediately to mind are the impact of globalization on the US economy, and, in a more practical example, the profound change that has occurred in the U.S. securities market.

We all know that the world economy is inextricably linked. The developed nations of the world realized long ago, after suffering the negative impacts brought on by isolation, that no country is an island when it comes to the global economy. An outbreak of the sniffles in Asia leads to a sore throat in Hong Kong and a fever in the United States. Witness the most significant economic events of this year; the Asian economy and its currencies devalued; despite the longest lived expansion in the history of the world and a profoundly strong economy, the US stock market reels from uncertainty characterized by unprecedented fluctuations. Despite all the wishful thinking, US corporate profits weaken, bringing about a correction in the market and driving the Federal Reserve to reduce interest rates. The point is well made; the United States, the strongest and wealthiest nation on the planet cannot afford to ignore what is happening in other parts of the world.

Let's look at a more specific example, again drawing on economics. We are all familiar with the Dow Jones Industrial Average; even for us non-business types we are bombarded with that term by daily news reports. The Dow Jones Average, a group of 30 very large publicly held companies, is about 100 years old. Let's look at the makeup of the Dow in about 1898. How many of these names do you recognize; how many are still around today? Lake Shore Railroad, New York Central, Union Pacific, Louisville & National Railroad, American Sugar, American Tobacco, National Lead, U.S. Leather, Distilling & Cattle Feeding Company?

Let's look at today's list, and pick out some familiar names that weren't in existence 30 or 40, in some cases, 20 years ago: Walt Disney, Walmart, Hewlett-Packard.

Let's go one step further and examine the New York Stock Exchange as a whole, compared to its upstart rival, the National Association of Securities Deal-

ers market, or NASDAQ.

What organization could be a better example of the "establishment" than the New York Stock Exchange? A who's who of corporations, security firms, and corporate and individual wealth. What organization could possibly compete with this type of wealth and entrenched organizations? In a little over 20 years, an upstart, the NASDAQ has become the third largest market in the world after the Tokyo and New York Exchanges. More than half of the shares that change hands each day are executed on the NASDAQ, and trading takes place electronically in 52 countries instead of a trading floor on Wall Street. The 5000 companies whose shares are traded on this exchange have assets of 3 trillion dollars, annual income of almost 50 billion, and are known to be among the fastest growing, most innovative companies in the world. Household names such as Cisco Systems, Northwest Airlines, Oracle, Qualcomm, Sun Microsystems, and Yahoo are just a few examples (www.nyse.com; www.nasdaq.com).

How did this upstart, undercapitalized, and poor cousin of the securities industry compete so successfully with the venerable New York Stock Exchange, bastion of the establishment? By technological innovation. NASDAQ was founded and continues to grow based upon a simple concept—to strive to be the technological leader, utilizing the latest and most sophisticated technology in telecommunications and computers to replace the traditional trading room floor. As the first, and, now the most successful electronic marketplace, it was and is able to leapfrog its older, set in their ways, traditional competitors.

UCEA Membership

So, what does this have to do with educational administration, and, with the UCEA? Are we the New York Stock Exchange, or the nation, which believes in economic isolation?

Sometimes, in my more critical moments, I am reminded of a line from a movie. You may have seen it; Danny Devito in *Other Peoples' Money* is standing in front of a factory in New England, which was about to close its doors, despite a dedicated, trained workforce, which produced a high quality product. "Buggy Whips" shouts Devito, "That is what you make." The point was that the

factory was in danger of closing because it was probably the world's best producer of a product whose market had passed into obscurity.

Now let's look at our organization in terms of its position in our field. Undoubtedly, we are the establishment. Our strength lies in our membership, which represents some of the most sophisticated, largest, well-funded, and productive contributors to our field. But are we excluding the equivalent of the NASDAQ from our membership, from our forums, from our planning? Could this lead to our producing buggy whips?

Let's look at some of the facts about UCEA and institutions preparing administrators for K-12 school leadership positions.

UCEA currently has 56 member institutions: 55 in the United States and 1 in Canada. Our membership criteria require that universities be Research I, Research II or Doctoral I universities. This means that of the approximately 220 doctoral-granting institutions-institutions offering the Ph.D. or Ed.D. in school administration in the USA, 159 are eligible for membership. The remaining 61 are in the category of Doctoral Universities II and are therefore not eligible. One question to ask is—Why have most of these eligible institutions not applied for membership? According to McCarthy and Kuh (1997) there are approximately 380 universities and colleges in the US and Canada (371 in the US and 11 in Canada that prepare school administrators). I believe this number has changed dramatically in recent years. As I examine the population of universities from which they drew their sample, many educational administration degree granting institutions are missing. For example, with the small state of Connecticut, four degree programs are missing from their appendix; two of which graduate far more educational administration students than the University of Connecticut, a UCEA member. And I have identified at least seven institutions in California that were not included, probably because the programs were not in existence four years ago when McCarthy and Kuh collected their data. California with one of the largest economies in the world and one of the fastest growing states, prepares ap-

CORDEIRO continued on p. 11



Boyan Receives Campbell Lifetime Achievement Award

Norman and Priscilla Boyan at the '98 UCEA Convention Banquet

(Remarks made by Norman J. Boyan after receiving the award)

Gratitude, I once heard, is the least lasting of the emotions. That is not the case here and now. I am truly grateful to Don Willower for his sponsorship of my case to receive the Roald F. Campbell Award and to the UCEA selection committee for its positive response. As I have reflected on the past years, I have recognized how often and positively sponsorship by others and by UCEA itself have favored my professional life, especially in the early days. For that, I am indeed thankful.

That I am here at all today is very much the result of a series of accidents in which many others played crucial roles. I did not intend to pursue a career in educational administration. I did commit myself as a teenager to a career as a teacher. My role models in high school were high school teachers. I wanted to be one of them. Principals, superintendents, professors of educational administration were not in my ken. I didn't know any or even anything about them. I saw my high school principal as a distant and forbidding figure; the superintendent as an even more distant and august person; and professors as members of a class to which I had no reason to aspire. As a child of the depression, the son of deaf-mute working-class parents, and the grandson of Irish and Italian immigrants, in the 1930s the goal of becoming a high school teacher was as high as I dared aspire.

Then I went to college. How I landed at Bates College is a story in its own right. It was, however, the perfect choice, in every respect. A new role model appeared, a college history professor, known as Doc Sweet. I wanted very much to be like him. But how do you get there from here. I had never even heard of doctorates. I didn't have the faintest idea how you got one, except that more money would be involved than was available to me. So, while I admired Doc Sweet and while I hoped that maybe someday I might share his status, I settled in 1941 on a career as high school teacher and basketball coach after my anticipated graduation from college in 1943.

Bates was also important in my life because there I met Priscilla, my wife of 55 years. I have to admit that I was more impressed that her father was a professor at Harvard than that he was a professor of educational administration. The field still meant nothing to me. My focus was on that high school history teacher career. I was so naïve that I never even saw the possibilities of a career in administration as a potential sequel to several years of teaching.

Then the war, marriage and family, end of the war, and wonder of wonders, the GI Bill. There it was, the vehicle for an advanced degree and the open sesame for a career as a college history professor. Off went six applications to graduate schools seeking admissions to Ph.D. programs in history; back came six acceptances. The decision of where to go turned out to be a very simple one, yet decisive for my career although it was not at all seen as such in 1946. I suspect few of you can speak from experience about how difficult it was to find living quarters around major universities im-

mediately after World War II. Briefly, the situation was grim. Therefore, I chose Harvard because my wife and first child were living with her parents in Cambridge and there was room in their apartment for me. Happily for all, six months after my discharge from the service in early 1946, our family was settled in our own 1-bedroom apartment not far from campus, and I had begun my Ph.D. program in history.

It turned out that my father-in-law's house was truly a crossroads for school superintendents from all over New England and the Northeast generally. So, while I was exposed to a magical academic program in the History Department, I was also exposed on numerous occasions to the cross talk of superintendents, and some professors of educational administration, as they wrestled with the problems of administering schools in the post-war years. Their excitement and their dedication greatly appealed to me. I found their company stimulating and attractive, a condition that later contributed to my career shift.

About a year and a half into my Ph.D. program in history, I could see that my need to work part-time as a high school history teacher was prolonging my expected time to degree and reducing my comparative competitiveness for securing a college post. The Chair of the History Department confirmed the unease about my relative competitiveness, pointing to the very large post-war production of Ph.Ds in history, not only at Harvard but from major universities across the U.S. I also discovered that career opportunities for Ph.Ds in history were distinctly limited. So, I decided to examine other doctoral possibilities. My first choice was a doctoral program in social studies education, which would enable me to couple my former career interest in high school history teaching with an interest in preparing aspiring high school history teachers. In 1947, I completed a transfer from the Graduate School of Arts and Science to the Graduate School of Education. Less than a year

BOYAN continued on p. 10

Driscoll President-Elect

Mary Erina Driscoll was elected President-Elect of UCEA at Convention '98. Driscoll is an associate professor of educational administration in the School of Education at New York University. A former music teacher in K-12 settings, she earned a Ph.D. in educational administration from the University of Chicago in 1989. Prior to joining the faculty of NYU in 1991, she served as an assistant professor on the Educational Policy Studies faculty at the University of Illinois at Chicago.

Her research focuses on the ways in which organizational and collaborative arrangements may be used to connect individuals to one another and to the communities in which schools and students are located. This includes the study of policies affecting schools and communities and in particular those that bear on issues germane to the coordination of children's services at the school site. She is currently an active participant in the NYU Partnership Initiatives with Community School Districts 2, 19 and 13 in New York City, most recently working with the implementation of an art therapy program in the two school-based health clinics run by NYU and District 2 in Manhattan. Past research has explored how school choice mechanisms in the public sector are related to student and parent beliefs about the quality of teaching and learning in their schools. Most recently, with Robert Crowson and William Boyd, she completed a study under the auspices of the National Center for Research on Inner City Schools that explored the work lives and collaborative strategies used by directors of programs that provide coordinated social services to children. She has served as a consultant for policy research to the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards in the early stages of its formation and was a staff assistant for the commission chaired by Lamar Alexander that studied the National Assessment of Educational Progress prior to its reauthorization. Professor Driscoll presently serves as the coordinator for the New York site of the Education Policy Fellows program that is affiliated with the Institute for Educational Leadership. She is a member of the executive committee for the University Council for Educational Administration and of the editorial boards of *Teachers College Record* and *EAQ*.

IESLP Update

The *Information Environment for School Leader Preparation* is available for beta testing through the 1999 academic year. Universities which test IESLP in their educational leadership programs will be provided with passwords and limited technical support during the test period. Currently, IESLP is being used collaboratively by Patti L. Chance (U. of Nevada-Las Vegas) and Jody Isernhagen (U. of Nebraska-Lincoln). Muriell Mackett (Northern Illinois U.), David Holman (Arkansas State U.), and Jerry Valentine (U. of Missouri-Columbia) also are beta testing IESLP.

Faculty interested in using problem based learning in their programs are encouraged to contact Patrick Forsyth at pbf2@tiger.coe.missouri to obtain a user ID and password for IESLP. Those with passwords may access the IESLP message boards at <http://www.ucea.org/~ieslp> to see what is occurring during these beta tests.

UCEA Executive Director Search

The UCEA Executive Committee has developed a plan to search for a new Executive Director following the resignation of Patrick B. Forsyth effective June 30, 2000. Meeting in Minneapolis on January 16, the Committee established a timeline for the search. The Committee invites nominations at any time. However, the official posting of the position will take place in May of this year. At that time, letters inviting nominations will be sent to UCEA deans, chairs, PSRs, and appropriate organizations. Nominations and applications will be kept confidential until the final phases of selection.

The Executive Committee will serve as the search committee, with President-Elect Mary E. Driscoll (New York U.) as chair. In early October, the Committee will examine applications, with the intent to create a short list during its meeting just prior to the UCEA Convention. Shortly thereafter, candidates will be invited to interview. A decision should be announced early in 2000.

The UCEA Executive Director reports to the Executive Committee and holds a three year, rolling contract. The starting minimal salary has been set at \$80,000. UCEA is committed to subsidizing personal moving costs for the selected candidate who will necessarily reside in Columbia, Missouri.

BOYAN *continued from p. 8*

after my transfer, the professor of social studies education took a position at another university. I decided not to wait for the Graduate School of Education to recruit a successor, instead electing to enroll in the doctoral program in educational administration.

But my “accidental career” story only begins with the transfer from History to Education. After completion of course work and preliminary examinations, came the choice of doctoral dissertation. One of the projects initiated by my major professor was a study of the relation of salary to competence; more simply known as merit pay. He recruited a group of graduate students to do bibliographic work on the topic. One of the story lines I saw in many of the references I pulled out of the literature was that merit pay was bad for teacher morale. (Does that sound familiar?) So I became interested in learning more about morale, a hot topic immediately after World War II. A major discovery for me was a small book by Fritz Roethlisberger, a faculty member in the Harvard Business School, entitled *Management and Morale*. The volume was a shortened version of *Management and the Worker*, written by Roethlisberger and his associates in the Western Electric Studies conducted by a Harvard Business School group under the direction of Elton Mayo. Some of these inquiries come to be known as the Hawthorne studies.

The two Roethlisberger books introduced me, in 1948-49, to the concepts of formal and informal organization, a territory uncharted at the time in educational administration research. I could not find in the literature any attempt to portray the formal and informal organizations of a school or to document the interplay between the two, as the Harvard group had done at the Hawthorne works. The lack of guidance in the literature was compounded by the absence of faculty members in the Graduate School of Education who had any familiarity with the concepts and with attendant methodology for examining their application in schools. So, I was pretty much left to my own devices, with some advice from a professor of anthropology and considerable assistance from Professor Roethlisberger and the

Human Relations group in the Harvard Business School. Somehow the work got done and the dissertation was approved. In those days, the Graduate School of Education did not require an oral examination after review by the dissertation committee. I do remember, however, that one member of the committee, Professor Talcott Parsons, an eminent sociologist, said to me, “Oh, how I would have liked to have had an opportunity to quiz you in an oral exam.” The glee in his voice suggested to me that he would have enjoyed it more than I. A postscript to the dissertation story came a few months later when the editor of the Harvard Studies in Education series asked me to do a “little reworking” of my dissertation so that it could be published. By that time, my family and I felt so worn down by the dissertation experience (and the loss of a child) that we just did not want to have anything more to do with the treatise. So much for looking ahead to a career as a professor.

Coupled with this lack of foresightedness (seen from later years) came my treatment of an invitation to candidate for a university position just as I was finishing my degree in 1951. My major professor recommended me for a post in the Bureau of Education Research at the University of Illinois at Urbana. With much anticipation, I traveled to Illinois. Upon my arrival, the doctoral student assigned to squire me around told me how unhealthy the winters were for people with bronchial conditions. Since both of my children (two by now) suffered from exactly such conditions, I tuned out immediately, went through the motions of candidacy, and withdrew my name from consideration immediately upon returning to Cambridge. I simply did not appreciate how intellectually exciting the Bureau was, what with people like Lee Cronbach, Nate Gage, Sandy Charters, and Bill McClure on the staff. I often muse about what my professional career might have been had I accepted an offer to join the Bureau, and the invitation to publish my dissertation. Different no doubt; but better, probably not.

Still there was a considerable restiveness among a significant number of professors of educational administration in favor of changing preparation programs by incorporating learnings from the social sciences and in favor of im-

proving disciplined inquiry in educational administration by employing social science concepts and methodologies. Out of this restiveness came the Cooperative Program in Educational Administration in the early 1950s, as well as the founding of the organizations we know today as UCEA and NCPEA. The conventions of the field were shattered with the coming of the Cooperative Program in Education Administration. Jack Culbertson has concisely documented the roots of the changes which followed and the sweeping reforms that took place in the field. In brief, “the theory movement” and the introduction of the norms of normal science took hold firmly, rapidly, and fully. Each of the CPEA centers recruited “real” social scientists to assist the former practitioners who had previously dominated the academy to improve their programs for the preparation of educational administrators. The prestige of the CPEA centers was so commanding that other institutions emulated their thrust. Out of the core group came the proposal to establish UCEA itself, originally intended as an elitist collection of the “very best” programs.

By the end of the 1950s the preparation programs for school administrators and professors of educational administration had shifted dramatically from the transmission of the “principles” by former administrators and their colleague school surveyors to the search for social scientific based knowledge relevant to the practice of school administration. One outcome of this major paradigm shift was the creation of a new cadre of professors of educational administration which filled the demand for social-science oriented professors in other institutions, which in turn created a new supply as those professors produced graduates from their programs. It is somewhat ironic, in retrospect, that the incorporation of the social sciences into programs of educational administration contributed more to the improvement of researchers in the field than to the improvement of practice as projected in the proposals to the Kellogg Foundation to fund the CPEA centers. A further unanticipated consequence was that the field of educational administration became notably vulnerable to disputation in both the social sciences and the humanities

continued ➤

over acceptable ways of knowing.

I have cited, very briefly, the advent, onset, and effects of the CPEA, and the attendant founding and later flourishing of UCEA, for two primary reasons. The first is that I consider it crucial for a professional field to be very self-conscious about its roots and its history. I have believed for some time that our field is woefully ahistorical. Once, in hopes of reversing this condition, I had hoped to build on the work of Jack Culbertson by producing a definitive intellectual history of educational administration. My definition of "definitive" is taken from my mentor and father-in-law, Alfred D. Simpson, identified by Stephen Bailey in his classic treatment of *Schoolmen in Politics* as one of the more influential scribblers of his generation. Simpson used to talk about a body of work being so well done that it does not have to be done again. I regret that time has passed me by for undertaking such a task. I hope that one or more of you out there might

find the interest and the zeal to devote yourself to doing so to ensure that future professors and students will become fully conversant with what others have done before them and will become fully respectful of the work of their predecessors on whose shoulders they have climbed, often quite unknowingly.

The second reason is that I believe it worthwhile to recognize that change in dominant paradigms of how to do research in educational administration and how to prepare practitioners is inevitable, even if at times highly uncomfortable. Many of us who were around at the time of the onset of the so-called "Greenfield-Griffiths" debates were made uncomfortable by the attack on what we had come to accept as good and proper. Those debates seem tame today, given current back and forth on the "the one best way" to conceptualize problems in educational administration and to employ acceptable methodologies. I am simply not competent to assess the vari-

ous claims that are made for and against this way of doing things as compared to that way of doing things. I have been away from this fray too long. But of one thing I am sure; namely, that there are folks out there, quite often in disparate fields, who are even now laying the foundations for challenging your best thinking about preparing administrators and professors, and of conducting related research. Of such is the intellectual world made in which you have chosen to live.

Thank you for listening to part of the story of my professional journey, and thank you once again for honoring me as you have.



EAQ Call for Book Reviews

Educational Administration Quarterly invites inquiries about submission of book reviews. Two particular types of reviews are considered: (1) critical essay reviews of single current books that have import for the field of educational administration and (2) comparative or thematic essay reviews of two or more books that have import for the field. Book review manuscripts should be approximately 1,500 to 2,000 words in length. Short descriptive reviews (mini-reviews) of books of interest to the field or essay reviews of novels or other literature with implications for pedagogy, practice, theory, or research in the field may be considered when consistent with the themes of special issues of *EAQ*.

The *EAQ* editorial staff receives copies from publishers of current books relevant to educational administration. Persons interested in reviewing books for *EAQ* are invited to submit a letter of interest to the *EAQ* Book Review Editors, Department of Administration and Supervision, College of Education, University of Kentucky, 111 Dickey Hall, Lexington, KY 40506-0017. Include in the letter a list of specific areas of interest, along with the address, phone, and e-mail address. Inquiry letters about a review of a specific book are considered, as well as letters of interest in serving as a reviewer.

CORDEIRO continued from p. 7

proximately 13% of all educational administrators in the US; yet, no institution in California is a member of this consortium. I believe the number of institutions in the US alone offering graduate degrees in educational administration is closer to 450. If we subtract the 159 eligible members, this means that ap-

proximately 290 educational administration programs are not even eligible for membership in this consortium.

Presently 15 states and the District of Columbia do not have member institutions in UCEA. How many preparation programs are in these 15 states? I have identified 75. No matter how the cake is sliced, I estimate that the mem-

bership criteria of UCEA excludes anywhere from 70%-80% of all programs graduating students who receive degrees in educational administration in the United States.

Preparation Programs

McCarthy and Kuh in their 1997 book *Continuity and Change* in which
CORDEIRO continued on p. 12

CORDEIRO *continued from p. 11*

they survey professors from preparation programs in North America offering graduate degrees in educational administration found that there is an “emerging homogeneity across institutions.” They also speculated about the uncertainty of what “constitutes quality in education leadership preparation” (p. 260). The literature is replete with criticism of educational administration programs and I ask: Would it make a difference to American schoolchildren if departments of educational administration closed their doors today?

Poland and Carlson (1993) examined the course listings of 40 UCEA institutions. They found that change in preparatory programs in educational administration was occurring, “but the change is gradual and incremental” (p. 8). They also reported that “the system within which change is occurring remains highly stable and conservative.” Other findings they reported include:

- little curriculum change (e.g., minimal attention paid to multicultural or gender issues)
- three-credit course still dominates
- little distinction between beginning and advanced study
- little substantive curriculum change as a result of the external environment.

In the last ten years reformers have called for numerous changes in educational administration preparation programs. There have been calls for changing recruitment strategies and focusing on quality and diversity. In some states candidates must be able to demonstrate expertise in teaching and learning. There has been a call for better qualified faculty, a doctorate in educational administration as a prerequisite to national certification and a full time year of residency. Others want better internships, more field experiences, cohorts of students, and more effective teaching techniques. Many of you are trying to implement these initiatives. But, I wonder, will these initiatives have a significant impact on the core of our programs? Or, if Poland and Carlson repeat their 1993 study in 2003, will they once again find, “the system within which change is occurring remains highly stable and conservative.”

In the last four months I have had a

balcony view of educational administration programs. I am no longer on the ballroom floor. I am beginning to see with more clarity patterns that I began seeing years ago. I am looking at administrator preparation within the context of the entire school, within the context of the entire university, within the context of the community in which my colleagues and I live and work. The view, my friends, is very different.

Boundary Crossers

I believe that once we encourage boundary crossing behavior in our professors we can consider three changes in our departments. Then programs of educational leadership will be substantially different, and better than they current are. We will have moved forward significantly.

We must give permission to those professors who want, to be boundary crossers. Let me share with you a concept that comes from the Portuguese language. In her autobiography, Nien Cheng, a former Chinese political prisoner, discussed the comprador role created in the 1880s to facilitate interactions between the insulated Chinese government and foreign companies. Comprador, a Portuguese word used in Macao, a former Portuguese colony on an island near Hong Kong, literally means “buyer.” Compradors were needed because of the bureaucracies and hierarchies pervasive throughout imperial China. Compradors were local Chinese people “who acted as liaisons between foreign firms and Chinese officials” (Cheng, 1986, p. 281). They were fluent in a second language, cognizant of the mores and customs of other cultures and bi- or multi-lingual, enabling them to freely cross boundaries. Without compradors, it would not have been possible for foreign firms to access local Chinese organizations and agencies. The compradors provided the flexibility these businesses needed.

We need professors and students who are similar to the compradors of China; educational leaders must be bi- or multi-lingual and -cultural. Although at times this may actually involve speaking another language, it really means being facile with the shared language created as different organizations with different cultures come together. Trust is developed, boundaries are crossed and

common agendas are identified; thus reciprocal relationships are formed. Aided by the compradors among us, new ways to communicate will create new collaborative cultures. The task for department chairs and deans of schools of education is to identify and reward those professors within their schools and give them permission to travel—to seek out others on campus with whom they can form networks. We must identify compradors in our schools, colleges and departments and give them permission and a reason to travel. Armed with a purpose, with permission to seek out others with whom to form linkages, with the authority to act as leaders, and with the imperative to interact across levels and organizations, these emissaries will offer our programs the hope of conducting business in a not-so-usual way that benefits all faculty and students.

Preparing Educational Leaders

The first suggested change I propose deals with our students. Who are they? Are most of them currently working in schools or related educational institutions?

Consider the following. In order to prepare people to lead schools, they must have an understanding of the many other institutions and organizations in our communities: the juvenile justice system; social service agencies; the medical community, the media, institutions of higher education, business and industry, etc. School administrators today are required to interact with these agencies. There is a “jumping together” a “consilience” to use Edward Wilson’s word. If we do not invite students from a variety of disciplines to engage in meaningful dialogue, then we have missed out on the incredible human capital in or university classrooms. How can we continue to prepare people to be school superintendents and principals when they have no idea how the juvenile justice system works? How can we allow them to be unfamiliar with human service agencies or the roles that many religious institutions play in their communities? The students sitting in our core classes must represent a variety of experiential backgrounds.

Secondly, once we have students from various schools across campus sitting alongside educators, our programs

continued ➤

must be interdisciplinary. If we have compradors among us, let us encourage and reward them when they collaborate with colleagues in the schools of business, public administration, nursing, social work, law, medicine, etc. to create core courses that are interdisciplinary in nature. If our goals are to prepare people who will be leaders in their respective organizations and agencies, then much common ground can, and must be found. These courses could be jointly developed and jointly taught and the students in these classes would come from a variety of disciplines. You would have a high school department chair sitting next to a police captain or an administrator of a drug rehabilitation program, or a social worker or a person whose goal is to work in a non-profit organization. These interdisciplinary core courses might include ethics, diversity, workplace learning, etc. to name but a few possible topics important to all.

Our research university campuses offer incredible resources for students of educational leadership. Let us map our assets and tap our colleagues and programs across the university. Resources are too limited for us to offer a course in leadership or diversity or ethics in the schools of business, nursing, medicine, law, education, family studies, or arts and science. We must collaborate in significant ways across our disciplines.

My third and final suggestion is a clarion call for us to seriously look outward; to put an end to our isolationist attitude. In my years of working in education one of the most important lessons I have learned is that a person who familiar with only one educational system, knows no educational system thoroughly. As a young teacher in an international school in Venezuela I worked side by side with teachers from many countries. Each of us brought our country's educational system to the table. For the first time in my life I began to ask questions that I had taken for granted. I believed that teaching and learning could only occur within certain structures and in certain ways. Because of my discussion with colleagues from other nations I began asking questions such as, Why do we teach algebra in 9th grade, geometry in 10th grade and advance algebra in 11th grade? Why not have strands of each and build on them

each year as the curriculum in many other countries does?' I asked, 'Why do many elementary school teachers in other nations move with their children?' For example, in Spain it is typical for a kindergarten teacher to move with his/her students from kindergarten to first and then second grade. The same would occur with grades 3-5 and 6-8. Today we call this practice(in the US) looping, as if it is a new concept being developed by the US educational system. I could give you dozens of examples of concepts and practices that I began to question as I explored the educational systems of other nations. And I was reminded of this once again when two weeks ago a graduate student from the University of San Diego's British university's partner spent a week visiting with San Diego secondary school principals. He attended our evening classes and then asked questions that in all likelihood only a person from another educational system, or someone, who was not an educator, would raise. They were good questions, thoughtful questions. They forced the students in that class to examine their beliefs and practices. They forced them to think coherently, relate what they knew from the research, and articulate with clarity. The class discussion became far more powerful because of what our visitor brought to the table. And so, I ask, how can we ensure that our students have the opportunity to be asked these questions? Or, that they get the opportunity to ask these questions themselves? We must afford all of our students some type of international experience.

In conclusion, with regard to this organization I wonder, has it been a good thing for us to exclude so many of our colleagues from our forums? Has this been necessary? Have the students in preparation programs benefited from us excluding our colleagues in Doctoral II universities? In universities that are not doctoral granting? Can we return to President Stout's three membership criteria: an identified program in educational administration; a commitment to the improvement of training programs; and willing to pay the organizational dues?

With regard to our programs, if we invite our colleagues from across campus to work with us, will we not dramatically change the patterns on the ball-

room floor? If we invite students from various experiential backgrounds into some of the same core classes, will we not afford greater learning opportunities for all of our students? And for ourselves? If we encourage boundary crossing by professors across campus and by students across international boundaries, will the ballroom patterns not be altered significantly?

The UCEA has accomplished many important results in its 40 year history, and I know that I am a better professor due to my participation. I look forward to continuing to work with the organization, and hope that my positive experiences can be afforded to ALL who are interested in improving educational administration.

Notes:

1. According to the most recent (1994) classification of doctoral institutions by the Carnegie Foundation there are 4 categories: Research University I, Research University II, Doctoral Universities I, and Doctoral Universities II. Research universities have to award more than 50 doctoral degrees each year and have annual federal support of \$40 million or more in Research I and 15.5 million or more in Research II. Doctoral I award at least 40 doctoral degrees annually in five or more disciplines. Doctoral II award at least 10 doctoral degrees in more or more disciplines. (The Chronicle of Higher Education, Almanac Issue, August 29, 1997, 54(1) p. 37.)

2. My estimations were arrived at by reviewing the following:

Chronicle of Higher Education, Almanac Issue, August 28, 1998 (p. 42); *Continuity and Change*, p. 275-281; E. Lilley's 1994 *Educational Administration Directory—1993-94* (12th Ed.) Morgantown, WV: West Virginia University, as well as through personal knowledge of programs.

References

Cheng, N. (1986). *Life and death in Shanghai*. New York: Penguin.

Heifetz, R. (1994). *Leadership without easy answers*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

McCarthy, M., & Kuh, G.(1997). *Continuity and change: The educational leadership professoriate*. Columbia, MI: University Council for Educational Administration.

Poland, P., & Carlson, L.(1993). Program reform in educational administration. *UCEA Review*, 34(3), 4-9.

Scribner, J. D. (1991, winter).UCEA Liberating Educational Administration from Hedgehog Thinking: A Planning Proposal for the New Millennium. Annual Presidential Address, 1990 *UCEA Review*, 32(1), 4-7, 12.

Stout, R.(1990, winter) 1989 Presidential Address. *UCEA Review*, 31(1), 3-5.

UCEA Convention 1999

“Contradictions in Accountability”

Minneapolis, Minnesota October 29–31, 1999

I. General Information

The thirteenth annual convention of the University Council for Educational Administration will be held at the Hyatt Regency in Minneapolis, Minnesota. The convention will open at 8:00 A.M. on Friday morning (October 29, 1999) and close at 11:30 A.M. on Sunday (October 31, 1999). The purpose of the 1999 UCEA Convention is to engage participants in discussing research, policy, and practice in education with a specific focus on educational administration.

II. Theme

Schools have been always been accountable to someone. In recent years, however, the number of judges of school performance both within and without the organizational school has grown substantially. Demands for accountability can also conflict with one another. Schools are subjected to tightening standards, broader accountability, and national curricula. At the same time, increasingly professional teachers desire greater control over school operation and a narrower scope of accountability. Administrators are resisting accountability in situations where there is little control over hiring and staff deployment. Skillful and vocal parents want equity for their children and other equally skillful parents seek excellence; both desire more immediate control of what is taught and how it is taught. The financially conscious public wants schools that are efficient, while the socially conscious demand broad choices. The problems of measurement limit standardized tests as the evidence of accountability. Other measures are suspected of manifesting a latent self-interest. As schools decide how they will respond to multiple demands for accountability from competing constituencies, they also choose which calls for accountability they will answer first.

Contradictions in accountability, this year's theme, encourages submission of work that puts some order into the variety and discordancy of accountability. Therefore, the convention looks for submissions in the following general areas:

- leading and organizing schools for accountability;
- schools leader preparation in the age of accountability;
- the ethical framework for accountability;
- the equity-excellence and efficiency-choice values;
- public demands and professional responsibility;
- administrative control and shared decision making;
- methods of narration and those of statistical analysis;
- democratic options of schools of choice and the potential vitiation of the general public system of education;
- political and legal implications of accountability.

III. Session Formats and Proposal Requirements

The 1999 UCEA Convention will include a variety of session formats that facilitate dialogue. **See form at right for detailed instructions for submitting proposals.**

1. **Paper Sessions.** These sessions are intended for reporting research results or analyzing issues of policy and practice in an abbreviated form. Presenters are expected to provide copies of papers. Proposal summary should include statement of purpose and rationale; for research reports, description of data sources, methods and findings; and conclusions. Sessions will be limited to three presenters allotted approximately 20 minutes each. A discussion leader will be assigned to facilitate dialogue during the final thirty minutes of the session.
2. **Symposia.** A symposium should examine specific issues, research problems, or topics from several perspectives and allow for dialogue and discussion. Session organizers are expected to chair the session and facilitate discussion. Symposium participants are expected to develop and provide copies of papers.
3. **Conversations.** Conversation sessions are intended to stimulate informal, lively discussion often using a series of provocative questions or vignettes. Session organizers are expected to organize a panel of participants and facilitate and guide the conversation about critical issues, concerns, and perspectives. The proposal summary should describe the purpose of the session, the ways in which participants will be encouraged to engage in conversation, and examples of questions or areas to be addressed.
4. **Interactive Roundtables.** These sessions are intended for small group focused discussions such as book discussions, “fireside” chats, research in progress, practitioner voices, and issues in teaching. The proposal summary should describe the focus and purpose of the session and the format(s) used to engage participants.

IV. Criteria for Review of Proposals

All proposals will be subject to blind, peer review. The three page summary of the proposal that will be sent to reviewers **must not include names of session organizers or presenters.** Proposal evaluations will be based on (1) significance of research problem/topic and contribution to the field; (2) thoroughness and clarity of presentation; (3) theoretical framework, methods, and analysis (for empirical pieces); and (4) the format of the session (for symposia, conversations, and roundtables).

V. Participation Guidelines and Proposal Deadlines

Anyone involved in research, policy or practice in educational or youth-serving agencies may submit proposals for consideration. Individuals may present or participate in no more than three sessions. **Paper presenters are required to provide an advance copy of their paper to the assigned discussion leader and a minimum of 30 copies for distribution. Proposals must be received on or before May 1, 1999.**



Proposal Cover Sheet
1999 UCEA Convention
Minneapolis, Minnesota
October 29-31, 1999

Session # _____
Proposal # _____

DEADLINE: MAY 1, 1999

1. **Proposal Title:** _____

2. **Preference (please check):** () paper () symposium () conversation () roundtable
 (Multiple presenter formats should include a format page listing all participants, their affiliations, their roles in the session, and the titles of their presentations. This information should NOT be present elsewhere in the proposal packet.)

3. **Presenting Author(s) or Session Organizer(s):**

i) Name: _____
 Affiliation: _____
 Address: _____
 City: _____ State _____ Zip _____
 Phone: _____ Fax _____
 E-mail: _____

iv) Name: _____
 Affiliation: _____
 Address: _____
 City: _____ State _____ Zip _____
 Phone: _____ Fax _____
 E-mail: _____

4. **Co-Author(s) or Other Session Participants:**

ii) Name: _____
 Affiliation: _____
 Address: _____
 City: _____ State _____ Zip _____
 Phone: _____ Fax _____
 E-mail: _____

v) Name: _____
 Affiliation: _____
 Address: _____
 City: _____ State _____ Zip _____
 Phone: _____ Fax _____
 E-mail: _____

iii) Name: _____
 Affiliation: _____
 Address: _____
 City: _____ State _____ Zip _____
 Phone: _____ Fax _____
 E-mail: _____

vi) Name: _____
 Affiliation: _____
 Address: _____
 City: _____ State _____ Zip _____
 Phone: _____ Fax _____
 E-mail: _____

5. **If this proposal is accepted, I agree to present and provide 30 copies of the paper (or prepared remarks for symposia)**

Signature _____ **Date** _____

6. () **I (we) will need an overhead projector.**

Audio-visual information: Overhead projectors will be provided for paper sessions. Other equipment may be ordered directly from the Hyatt Regency (612) 370-1473 or Fax (612) 343-5176. Arrangements and payment for other equipment are the responsibility of individual users. Individuals whose paper proposals are accepted agree to provide 30 copies (paper or diskette) at the presentation.

PROPOSALS MUST INCLUDE SIX (6) SETS OF THE FOLLOWING:
 1. Proposal cover sheet.
 2. Summary of three pages or fewer (**without author names** for blind review).
 Send proposals to: **UCEA Convention '99**
University Council for Educational Administration
205 Hill Hall
Columbia, MO 65211

Submitting Articles For The UCEA Review

C. John Tarter (St. John's U.) is Feature Editor for the **UCEA Review**. If you have suggestions for the **Review** or ideas for substantive feature articles, he would be happy to hear from you.

C. John Tarter
**School of Education and
Human Services**
St. John's University
8000 Utopia Parkway
Jamaica NY 11439

e-mail: ctarter@aol.com
FAX: (718) 990-6096

1999 Schedule Of Events

April 17-19.....	David L. Clark Graduate Student Research Seminar in Educational Administration (Monteal, Marriott Chateau Champlain)
May 1.....	Deadline for Culbertson Award nominations
May 1.....	Deadline for Campbell Award nominations
May	UCEA Executive Committee (Minneapolis, Hyatt Regency)
Oct 29-30.....	UCEA Plenum (Minneapolis, Hyatt Regency)
Oct 29,31.....	Graduate Student Seminar (Minneapolis, Hyatt Regency)
Oct 29-31.....	UCEA Convention '99 (Minneapolis, Hyatt Regency)



The University Council for Educational Administration

205 Hill Hall
Columbia MO 65211
(573) 884-8300
FAX (573) 884-8302
www.ucea.org

Non-Profit
Organization
U.S. Postage
PAID
Columbia, MO
Permit No. 255

Review

Published three times a year—winter, spring, fall—by the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA). Address changes and other corrections should be sent to the *Review* at the above address.

Patrick B. Forsyth Executive Director
Richard V. Hatley Associate Director
Sean A. Flynt Assistant to the Director
C. John Tarter Feature Editor
M. Scott Norton .. Program Center Coordinator
Michael Shane Mountjoy Editor
James R. Crawford Graduate Assistant
Timothy O. Smith Graduate Assistant
Lisa C. Wright, CPA Financial Director