Donald J. Willower’s record as a scholar in Educational Administration will serve as a criterion for generations of professors—his work was a rare combination of philosophy, theory, and empirical research. He was a prolific writer, reflective thinker, extraordinary mentor, helpful colleague, and a genuine friend. His example was as edifying to those around him as was the lasting influence of that example. He was a professor’s professor.

Although Willower’s interests, scholarship, and writing are diverse, his work exemplifies a number of programmatic themes, two of which I know well and will discuss briefly—his leadership in the theory movement in educational administration and his research on pupil control—then I will comment on his scholarship and writing, his teaching and mentoring, his professional progeny, and finally, end with a personal statement of tribute.

The Theory Movement

Don Willower was a pioneer in the theory movement in educational administration. His dissertation was a model for using a social systems perspective to generate and test theoretically grounded hypotheses about schools and administrators (Willower, 1960; 1962; 1963). I still use his article on hypothesis construction (Willower, 1962) to illustrate the development of sound hypotheses grounded in theory.

Willower, however, was the first to warn that physicist Feigl’s (1951) definition of theory, as a set of assumptions from which a larger set of empirical laws can be derived by purely logicomathematical procedures, was too narrow a definition for educational administration. Although Halpin (1958) and Griffiths (1959) embraced the physicist’s definition as appropriate for educational administration, Willower (1975) argued that Feigl’s definition was so rigorous that it excluded most, if not all, theory in educational administration. Willower (1975: 78) offered a more parsimonious definition of theory as “a body of interrelated, consistent generalizations that serves to explain.”

Willower anticipated problems with the movement; he was ahead of his time. Perhaps one of the reasons that the theory movement in educational administration declined as quickly and as completely as it did was that its exaggerated expectations of theory gave way to harsh realities of life. Educational administration is not physics, nor is it governed by a set of empirical laws. The social sciences will never be as consistent and accurate in prediction as the natural sciences; social life is too complex and changing. Yet, educational administration has the potential to become more systematic and informed by theory and research. That was Willower’s message: let administrative practice be guided by logic and evidence.

My first encounter with Don Willower was in 1960, he had been at Penn State for only a year and I was a beginning master’s student in educational administration. Just by chance, I was assigned his advisee—thereafter, I have never underestimated the power of luck. My first and last courses at Penn State were from Don Willower. He taught me many things both in and out of the classroom. I cannot recount all that I learned, but a few examples should suffice.

Scholarship and Research

Don Willower was a scholar par excellence. He lived the life of a scholar—reading, thinking, and writing. He was a prolific writer, producing nearly 200 articles in his four decades as a professor of educational administration. My introduction to Don as a scholar, theoretician, and writer came early in my career as I struggled and searched for a topic to pursue for my doctoral research. His advice was to read, but to read with purpose.

At the time he was doing a case study of a junior high school in central Pennsylvania (Willower & Jones, 1965). Yes, he was doing ethnographic studies long before they became fashionable. He shared the major finding of the study with me. Pupil control was the dominant motif and integrative theme that gave meaning to much of what was happening in the school. The saliency of pupil control was vividly demonstrated with a host of examples:

- a single roll of toilet paper padlocked and chained to the wall
- classrooms and offices were locked and unplugged in the interest of maintaining discipline.
- new teachers to show they could “handle” difficult students,
- cafeteria and assembly halls served as “proving grounds” for teachers and students to show students who were “the best teachers,”
- continuous, and often emotional, discussion about student discipline by teachers in the faculty lounge,
- widespread suspicion of teachers that the guidance counselor was undermining their authority,
- fear that the new principal would be weak on discipline,
- a single roll of toilet paper padlocked and chained to the wall

Ever the theorist, Willower asked for an explanation. He asked why was pupil control so important? How should we conceptualize pupil control? Those were two of the questions that framed our readings and sub-
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sequent discussions. They were theoretical questions, so we read theoretical literature.

Carlson’s (1964) theoretical analysis of service organizations was especially useful in explaining why control was so salient in schools. Schools, like prisons and public mental hospitals, are service organizations where clients have no say in their participation—they must participate; and the organization has no choice in selecting clients—they must take all clients. It is not surprising that in service organizations with mandatory participation and unselected clients, some participants may not want to take advantage of the services rendered; therefore, control is a problem. Indeed, control is a central feature of life in public mental hospitals and prisons, as well as schools. To be sure, there are dramatic differences among these organizations, but mandatory participation and unselected clients inevitably make control central in such organizations.

We were also confronted with the question of conceptualizing pupil control. We considered Etzioni’s (1962) notion of coercive and normative control; Lewin, Lippitt, and Whites’ (1939) authoritarian and democratic control; and Rotter’s (1954) notion of internal and external locus of control among others. Eventually we were drawn to the work of Gilbert and Levinson (1957) in their study of patients in public mental hospitals and pris-
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To be a successful professor is to write and publish useful work. Those who studied with or knew Don Willower got that message quickly. He led by example. There was never a time in my 40-year association with Don that he was not writing something. If it was worth doing, it was worth writing. He had a writing schedule. The last time I talked to him he had blocked out Tuesdays and Thurs-

He liked to talk about his professional sons and their students as part of an extended family. Only through his own intellectual ideas but also in terms of the contributions of his students, Don saw his students as family and their students as part of an extended family. He liked to talk about his professional sons and daughters, grandsons and granddaugh-

Don Willower was a gentle and caring teacher. He taught, as he did most things, by example. Expectations were high, but he never asked of his students anything that he was not willing to do twofold over. The focus of his teaching was on logic and evidence, the hallmarks of Willower the scholar and teacher. He expected thoughtful arguments buttressed by evidence, an expectation that intimidated some but challenged others. Although he did not suffer fools lightly, he was always willing to go the extra mile with all his students.

His care for his students was legend at Penn State. If you were lucky, as I was, to have Don as advisor, you could be sure you would get his attention and help. Turn in a chapter or two of your dissertation and you could be certain that he would read it, make comments, get it back to you, and discuss it with you within the week. He cared—students were important. Indeed the last week of his life he was busy reading and commenting on student dissertations.

He treated his students as junior colleagues. The culmination of their dissertations led to at least one joint publication, with Willower teaching us what was involved in successfully writing and publishing the results of our work. Another lesson that I learned early and follow to this day is to take the lead, as he did, in encouraging students to publish their work, and I am, as he was, a willing collaborator in that process. His concern for students, teaching, and learning is a gift he left to many of us.
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Our field and our profession are currently receiving an extraordinary level of attention. We witnessed an election in which education — its flaws, its future, and its funding — captured at least the rhetoric of both major political parties. All of us are aware of the renewed notice that foundations, states, and other interested parties are paying to education. There is a consensus that one of the roads toward improvement of American education is through educational leadership. And most of us would agree that the challenges facing American education in this new century have never been greater. At this moment it is imperative that we as educators, and UCEA as an organization, articulate our vision for what that new century for American schools should look like, and in particular, what our vision for the preparation of leaders and scholars in our field should be.

It is tempting as one prepares to address some of these pressing issues to search for some inspirational theme, vision, or title that would capture some of those exciting possibilities. But as I searched among all the clichés and hortatory rhetoric that we encounter on a regular basis, almost everything I found seemed wanting in some respect, at least until I encountered (through almost complete serendipity) a poem by the Nobel prize-winning Irishman, Seamus Heaney. In its lines will be found the explanation for my title—"The Heartland of the Ordinary: The Landscape of Educational Administration in the 21st Century.”

In the opening of his 1991 volume Seeing Things, Heaney imagines a ghostly encounter with the deceased poet Philip Larkin. As the poem begins, Larkin speaks, describing his own metaphysical journey in the world beyond. The ghost quotes a passage from Dante, saying:

‘Daylight was going and the umber air
Sothing every creature on the earth,
Freeing them from their labours everywhere.
I alone was girding myself to face
The ordeal of my journey and my duty’.....

But then Heaney surprises us. The journey for which Larkin girds himself—the ordeal of his duty—is not at all what we might imagine. The shade continues his description:

And not a thing had changed, as rush-hour buses

Bore the drained and laden through the city.
I might have been a wise king settling out
Under the Christmas lights—except that

It felt more like the forewarned journey back
Into the heartland of the ordinary.

A nine-to-five man who had seen poetry.’

(Seamus Heaney,”Seeing Things”)

A journey back into the heartland of the ordinary. Rather than conjuring together an image that connotes a voyage to an unseen and unknowable land, let us imagine that our endeavors in re-imagining schools and our roles in them are more like this: a journey back into the heartland of the ordinary. Like Heaney’s ghostly poet, we are ready to embark on new adventures—modern day Magi, out to discover a new and barely yet imagined world of educational possibilities and challenges. But we, too, are caught aback by the familiarity of this “new” terrain. Part of Heaney’s genius is helping us see that understanding the heartland of the ordinary is the daunting work of a lifetime, deceptively simple at first glance, but ultimately redemptive when our persistent gaze and reflection finally illuminates the reality before us. Through the ordinary things and experiences of life we begin to understand true complexity. And, paradoxically, only by encountering the ordinary can we ever glimpse that other world of possibilities that lies just beyond our vision.

Before I explore some of the possibilities of this image with you, I want to invoke another meaning of the word ordinary, one that resonates with a certain liturgical sensibility but is not relegated to any one denomination or tradition. In the Roman Catholic ritual of the Mass, the liturgical text is divided into two parts. The Proper of the Mass is that part that changes with the Feasts and Seasons. The Ordinary of the Mass is that part that remains fixed, i.e., does not vary in form from day to day. In this sense ordinary is not the mundane, but rather the constant that we know. It does not change, in other words, because it reflects an enduring truth or set of beliefs, which in this case is always embodied in the ritual.

To journey towards the heartland of the ordinary, then, is to embrace the enduring issues of our field and to wrestle with them anew. In imagining new schools, new purposes, and new possibilities for all children, we must not fail to encounter anew those truths, which have remained problematic for us precisely because they are so difficult. To name them mundane, uninteresting, or trivial is dangerous; to recognize them for what they are, and to probe their many layers, past familiarity into new insight and understanding, requires some courage.

And so I want to journey towards some hard truths and thorny issues that we must return to if we are truly “to build a newer world.” I offer then some highly selective observations about the ordinary truths of our field: first, about children and schools; second, about the profession of educational administration; and finally, about our own organization, the University Council for Educational Administration.

It is important to consider each of these issues given the many roles we all play here today. As scholars, we identify the questions that shape our own inquiry and guide the studies of the doctoral practitioners with whom we collaborate. As professors, we work with professionals who prepare for new leadership roles, and with them we engage the critical problems of practice that shape education. Finally, as members of the Plenum, we are stewards of UCEA,
an organization that summons our corporate strength to address these issues anew.

I do not presume to suggest that I have answers to the questions I am about to raise. But if I succeed in complicating the ordinary facts I am about to present, then my work is done here—because together we can navigate the next steps.

**American Education**

One of the most ordinary truths about American education is the fact that most children go to school. According to the National Center for Educational Statistics, at the present time about 95% of the school age population ages 14-17 are registered in school during that time of their life. What should we make of this most ordinary of facts?

At first, we may rightly ask what happens to the 5% of American children who are not in school, and appropriately focus our attention on the recurring issues of those who drop out of school. Probing these issues further, we would probably find that these dropouts are not evenly distributed, and that social class, race, and family circumstance both independently and interactively help to predict the likelihood that a given child will not continue to attend school during that time in their life. That realization is a critical guidepost for any renewal of schools for all children that we might imagine.

Another cut at this “simple” fact comes from a historical perspective. Again—according to NCES—the percentage of people in this age group attending schools (i.e., not necessarily graduating) in 1900 was 10% of the population. Forty years ago, at the height of post-Sputnik fervor, the figure was still only 86%. What does that tell us?

Certainly, our contemporary rhetoric about ‘failing’ schools—and any comparisons about the halcyon days of education mid-century—miss the fact that our supposed lag coincides with our attempt to educate the most inclusive population we have ever known in American schools. Schools must now be designed to meet the reality that gender, religion, race, ethnicity, disability, English language competency, or almost any other reason we can imagine does not preclude one’s right to receive a thorough and efficient education. It is not enough to counter assertions that schools once worked with the next question: Worked for whom? This ordinary realization also impels us to recognize that forms of education designed for the last century (which themselves were intended to address the ‘ordinary’ facts of relatively elite public education at that time) are not likely to work given the ‘ordinary’ facts of our present century.

There is a third realization that must be coupled with this ‘ordinary’ fact of universal attendance. A significant number of the children our schools educate are poor, more than ever before. According to the National Center for Children in Poverty, the number of children in poverty in the US increased from 10.3 million in 1979 to 13.3 million in 1998. Using the 1998 official poverty threshold of $16,600 income for a family of four, the National Center for Children in Poverty reports that the US poverty rate is currently 18.7 percent. While that rate is down from its all time high of 22.5 percent in 1993, NCCC also tells us that the progress “continues to lag well behind the decreases in the unemployment rate and the national welfare caseload.” Moreover, they continue, “there is also wide variation among the states in their current child poverty rates and trends in those rates over the past two decades.” In other words, only 12 out of 50 states looked better than the national average, 32 were at or near that national rate, and 7 were considerably worse, with upwards of a quarter of all families living in poverty in those states. In the District of Columbia, over 45% of families are living below the poverty line.

What are we to make of this? For one thing, I am not arguing that schools cause poverty, or that as institutions we have the resources to address the root causes by ourselves. As leaders and preparers of leaders, we are misguided if we allow ourselves or our students to neglect the larger causes of this problem that affects children’s life chances. But we are also mistaken if we think that high expectations alone can confront the pernicious effects of persistent malnutrition, high mobility, and stress that accompanies the life of poor kids.

I want to add a final “ordinary” fact. The schools, which we prepare our students to lead, have never been in worse physical shape. First apparent in cities where buildings are routinely more than 60 years old, the problem is now evident in the “baby boom” schools of more recent decades. Few problems are more difficult from a policy perspective, where we seem unable to marshal the enormous resources needed to rebuild our physical capital.

So now we have an ‘ordinary’ landscape of enormous significance for our profession. More children than ever before are attending schools that were organizationally designed for another time and which are often crumbling physically. More of those children than ever come to school without their basic needs met. Those and which are often crumbling physically. More of those children than ever come to school without their basic needs met. Those facts must be front and center in any reform or leadership preparation or program of inquiry we design. As inquirers, understanding the ways in which our educational institutions contend with these issues is critical. As leaders, we must balance a search for solutions and commitment to improvement with an informed advocacy rooted in this ordinary knowledge, an advocacy that continues to alert the broader spectrum of American society with those ordinary yet pernicious facts that we know to be significant in children’s lives.

**The Profession of Educational Leadership**

I want to turn now to another, very simple (yet I would argue) still stunning fact about the profession of educational leadership in the K-12 sector to which we all bear some commitment. According to NCES, the gender distribution of the teaching force is still overwhelmingly female. About 75% of the teaching force is comprised of women (a number that has risen from the level of 68% over the past four decades). But only about a third of all principals are female. In the superintendent, the figures are even starker. A recent survey of superintendents in New York, for example, showed that only 12% of the superintendents were female.

The racial composition of the educational leadership force is also relatively homogeneous. In that same NYS survey, 97% of the superintendents were white (recall this is a state with several large urban population centers). Using NCES figures once again, only 13% of the nation’s principals are people of color.

These numbers surprise few of us, although we might have imagined that the balance of women in administration might have shifted more by the year 2000. But here is another “ordinary” fact: our preparation programs are—and have been—majority female in many geographic areas. A recent report by the Harvard Principals Center states that 47% of the nation’s teaching force hold master’s degrees, many of which are in administration. Moreover, our prepa-
ration programs also include more people of color than ever before, although there is also wide variation on this dimension.

These two facts—preparation of more individuals who are female and/or of color to take on positions in a profession that by all statistics is overwhelmingly white and male—must be coupled with recent rhetoric about a lack of “qualified” candidates. When we put these ordinary facts together, it requires us to take a hard look at the intersection of our preparation programs and the realities of hiring and career advancement in our field. Are our candidates who look different perceived as “qualified”? If not, why not? Do they bring experiences that challenge dominant conceptions of leadership? As retirements loom, what are the critical ordinary facts to have in our vision as we inquire about the problem and collaborate with practitioners to design solutions to address it?

By now I hope to have achieved the goal of illustrating that probing the heartland of the ordinary is serious business that will keep us occupied as scholars, leaders and teachers.

UCEA

Finally, I want to turn to some ‘ordinary’ facts about UCEA.

Over 40 years ago, UCEA was founded as an organization by individuals situated as doctoral faculty in research universities. They were even then, a subset of the profession, committed, not only to improved preparation, but also to advancement of the field through the creation of knowledge. Inquiry has always been at the heart of most UCEA institutions, and today all of our universities profess scholarship as one of their key values. We understand, however, that knowledge is created in many ways. Ours is a scholarship that connects theory with practice, which looks to practice as a means of insight used ultimately for the betterment of schools.

But UCEA, like any organization, has also been a living organism that has evolved over time. In the late 80’s, the ongoing conversation about the relationships between preparation and the critical need for our institutions to both challenge and collaborate with the broader field took on an especially significant form in the National Commission’s report and the formation of the National Policy Board in Educational Administration. And it was at that time that this body wrestled with a set of standards, not only to guide criteria for membership, but also to benchmark ourselves against as we continue to inquire, to converse, and to collaborate.

That set of standards—which in their own way have become “ordinary” to us—are a kind of background music to our conversations as we identify and wrestle with what we might imagine to be new problems and issues. But every time I look at those standards anew, I am struck with how recurrent, how enduring the themes they encompass, and how central the questions they address are.

My selective perspective is that, at their simplest, they argue for institutions committed to some very simple things. They call for a critical mass of faculty committed (on a fairly intense basis) to scholarship, as well as to students, program activities, and collaborations with practice. They require a commitment to recruit and retain a diverse student body. They stress the importance of constructing relationships that extend beyond the requirements of degree programs to include collaborations with practitioners that reach throughout their career life cycle. They embody the realization that intensity in graduate study and deep connections to practice through internships are vital enough to command resources from universities as well as students. They impel the creation of a curriculum that reflects the best of what we know embodying critical analysis, inquiry skills, and a deep understanding of our knowledge base.

This is our “heartland of the ordinary,” and I would submit that this is terrain that we find both familiar and treacherous. Each one of these dimensions places its own demands, and taken together they form a rigorous and challenging package. But we do journey together, and UCEA is, and should be, the place where we continue to debate and discuss the enduring challenges we all face. How do we balance these commitments? For example, How do we balance between intensity (which may be traditionally defined as full-time study) and a diverse population (whose financial and family needs may differ from “traditional” students who can more readily defer income)? What have we learned about non-traditional arrangements of faculty or curriculum that hold some promise for realizing these goals? Where have we learned that the costs of compromise are just too great given the values we profess? What do emerging forms of inquiry and of professional practice have to bring to this discussion?

No conversation—however ordinary to us—is timelier, more complicated, or more important. We owe it to ourselves to acknowledge that we have learned much—sometimes from our mistakes—even though we still have much to learn.

For better or worse, as Heaney’s poet says, we are girded for a journey. Nothing has changed except us. We bring to this ordinary enterprise new insights and old understandings. We are still our old selves (most definitely ready to knock one back), and we are ready for our journey back into the heartland of the ordinary.
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Should demographic shifts alter the way we prepare school leaders? See Point-Counterpoint p. 10.
Thus far, however, the national attention given to school leadership preparation has been negative and narrow rather than generative and comprehensive. Committees and panels of policy makers, business leaders, funders, journalists, and education association leaders have made sweeping negative generalizations about current school and district leaders and about the inability of higher education-based educational leadership and administration programs to provide quality training, meaningful content, and relevant experiences to leadership candidates. Many have also asserted that alternatives to higher education are needed in order to prepare 21st Century leaders effectively.

Put simply, these assertions are not true. They appear to have been made with limited knowledge of educational leadership preparation programs and in the absence of educational administration faculty-scholars. There are more than 500 university-based educational leadership programs in the U.S. Although each of these programs has as its core focus the development of effective leaders for our nation’s schools, they have many differences. They serve different populations with various needs and interests. They have different delivery systems, resources, and expertise. The missions of their institutions differ. The current national discourse, however, does not reflect such contextual issues. This discourse also lacks a socio-political perspective of both school leadership and school leadership preparation. Professors of educational leadership and administration are acutely knowledgeable about these issues. These are areas where educational administration faculty could substantially contribute to the current national discourse. The absence of participants from the university community in recent national discussions seriously compromises the integrity of those discussions, as well as their content and proposed solutions. The absence of educational leadership faculty also serves to alienate key partners in the process of reform.

Interestingly, most of the people with whom I spoke (professors and association leaders alike) found the absence of educational administration professors in these discussions to be problematic. Adequately responding to the leadership needs of today’s schools and school districts is a complex undertaking and is dependent upon the collaborative actions of many stakeholders. This holds true for national, state, and local discussions and initiatives.

During UCEA governance meetings in Albuquerque, Plenum Session Representatives (PSRs) engaged in complimentary dialogues. They discussed the need for better representation of the university perspective in national discussions and the need for increased collaboration. These faculty-scholars of educational administration, who are constantly involved in research, teaching, and thinking critically about educational administration, reflected on the current context of school leadership preparation, identified important issues for UCEA and the broader field, and developed an ambitious list of possible future directions for UCEA and its member institutions. Their suggestions fell into fourteen general categories and included suggestions for research, program development, visibility and involvement, rapid response, communication, publications, career development, graduate student mentoring, and membership (a working draft of these suggestions will be available through the UCEA web site in February). Under the category on visibility and involvement were suggestions that UCEA proactively represent the university perspective, showcase innovative programs, rapidly combat misinformation, and work with other organizations like the
National Council of Professors in Educational Administration (NCPEA), American Association of School Administrators (AASA), American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP), Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD), National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP), among others on common agendas focused on educational leadership. PSRs, in collaboration with the UCEA Executive Committee, will be working from these suggestions as they create goals and set UCEA’s agenda for the next five years.

The development of UCEA’s agenda and future work will be an ongoing process with multiple opportunities for involvement. PSRs and Executive Committee members will be soliciting information from other faculty-scholars, holding generative discussions, and devising plans. UCEA will be facilitating this work and moving forward to develop stronger ties with other organizations, to ensure the voice of university preparation programs are represented at the national level, and to keep UCEA faculty informed of and connected to important educational leadership issues. Below, I share just a few of the activities UCEA will be involved in this year.

In September, UCEA in cooperation with the Johnson Foundation will convene a Wingspread conference focused on university-based leadership preparation programs. Specifically, conference participants will analyze the socio-political environment within which leadership preparation takes place, develop an understanding of the university’s role in and capacity to provide preparation for learning-focused leadership, and develop strategies for program development, implementation, and evaluation. This conference will not only provide an opportunity for multiple stakeholders (e.g., professional organizations, universities, business community, and government) to collaborate on critical issues, but it will also ensure that the voice of the university is well represented in this conversation. Findings and recommendations developed through the Wingspread conference will be widely distributed and built upon at subsequent and related meetings.

One organization with which UCEA has recently begun to work is the National Land Grant Deans Organization. UCEA was invited to work with their Focus Council on Leadership, a group concerned with the preparation principals and superintendents. Although UCEA’s work with the task force is still in its infancy, it is hoped that the agenda of this council will complement and perhaps even parallel the Wingspread conference. This would enable conversations generated through Wingspread to be continued at the Land Grant Deans’ meeting and then further developed at the UCEA Convention in Cincinnati. Participation in this focus council is an important opportunity not only because of its focus and its national character, but also because the council is made up of deans. Deans, as most of you are aware, are often key in the development and sustenance of stellar educational leadership programs.

The Land Grant Deans’ Focus Council on Leadership was developed to parallel a similar council created by the AACTE last spring. UCEA will continue to be involved with the AACTE council as well as other AACTE leadership focused initiatives. While I was in D.C., in fact, I talked in length with David Imig of AACTE about opportunities for UCEA-AACTE collaboration. I also talked with Gerald Terrozi of NASSP and Vince Ferrandino of NAESP and continued previous conversations with Joe Schneider of AASA about opportunities for collaboration with their organizations. Substantive opportunities are apparent, and each of these leaders agreed that necessary and positive change necessitated some form of collaboration.

Before closing, I will mention one more development. Since August of 2000, I have engaged in several generative discussions with representatives of NCPEA about areas of collaboration. We have been invited to co-sponsor the conference-within-a-conference with the NCPEA and AASA. This conference is held each year during the AASA annual convention. This year the convention will be held in Orlando, Florida from February 16-18. As noted in the previous UCEA Review, registration costs for professors have been reduced. Information about the convention can be found on the AASA web site which you can access from www.ucea.org.

As many of you have argued and as I asserted in the fall 2000 UCEA Review, we can and must contribute pro-actively and substantively to national, regional, and local discussions of leadership issues. But we cannot have a considerable meaningful impact if we try to do this alone. By building stronger ties with other national organizations, we can meet the challenges we are facing and continue to have a positive impact on schools and school leadership preparation. There is no question that we have a strong foundation to build upon. The questions are how will we proceed and in what way will each of us contribute?
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Kudos
Kudos to Barbara Jackson, Fordham University. Barbara was recently awarded The Teacher’s College Distinguished Alumni Award by Columbia University. As he presented Barbara with the award, the President of Columbia University, Arthur Levine, stated: “For more than forty years you have been involved in educating, administering, and evaluating programs, students, and educators in various capacities . . . we at Teacher’s College applaud your exemplary service to the field of education and honor you today for your role as a leader.” Barbara’s accomplishments are exceptional, and we heartily congratulate her.
Interview with 2001 UCEA President, Dr. María Luisa González
December 17, 2000

Interview conducted by Bonnie L. Kilmer

How did you become involved with UCEA?

I became a professor after spending nearly two decades with a border school district and another stint with a major urban center. When I moved to New Mexico State University in 1989, some of the faculty members attended the convention that year. I was not able to go, but I attended the following year and have not missed a convention since then. Because of my major career change I did not have the contacts that I saw other colleagues enjoying. It was a rough beginning for someone who did not know anyone and was not socialized in the UCEA culture. Fortuitously, I met Paula Short at the book exhibit in Minneapolis and then had coffee with her. Since that day she helped mentor me professionally. Through Nan Restine and Lynn Arney, I was introduced to many UCEA “regulars.” Subsequently we started an informal dinner group that would gather each evening after the sessions and share the events of the day. A few years later when I became a Plenum Session Representative it was a series of three presidents who set the tone of making individuals feel invited and accepted. They, alongside their Executive Committee members, created the type of atmosphere that made one feel needed and that one’s contributions were important.

What has been the most gratifying aspect of your involvement with UCEA?

The most gratifying part of my involvement has been the number of exemplary individuals whom I have met and now consider good friends. Also, UCEA set the parameters and expanded my perspective on what my role as professor of educational administration should be. The research and conversations in which I engaged were critical to understanding my professorial role in educational administration. My involvement definitively helped in my adjustment to a new career in mid-life. I have always been an active member of other national/international organizations, but no other has provided the same opportunities of bringing together the scholars and leaders in our field. UCEA provided me with the connections for furthering research and helped build my confidence that what we do as professors carries great impact into the world of practice. UCEA helps to shape us as academicians and strengthens what should be a continuous development of our professional spirit.

Discuss your current goals as UCEA President.

During this last meeting of the Plenum, extensive and intensive discussion took place. Guiding these discussions was a set of goals that included (a) enhancing the capacity to support research, (b) expanding the publications program, (c) increasing the positive impact on school leadership preparation, (d) improving the visibility of UCEA, (e) creating stronger ties within UCEA institutions, and (f) linking with other educational organizations. From this set of goals identification of possible directions for UCEA took place. The Plenum identified 13 possible future directions at the Convention. I will only state these, as continued discussion will take place over the course of the following months, with the goals projected to be finalized at the Plenum in Cincinnati. These directions are:

- Creation of a marketing plan,
- Promotion of research,
- Enhancement of annual convention activities,
- Publications to proactively address issues of policy and practice,
- Program development for improvement of preparation,
- Career development for professors,
- Expansion of program centers concept,
- Increase UCEA visibility and involvement,
- Enhancement of the web site,
- Increase opportunities for funding,
- Strengthen support of UCEA by deans and other administrators in UCEA institutions,
- Revisit membership criteria, and
- Build stronger ties with other educational organizations.

Clearly the Plenum raised some pressing questions, reviewed very direct goals, and developed challenging directions. The next steps might be to make some critical decisions about the priorities and define a reasonable time frame for their attainment. Therefore, my main goal is to support the review of these goals and facilitate open and inclusive discussion surrounding them to move our organization toward their accomplishment.

Another important goal is to support a smooth transition for our new Executive Director. This position is the engine of our Council. While presidents get to drive the UCEA “bus” for one year it is the engine that keeps us moving in positive directions. Therefore, my overarching goal is to collaborate closely with Michelle Young to see that what has worked positively for us in the past is continued and that we look closely at the current trends in our society so that we take positive steps in meeting the changing priorities of our educational landscape. The current context may lead us to define a new set of expectations and create a new list of priorities. Among these is the critical shortage of educational administrators who must be leaders in the schools, the new interest in assessing our preparation programs, and the changing face of our schools.

Another goal is to expand our sphere of influence by working within our own membership as we simultaneously work with external constituents. In order to work with our membership I need to clarify something. I strongly believe that we are THE learned society in educational administration but this statement carries a heavy responsibility. As a learned society our focus has been on leadership preparation. Many of our research topics deal with building community, engaging groups in collaborative efforts, building democratic schools, promoting diversity in educational systems, and the list continues. Thus, our own research provides us with examples of what needs to be done in these areas. As an organization we can put these recommendations to good practice. We become the exemplars of what we believe our schooling systems should be, based upon how our graduates impact educational systems whether they opt for school positions or become faculty members. Thus, as we practice the leadership we know works then let us build a community that fosters collaboration, respects democratic principles, and increases diversity within our Council.
To this end we must understand that the Council is more than the sum of those who hold leadership positions. Its strength comes from the Plenum and the faculty of our member institutions. We need to make clear to everyone that there are opportunities for active involvement, especially for those who seek more participation. Each of us has much to offer and it is this reservoir of talent that comes from our own constituents that we need to continually tap. We need to remember that there are those who are quite familiar with UCEA and its activities and there are others who are not. It is this group who also needs to feel invited. There has been discussion of creating a formalized mentorship process for professors at the different stages of their career and increasing student involvement. This might be a topic for future direction. As we talk of more participation and increased involvement then we must also talk about the composition of our membership—diversity.

Expanding the number of professors from underrepresented groups has been discussed ever since I became involved in the Council. We have had convention sessions dedicated to this concern and it continues to challenge the majority of our institutions. Yet, there are still very few professors who come from traditionally underrepresented groups. One compelling reason to study this issue is that academia can no longer represent a different face from the one that exists in the schools. Thus, as schools demand more and better prepared leaders to meet the needs of their ever-growing diverse student populations they are also asking that we prepare leaders who come from minority groups. As a professional organization we have been concerned about diversity, and in fact, one of our membership criterion calls for the recruitment of qualified students “including applicants from racial and ethnic minority groups and women.” One answer to becoming a more representative group may come from our work with our own students. Discussion of this issue as a major goal needs to take place. We need to assure everyone that UCEA is comprised of a diverse group of professors including those of varying philosophies, distinct backgrounds, divergent interests, and different races and cultures. It is this diversity that must be developed and maintained because it lends strength and gives us credibility in the field.

As we build on the leadership, involvement, and diversity of our own membership it is logical to expand outside the sphere of internal influence by thinking of the outside forces that tend to shape us. Our goals and our directions point to the call for expanded visibility and linkages with other professional organizations. An integral part of this activity is to call upon those members who are active in and at times may hold leadership positions elsewhere to assist us in making these linkages. I strongly believe that every educator, whether affiliated with UCEA or not, should know what UCEA is—this awareness begins with us, carried into our institutions, transferred to our students, and transmitted to other educational organizations. Over the past few months we have been moving toward this goal. Michelle Young has implemented the directions of the Plenum and increased communication among the member institutions and moved to better connect us with other key educational organizations and policy makers. As we move toward this increased national visibility, we must increase our international involvement as well. We cannot forget the place that internationalization plays in the strength of an educational organization. I hope that this year we can frame our discussions around a more global perspective of educational administration.

Share your professional goals and research interests.
Currently I am serving as academic department head, a position I have held for the past six years. A major project at our institution involves the redesigning of our K-12 preparation program with administrators in our surrounding area. We are following a planned process of curriculum changes whereby public school personnel will be involved in team-teaching some of our coursework alongside the professors. The plans also include professional development that will encompass educators from the classroom through the central office. One district is so committed to the plan that they have dedicated financial support to our program. The most gratifying piece of this project is engaging in true partnership with individuals who are in the schools and in university classrooms trying to make changes at both ends of the educational continuum. My main ambition is that we will be able to implement the plan to improve our leadership preparation specific to meeting the needs of children in border areas. This work will be useful to other areas of the nation for the schools in border regions have continually faced a conglomerate of challenges that plague urban as well as rural areas.

I continue my research on the education of marginalized groups, including (a) homeless children, (b) children of undocumented workers, (c) students for whom English is a second language, and (d) administrators leading the schooling efforts of these students. I have attempted to raise the awareness level of timely topics and impact policy. One project that encompasses these interests is my current research on principals who are leading programs in Two-Way Dual-Language programs. The research project began last year from funding by the New Mexico State Department of Education. The project brought together researchers from three of the state institutions to study the schools that began implementing the Two-Way Dual-Language Program five years ago. Each researcher studied a specific component of the project. While one looked at the acquisition of both the English and Spanish languages, another looked at classroom strategies, and I worked on the impact that a principal’s leadership plays in the success of these programs. This comes at an especially critical time as many schools across the nation are confounded by the contradictions in the research related to language teaching. Based on our preliminary findings and on other landmark studies, the best method to reach our students who come with languages other than English is to implement a strong Two-Way Dual-Language Model. However, while research continues to focus on the impact of classroom instruction when it comes to bilingual education I continue to find that a major piece to the success of these programs lies in the hands of the principal. Therefore, I will continue to study how preparation programs can develop school leaders to meet the needs of a diverse student population. Whether we are border, urban, suburban, or rural educators, our leaders must be prepared to lead programs that successfully educate students from diverse socioeconomic statuses, cultures, languages, and exceptionalities.
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Point: Success for All Children . . .
As professors of educational administration who train future leaders for K-12 school systems we must be mindful of how we conceptualize and structure our principal preparation programs. Given the myriad of societal and educational issues and problems that school systems, and thus principals, often face today, it is important that principal preparation programs provide both theoretical and practical knowledge and experiences that are relevant to schools in general, and to specific social, cultural, and demographic contexts in certain types of school systems.

The changing demographics of public school systems have become an issue that we can no longer afford to ignore as we prepare future leaders. While the educational system in general, and school districts in particular, have historically served primarily white, middle class children, the rapidly changing demographics of schools, and particularly large urban school districts necessitates that we re-examine our administrative preparation programs.

The purpose of this essay is to consider how current principal preparation programs can and should train future leaders to meet the needs of all children, particularly the increasing numbers of poor and minority children who attend public schools today. Specifically, I will discuss the need to reconsider both ideological frameworks on which principal preparation programs are based and the content of the courses that make up principal preparation programs.

The Changing Landscape of Public Education
The landscape of public education is rapidly changing. Nationally, African-Americans, Latinos/as, and American Indians make up one-third of the 54 million children in K-12 classrooms (Education Week, March 15, 2000). Currently, Latino/a students represent one of the fastest growing populations in schools. The United States Department of Education (1996) reported that in 1993 the Latino/a student population was 13% nationally. It is expected that by the year 2020, Latino/a children will represent over one quarter of all public school students (Reyes, et al. 1999). In addition, in the largest states such as California and Texas, students of color are already the majority. The percentage of students who are from poor families is also increasing. Reyes, et al. report that “In 1984, one in five children lived below the poverty line . . . . in 1990, one in four children under the age of six, nearly five million children, were in families living beneath the poverty line” (Reyes, et al., p. 192). Pallas, Natriello, and McDill conclude “the single most important factor in the school-age population of the future is the expected increase in both the number and proportion of disadvantaged young people” (quoted in Reyes, et al., p.193).

From a leadership perspective, the single most important factor is the lack of success of leadership programs to prepare leaders who will be successful in serving the increasing numbers of poor and minority children–children who have been and continue to be under-served in public school systems (Skrla, et al., 2000). Thus a key question which must be raised is: Are current leadership programs designed and intended to lead to successful outcomes for all children including low-income children of color, or do these programs continue to emphasize models of leadership which rely more on traditional theories of educational leadership and fail to provide practical application and experiences which are necessary in order to meet the social, emotional, and academic needs of all children?

Leadership Preparation Programs Past and Present
Leadership preparation programs have not changed dramatically over the last half-century. As McCarthy (1999) has noted, “Units engaged in significant programmatic changes, while increasing in number, still must be viewed as outliers” (p. 135). Typically, administrative preparation programs are similar in philosophy and content. For example, most programs include courses such as Introduction to Leadership/Administration, School Law, School Finance, School Personnel, the Superintendent, and Internship. Recently, more principal preparation programs have added courses which focus on race and/or multiculturalism in schooling. In addition, many state departments of education have developed principal standards. For example, the Louisiana Board of Elementary and Secondary Education has endorsed the Louisiana Task Force Standards for School Principals (1998) which is used as a guide in principal preparation programs in colleges and universities in Louisiana. The Interstate School Licensure Consortium for School Leaders (ISLLC) is another example of a set of standards which are being used in several states to guide the philosophy and content of administrative preparation programs. Beginning with the words “A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by . . . .” each of the six standards are completed by giving a description of a principal. For example, ISLLC Standard Six reads as follows: A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context. In addition, the standard is expanded to define what knowledge the principal should have, what beliefs and values (dispositions) the principal should have, and what activities (performances) the principal should engage in and facilitate.

The principalship program at my own institution requires thirty-six hours of course work made up of the following courses: School Leadership, School Law, Governance and Organization of American Schools, School Community Relations, Supervision of Instruction, Educational Research, A Foundations of Education Course or Contemporary Urban Education, Foundations of Curriculum Development or Elementary or Secondary Curriculum, School-Based Management, School Improvement, Elementary or Secondary Principalship, Internship in Educational Administration.

From a philosophical standpoint our program represents a rather traditional approach to educational administration. It combines traditional theories of educational administration (for example, Hoy
and Miskel, 1996) with more recent theories (for example, Sergiovanni, 1994 and Bolman and Deal, 1997). Philosophically, the program is designed for the “ideal” leader; that is, there is an assumption that all of our students will become principals in an “ideal” school where there are a majority of white, middle class students, where the majority of the teachers are certified, where there is an abundance of resources, and where external factors such as poverty and crime have little or no bearing on how the school functions and thus how the principal leads. From a course content standpoint, each professor in the department brings to the classroom his or her own experiences, values and vision of what educational administration/leadership should be; in the classroom, professors conceptualize and teach their classes based on their own specific ways of knowing. Clearly our epistemological stances affect what and how we teach. While our collective intent is to prepare future leaders for a range of administrative tasks which will promote the success of students, the content of our courses (i.e., course syllabi, textbooks, supplementary readings, class activities, assignments) reveals our individual and specific views about what we believe principals should know. As the coordinator of the graduate program at my institution, I have two major concerns: (1) Is the current program relevant to the context of the school districts that we serve, one of which has a 99% African-American student population, and (2) is the content of the courses more than sufficient to prepare leaders who will work in buildings where there are a majority of poor and minority children, where there are few resources, and where there are a number of uncertified teachers. Given the very strong emphasis on student achievement (standardized test scores), does our program provide courses and course content which prepare future principals to work toward the success of all children?

While the ISLLC Standards consistently use the words “success of all students,” I am concerned that many of our administrative preparation programs are not conceptualized from a “success for all students” framework. And it is interesting that ISLLC Standard Six uses the words “social, economic, and cultural context,” for given the rapidly changing demographics of school systems, I am concerned that these terms are only being given superficial attention in our preparation programs. I am also concerned that as a field of study and as a body of knowledge, administrative preparation programs still fall short of addressing the most fundamental inequities in our educational system: the pervasiveness of racial and economic isolation which directly affects the quality of education that millions of poor and minority children receive and which continue to leave these children under-served and under-educated.

We Do Have Choices

As we re-examine the role of the profession and our individual and collective roles as professors of educational administration, we must ask ourselves the following questions: Should we continue to train future leaders using traditional models, which are non-inclusive, and prepare principals for an “ideal” school? Or should we train future leaders to work toward the success of all children by addressing the problems that plague schools, and particularly those schools that serve large numbers of poor and minority children, and to work toward solutions to these problems?

If we choose to take the first path and continue an exclusive emphasis on traditional models, I fear that we will continue “to get what we have been getting”—too many principals who are overwhelmed with the social, racial, cultural, and economic differences that poor and minority students bring to the educational setting and the under-achievement of many of these students. Should we choose to continue the exclusive use of traditional models, then I fear that we will continue to produce principals who are either reluctant, or refuse, to implement change because of an over-dependence on theory over practical applications of the knowledge they have acquired. This over-dependence on theory instead of practical application is often held at the expense of poor and minority children.

For example, current instructional strategies presume that African-American children are deficient, thus principals may be caught up in constantly trying to find the right strategy or technique to deal with and control low-performing African-American students (Ladson Billings, 1998). Traditional theories of educational administration also often reinforce the false rhetoric that “constructs children of color” as “less than interested in and less capable of learning” (Scheurich, 2000). The over-dependence on traditional models limits the opportunities for K-12 leaders to serve poor and minority students who lack “cultural capital,” (Anynon, 1997; Kozol, 1991) which, for the most part, defines success in schools.

If we choose to take the latter path and choose to train future leaders to work towards the success of all students, we must be willing to re-think our course offerings, and more importantly, the content of these courses. Will we continue to base all of our teaching on theory and ignore the realities of schooling: violence, racial inequities, and external factors such as poverty? Or, will we make the effort to go into the schools, identify the problems, and work with our students in developing courses and course content which are intended to strengthen the principal preparation program, provide relevant content knowledge, and make our primary goal the preparation of principals who will serve all students? The voices and the experiences of the students themselves should provide a foundation for some of what is taught in courses. We should not be reluctant to learn from our students who usually come from a variety of school districts. My own students come from five parishes (school districts), which are very different socially, culturally, economically, racially, and politically. Consequently, it is imperative that I avoid teaching “an ideal version of leadership.” Rather, I need to know who my students are, where they work, and what their realities are. I need to visit schools in each of the parishes, and I need to listen to and learn from the students who work in the schools and to welcome and respect their individual and collective knowledge bases. As I stated earlier, many of my students work in a district which is 99% African-American. Many of the students in this district come from low-income families and would be considered students who lack cultural capital. In very specific ways, I must address the realities of being a leader in this large urban school district. I have an obligation to help future leaders consider how their realities are. I need to visit schools in each of the parishes, and I need to listen to and learn from the students who work in the schools and to welcome and respect their individual and collective knowledge bases. As I stated earlier, many of my students work in a district which is 99% African-American. Many of the students in this district come from low-income families and would be considered students who lack cultural capital. In very specific ways, I must address the realities of being a leader in this large urban school district.
ius have developed innovative internship programs (for example, the University of Texas at Austin), other programs are typical of the traditional model of an internship program. That is, the internship experience is unstructured and the student is, in many instances, a “part-time” intern. In the absence of any specific agreements between school districts (and in some cases, the state department of education), the internship experience is reduced to doing busy work, filling in where needed in the building, and shadowing the principal only during the student’s planning period. In addition, in internship models where the student is not released from his/her teaching duties, there is usually little or no input from the principal regarding the specific duties the intern will perform and the intern’s progress over the course of the internship assignment. The collaboration between the school district and the university is important because it not only represents a commitment to a quality internship experience, but it also assures some level of accountability on the part of the intern, the principal, and the school district. The internship also provides an opportunity to assess the student’s strengths and weaknesses (as well as the strengths and weakness of the internship course). Since the purpose of the internship is to expose interns to as many administrative tasks in a school as possible and to draw on the expertise of the supervising administrator, it is imperative that the intern be released from his/her teaching duties. The internship should be one of the focal points of a principal preparation program, and it should be structured to assure maximum success for the intern.

I am not suggesting that we abandon traditional educational administration theory in total. Indeed, it has been useful in the past and continues to be useful in the sense that it allows us to determine how traditional theories and models can be improved given the current needs in our public school systems. However, given the changing demographics as well as the changing imperatives of schools (safe environment, funding, standardized testing), we need to re-examine our programs and hold ourselves accountable for the success of all children. As professors of educational administration, we cannot de-emphasize our own roles in transmitting knowledge and shaping the values, beliefs, and behaviors of future leaders. The ISLLC standards are a first step, but like much of the traditional theory, the standards are somewhat general and do not address the specific issues of racial, economic, and educational inequity. While one might argue that not all children attend public schools in urban districts, most poor and minority children do attend urban schools. In addition, it has been my experience that the majority of my students assume their first administrative position in the same urban school districts in which they teach.

Conclusion

In this essay, I have argued that we can and must do more to prepare future leaders who will work in urban systems. The changing demographics of our public school systems necessitates that we re-think what and how we teach. In addition, we must begin to assess what our graduates know and how they can use what they know to educate all children. The changing demographics tell us that the faces of the students in our school buildings will look different, the voices will speak different languages, and the cultures will not be like that of the disappearing majority. The school-age populations, which will make up our future workforce, are waiting for a proactive response from us. How will we answer?
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Counterpoint: . . . Reforming Again, Again, and Again

As we enter the real new millennium, with UCEA under the leadership of a new executive director, perhaps it is only natural for us to begin by re-examining the core of our profession: the preparation of leaders and administrators for our schools. Such discussions inevitably lead us to question the adequacy of university-based preparation programs, and rightly so. Just as inevitably, however, such discussions often lead to calls to substantively reform, even completely overhaul, our preparation programs, particularly in light of some recent, imperative developments—in this case societal and demographic changes (Reyes, Wagstaff, & Fusarelli, 1999).

It is true that major societal and demographic changes have occurred in the U.S. population in the past fifty years, and many of these trends are predicted to continue well into the twenty-first century. For example, income inequality continues to increase, and the gap is not expected to narrow for the next several years. The nation’s economic base has shifted, with rapid job growth in the service and information technology industries; job security is a thing of the past, and job retraining now the norm. The traditional nuclear family has been supplanted by the more diverse families of today. The youth population has steadily risen since 1985, boosting student enrollment and creating pressure on the already overburdened public school system. Immigration levels remain high, with the strong U.S. economy continuing to attract peoples from throughout the world. The ethnic composition of the student population continues to change—becoming increasingly diverse and impover-
ished (Pallas, Natriello, & McDill, 1995). Finally, the gap in student achievement and differential dropout rates continues to persist among different ethnic and socioeconomic groups, and in some instances shows signs of widening.

In light of these societal changes and demographic trends, the challenges facing educational leaders are great indeed. The operative question for those who prepare educational leaders, however, is to what degree, if any, changes need to be made in administrator preparation programs to meet the needs of a changing society. While in some cases revisions need to be made to make individual programs more effective, it will be argued in this essay that calls for major substantive revisions or a complete overhaul of university-based preparation programs are unnecessary, even misguided. Five major points will be made in this article:

- **Yeast, demographics are changing, but that is nothing new.** Demographics are always changing in a pluralistic nation such as the United States.

Most educators are poor historians. A common error is the tendency to lapse into what I call “the fallacy of presentism”—the tendency to see recent events as somehow new or radically different from the past. The United States is one of the most ethnically and culturally diverse nations in the world. Waves of immigrants have entered the country throughout the past two hundred years. A review of data collected over the past century by the National Center for Education Statistics reveals near constant change in the ethnic composition of the U.S. population. Immigration to the U.S., always high, spiked twice in the last century—between 1900-1910 and 1980-1990 (Huelskamp, 1993). The changing ethnic composition of the student population is not a recent phenomenon. In fact, it has been in a state of constant change for at least the past forty years. Preparation programs throughout the country regularly address these demographic changes and their impact on education.

- **Calls for revising, reforming, and reinventing our administrator preparation programs in light of changing demographics are similarly not new. In fact, in the past two decades, educational leadership programs have been in a near constant state of revision.**

The release of Leaders for America’s Schools by the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (UCEA, 1987) heralded what Jacobson (1990) calls the third wave of reform: reforming administrator preparation. Since that time, universities through the country have reformed their preparation programs, many with assistance from the Danforth Foundation, placing greater emphasis on school leadership, curriculum and instructional issues, university-school district collaboration, and making preparation programs more relevant to the demands of school administrators, particularly through more effective internship experiences and problem-based learning activities (Erlandson, Skrla, Westbrook, Hornback, & Mindiz-Melton, 1999; Forsyth, 1992; Fusarelli & Smith, 1999). Calls for substantive reform of our preparation programs simplistically ignore the major changes and improvements in administrator preparation in the last two decades.

- **Most current preparation programs are more alike than different.**

While individual differences in course title and sequence are common, administrator preparation programs are more alike than different. Most require some knowledge of school structure and organization, finance, law, and governance. Within the past two decades, increased emphasis has been placed on developing an instructional component, often coupled with an emphasis on supervisions and “best practices,” coursework emphasizing sensitivity to ethnic and cultural differences is common, and recent revisions to preparation programs include greater emphasis on psychology. Internships are required in nearly all programs. Individual differences among programs tend to reflect faculty interest and expertise more so than substantive differences in educational philosophy or vision. The increased emphasis on national and state accreditation standards will serve to further align preparation programs in the coming decade.

- **Calls for substantive change ignore the knowledge base in educational administration as well as the cumulative wisdom of academics and practitioners who created the programs we currently have.**

Calls for completely overhauling our preparation programs imply that past programs were, at best, inadequate, at worst, complete failures. This makes professors of educational administration look like cheap hack—bumbling incompetents who don’t know what works or what is effective. This indictment of the field ignores the fact that through experimentation and frequent revision, current preparation programs are built upon the knowledge base in educational administration, as well as reflect the cumulative wisdom of practitioners and academics (many of whom have served in both roles) (Donmoyer, Imber, & Scheurich, 1995; McCleary, 1992). Wholesale substantive change in the way we prepare educational leaders suggests that this knowledge base is faulty.

While conversations over facets of the knowledge base are important, it should be pointed out that no other professional field routinely undergoes such “reform contractions” as educational administration. Perhaps, indeed, there is no knowledge base in educational administration—damning indictment of departments of educational administration. Or perhaps those who came before us, those who helped create preparation programs, were stupid, inferior, and out of touch with reality (odd for a field initially developed by practitioners). Before we engage in the common educational practice of reforming again, again, and again (Cuban, 1990), perhaps we need to examine more carefully the impetus for reform and the effectiveness of our current preparation programs. In some circumstances, change may be good, but we should never assume that wholesale change in our administrator preparation programs is always good or better than current efforts.

- **If anything is in need of reform and overhaul in our preparation programs, it is how we select students for admission into leadership preparation programs.**

The most overlooked facet of university-based preparation programs is how students are selected and admitted into the programs. While most universities exercise great care and diligence in admitting students for doctoral study (many personally interview applicants for admission), admission procedures and requirements for the vast majority of students in preparation programs at the masters/professional diploma/advanced certificate level are notoriously low. Few universities require applicants to take the GRE or MAT. Perhaps this is a good thing, since school administrators who take the GRE score higher only than candidates in home economics, physical education, and social work (UCEA, 1987). Fewer still bother to interview prospective students. Why? Perhaps faculty find doctoral students more interesting. Perhaps doctoral students make better research assistants. Or perhaps faculty are less willing
to make an investment in selecting students who will take, at most, two years of coursework and then are finished with the degree. Doctoral students, on the other hand, seldom complete their dissertation within three or four years after beginning their program of study, and only under the close supervision of faculty. And doctoral students are a useful resource--permitting faculty to further their own research agendas.

Perhaps admission standards to master’s level university-based preparation programs (such as for the principalship) are lower because the large numbers of students in these programs represent the cash cow, the bread and butter, of our business. Universities may be nonprofit institutions, but schools of education are not. If schools of education had to rely exclusively on doctoral students as their major source of revenue, most educational administration programs would go belly-up. As a result, while maintaining high standards of admission for doctoral study, standards of admission for preparation programs are allowed to lapse. In conversations with faculty of several top-ranked departments of educational administration, the oft-expressed sentiment was that admissions standards are incredibly low. A faculty member at a reputable UCEA institution commented that “anyone with a pulse and a checkbook” could gain admission into an administrator preparation program. There is something seriously wrong with this approach. As Griffiths, Stout, and Forsyth (1988, p. 290) noted, “Lest some think too much emphasis is placed on the intellectual criterion for educational administrators, they should be reminded that there are no recorded examples of good dumb principals or successful stupid superintendents” (cited in Jacobson, 1990, p. 35). “Quite simply, for too many administrator preparation programs, any body is better than no body” (Jacobson, 1990, p. 35).

Usually, the argument is made that there are far too many applicants, the programs too large, and the faculty too busy to interview would-be principals and administrators. This means that the vast majority of students in our preparation programs are self-selected, or, at best, encouraged by their supervisors or school districts to obtain administrator certification. If they meet often-minimal qualifications, they are admitted to principalship programs. The financial benefits to the university are obvious, and the commitment by department faculty is minimal--a win-win situation for everyone, except, of course, the schools these oft-unqualified students are subsequently allowed to lead.

In fact, a solid argument could be made that we should exercise greater care in selecting candidates for administrator preparation programs than in selecting candidates for doctoral study. Most programs that offer doctoral degrees in educational administration are filled with practitioners seeking to become superintendents. While important, superintendents are few in number, have shorter tenures, and tend to have less direct impact on education and students than either teachers or building-level administrators. We have our admission priorities backward.

We cannot hope to effectively produce leaders for tomorrow’s schools--leaders prepared to tackle the challenge of school improvement amidst demographic and societal change--unless we first address the issue of how students are selected into administrator preparation programs. A few universities, such as the University of Texas at Austin, have undertaken efforts to more carefully select candidates for preparation programs; unfortunately, such efforts remain the exception to the rule.

Conclusion: What We Ought Not Do
Should we be vigilant in reviewing, monitoring, and reforming our administration preparation programs? Of course. Should we be aware of changing demographics and engage in critical reflection on whether our programs meet the needs of students, producing the best possible leaders for our schools? Of course. Should we also completely restructure our preparation programs in light of recent demographic changes? Should we ignore the knowledge base and cumulative wisdom upon which our programs are based? Should we, in effect, throw the baby out with the bath water? No, of course not.

What We Must Do
Joe Murphy has called for a reorientation of educational administration with a focus on school improvement. At a recent AERA symposium, his proposal generated vociferous debate, with particular divisions drawn along the lines of concerns for social justice and diversity--suggesting that efforts at school improvement are somehow incompatible with social justice and diversity. To many practitioners, this “debate” is largely miscast and overdrawn. It represents a false dichotomy (or trichotomy). First, school improvement should always be the focal point of our profession. It is the raison d’etre of our field and the major, overriding concern of practicing school administrators. Second, issues of social justice and diversity are part and parcel of efforts to improve schools. School improvement absent such emphases isn’t really school improvement. Given the chronic difficulty of schools and society to improve the educational outcomes of certain groups, particularly poor children, any effort at school improvement must, by necessity, include efforts to close the performance gap between different ethnic and socioeconomic groups. By definition, therefore, school improvement promotes social justice and addresses diversity concerns. Although education is a notoriously faddish field, we must never lose sight of this objective.

Also, we must redouble our efforts to make research relevant to practice, thereby bridging the schism that led to criticism of preparation programs as being irrelevant to the needs of the field. One way to make our preparation programs more relevant and effective is to more actively involve current practitioners in program planning and instructional delivery--since the most damning criticism of preparation programs is that they are chock full of faculty who have limited, if any, practical experience in public schools (particularly recent experience). To do this, we must develop more collaborative partnerships with school districts--involving practitioners in the actual design of our preparation programs. By combining instruction by university researchers and practitioners, we can blend effectively research, theory, and practice--producing students who are critical thinkers, adept problem solvers, and able leaders.

Finally, we must continue our efforts to restructure clinical experiences, working in partnership with districts to provide substantial release time for interns, and making the internship a central component of our preparation programs, rather than an afterthought as is all-too-often the case (Fusarelli & Smith, 1999). As an applied, professional field, we need to offer diverse clinical experiences throughout a student’s program of study. If we continue with these program modifications, many of which are well underway, we can build upon past success while effectively preparing educational leaders for tomorrow’s schools.
I close with a tribute to Don Willower that I made at his funeral this past January 19, 2000:

To Don’s family, I can only say what you all know. Don Willower was a great man. He was proud of his son, John, and daughter, Ann; he spoke to me often and with great pride about both of you. To Catherine—you know that you were the light of his life. His years with you were happy, active, and fulfilling ones. I grieve with you this morning as we recount our fondest recollections of a wise and caring man.

I knew Don for a long time—he was a good friend and colleague for nearly 40 years. He was my mentor at Penn State, and I am not alone in that honor. Donald Willower also was a mentor, teacher, and dissertation chair for nearly 100 doctoral students during his four-decade career.

Don dedicated his entire adult life to education. He was a professor without peer—a reflective teacher, a thoughtful scholar, and a prolific writer. He was my model of a professor. He gave no thought to retirement because he loved what he did, and he did what he loved—reading, thinking, writing, and teaching.

Permit me one story about Don Willower the teacher. I have told this story on several occasions—so you may have heard it—but it is worth telling again because it is true, ro-
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**NASSP Bulletin To Be Peer-Reviewed**

The NASSP Bulletin, a publication of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, recently adopted a peer review format and will place more emphasis on research and scholarship that supports data-driven decision making among principals. The May issue will focus on how principals can reexamine their use of time, facilities, and human resources to improve student learning. The guest editors of this issue are seeking 4-5 articles of about 3-4,000 words. For more information about this issue, contact Professor David Conley, guest editor of the issue, at (541) 346-6155 or at conley@oregon.uoregon.edu. For other Bulletin issues visit http://www.principals.org/news/05.html for submission guidelines. To offer your services as a referee, please contact Bulletin editor, Amy Ciliberto, at cilibertoa@principals.org.
bust, and catches the humor and wit of Don in the classroom.

When I was a beginning student at Penn State in 1960, I took a seminar from Don, "Dynamics of Organizations." There were about ten of us in the class, which was mostly discussion on theoretical issues in schools. I recall vividly, one class in particular—early on in the course. Three or four of the students were from South America. On this particular day, Don opened up the seminar with a brief observation about the readings for that day and one of the South American students launched into a long complicated question. The student had a heavy accent and spoke very rapidly. The whole time I kept thinking to myself—there is no way Willower understands the question. I certainly didn’t have a clue. Yet he was listening attentively, smiling, and nodding his head. The question finally came to an end. Without so much as a pause, Don said, "I am glad you asked that question—it is an important one. Mr. Hoy what you think?" I don’t remember my answer, but I do remember his question.

I don’t think that Don personally knew Ralph Waldo Emerson, but Emerson must have known Don. Emerson’s "The American Scholar" captured the spirit of Don Willower the scholar—in these words:

Free should the scholar be—free and brave . . . for fear is a thing which the scholar, by his very function, puts behind him . . . . The office of scholar is to cheer, to raise, and to guide by showing us facts in the midst of appearances.

Don Willower is recognized as one of the world’s leading authorities on educational administration; his work and scholarship were anchored by two principles: logic and evidence. He was a man of science fearlessly “showing us facts in the midst of appearances.”

I can testify to the influence of Don in my own career. My father was a superintendent. I went to Penn State to become a superintendent of schools as well, but I left as a Professor of Educational Administration. That transformation was a function of Don’s influence. He made the field of educational administration an intriguing and intellectual challenge. I acquired a fascination for theory, research, and knowledge, and because of Don, the abstract world of ideas became as exciting to me as the pragmatic world of action.

Life is always too short, but Don Willower lived his life unselfishly, with compassion, love, and honor. I will never forget him. He was my friend, my colleague, and my mentor. Words cannot contain my love and respect. There was, there is, no stronger professor, no better person.

More than two thousand years ago the poet Sophocles wrote, “One must wait until the evening to see how splendid the day has been.” We who were privileged to know him and be his friends can take comfort that Don Willower—in the rich midst of appearances.”
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Donald J. Willower was a Distinguished Professor of Education at Pennsylvania State University. In Penn State’s Department of Education Policy Studies, he was twice educational administration chairperson, twice acting head of the Division of Education Policy Studies, and acting dean of the College of Education. He was a Kellogg Fellow in educational administration and the social sciences at the University of Oregon and served on the National Commission on the Preparation of School Administrators of the AASA. Willower was twice elected to the Board of Trustees of UCEA, including a term as president, and he was a member of its National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration. His publications, which numbered over 200, dealt with schools as organizations and with philosophical issues in educational administration. His credits include several prizes for best publication and UCEA’s Roald F. Campbell Award for Career Achievement.

NCATE Update
In May 2000, the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA) created a committee with representatives from each NPBEA member organization to revise the NCATE standards for educational leadership program accreditation. This group updated the standards and aligned them to the ISSLC standards. The draft, completed December 8, 2000, was distributed to the NPBEA Board of Directors. At the December NPBEA meeting, the board voted to distribute the draft for public comment.

The standards document is divided into: 1) NCATE Program Standards for Educational Leaders, 2) Program Matrix, and 3) Program Assessment. You are invited to provide comments and suggestions for further revision. A copy of the draft has been forwarded to all UCEA Plenum Session Representatives (PSRs). An electronic version of this draft will soon be distributed to all UCEA faculty members through the new UCEA Listserv, and it will be made available through the UCEA web site.

The deadline for public commentary is March 15. UCEA will be providing an official response during this time period. Please forward your remarks to the UCEA office and/or Honor Fede (e-mail) of AASA/ELCC. Your comments will be considered by the NCATE revisions committee, and, subsequently, the new standards will be constructed. Please contact UCEA if you have any questions about this process.
Exceptional University Programs
George J. Petersen, UCEA Associate Director, with the assistance of the Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis Faculty at the University of Missouri-Columbia

Over the past decades several educational reform reports have underscored the importance of changing and enhancing educational leadership preparation (Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986; Holmes Group, 1986; NCEEA, 1987). These reports clearly articulate the strategic role and importance of university leadership programs and their impact on the quality of learning and development experienced by children in schools. Many of the leader preparation programs in the UCEA university consortium have taken these reports seriously. They have re-examined what they do and made substantial strides in shaping their curriculum and programs to meet the needs of their students and successfully prepare leaders and scholars for the new millennium. Seldom are we presented with the opportunity to highlight the gains and achievements of our member institutions. In this and subsequent issues of the UCEA Review we will share with our colleagues the strengths and innovations of UCEA programs in preparing leaders for service in school districts, professional organizations, and higher education.

Because of the unique relationship between UCEA and The University of Missouri-Columbia’s Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis (ELPA), we have chosen to feature MU in this issue. ELPA is one of five academic units within the MU College of Education. The ELPA department offers graduate programs in four areas—K-12 educational administration, higher and continuing education, educational policy studies, and educational leadership. Recently, ELPA’s graduate programs were ranked among the top 25 in the country (Administration/Supervision—17th and Higher Education and Administration—23rd) in the most recent U.S. News and World Report Rankings of Graduate Schools (2000). The K-12 educational administration and educational leadership area offers a master’s, specialist, Ed.D. in Educational Leadership, and a Ph.D. in Educational Administration. All of these programs emphasize the application of theory and research to the practice of administration in K-12 schools. They also prepare students for teaching, research, and administrative positions in higher education. The curriculum are integrated, thematically driven, and have a problem-based orientation. Current research and theory inform instructional approaches about professional learning.

ELPA has made substantial changes to its programs using the recommendations of the 1989 National Policy Board’s Improving the Preparation of School Administrators as a framework. For example, in 1995 ELPA abolished its traditional master’s degree program in educational administration. In 1999, the department, in collaboration with other departments in the College of Education, designed and implemented a master’s degree program with an emphasis on learning and instruction (MLI) and a concentration in educational administration. The MLI curriculum is integrated around important skill dimensions (e.g., learners and learning, school culture, assessment, empowerment, organizational management, reflection, and diversity) that prepare individuals for the complex responsibilities of leadership positions. At the conclusion of the program, students are eligible for initial principal certification.

The educational specialist (Ed.S.) program in educational administration is a collaborative, integrated course of study focused on building leadership and is enhanced by technology. During the specialist program students establish formal partnerships with school districts, participate in site-based seminars, and conduct applied research. Along with the course work, students also participate in an intensive and meaningful internship in the public schools. These internships are designed to focus on the current working life of practicing administrators and take an active interest in problem solving activities at the local district. The Ed.S. program prepares students for advanced principal certification.

One of the most innovative developments in doctoral curriculum and delivery at MU occurred in 1997. ELPA, in collaboration with several Missouri institutions of higher education, the coordinating board of higher education, and the Governor’s Office, launched an interdisciplinary Ed.D. program in Educational Leadership that has been showcased at numerous national research and professional meetings. The program’s strengths are its collaborative design for curriculum planning and delivery, its orientation in preparing individuals to confront the complexities of daily practice, and the integration of a thematic and problem-based curriculum. Faculties collaborate as program instructors and dissertation advisors with students across the state.

Both the Ed.S. and Ed.D. programs have been changed from open enrollment to cohort programs, and the instruction, program delivery, and assessment are enhanced through state-of-the-art technology. The MLI program offers students the opportunity to earn their master’s degree primarily through web-based instruction. The Ed.S. and Ed.D. programs are also supported by the use of web-based and interactive technological instruction. ELPA offers a Ph.D. in three emphasis areas—educational administration, higher and continuing education, and educational policy studies. The Ph.D. in educational administration emphasizes research and theory.

The ELPA K-12 faculty is involved in research and service. The research interests include the study of professional learning of teachers and administrators, superintendent-school board relations, middle level leadership, instructional leadership of school administrators, school empowerment, collaboration in higher education, educational program planning and evaluation, parental involvement, equity in leadership policy, school-community relations, k-12 school violence and prevention, migrant education, professional learning communities, teacher empowerment and leadership, and school culture. Faculty is also involved in leadership in national organizations such as UCEA and the AERA.

The Department sponsors several national and state initiatives and serves as home for major national professional associations. These include UCEA, the Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE), the National Basic Schools Network, the University of Missouri System Consortium for Educational Policy, the Middle Level Leadership Center, and the Missouri North Central Association Office.

We would greatly appreciate hearing about the strengths and innovations of your program.

Please contact the UCEA office.
Cincinnati is Site of UCEA Convention 2001

The University Council for Educational Administration’s 15th annual convention will be held at the Omni Netherlands Plaza in Cincinnati, Ohio, on November 2-4, 2001. The convention will open at 8:00 a.m. on Friday, November 2, and close at 12:00 p.m., Sunday, November 4. The purpose of the convention is to engage participants in discussing research, policy, and practice with a specific focus on educational administration and educational administration programs. The 2001 theme is “Leadership and Learning for the Success of All Children.” Members of the 2001 Program Committee are Gail Furman, V. Darlene Opfer, and Linda Skrla. The University of Cincinnati will be hosting convention 2001.

Gail Furman-Brown Voted 2001 UCEA President-Elect

Gail Furman-Brown was voted UCEA president-elect at Convention 2000 in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Furman-Brown is an associate professor and program coordinator of Educational Leadership for the College of Education at Washington State University (WSU). She received her Ph.D. in Educational Administration from WSU in 1989. While a doctoral student, she first became involved in UCEA as a presenter and as managing editor of Educational Administration Abstracts. Prior to joining the faculty at WSU, she was a K-12 special education teacher and administrator in Washington State, and earlier in Virginia, where she earned her master’s degree in special education from Radford University and her bachelor’s degree in biology at George Mason University.

At WSU, Dr. Furman-Brown has been instrumental in the redesign of administrator certification and degree programs. In recent years, she led the faculty in the revision of the principal certification program around new state requirements and helped to launch a new “Field-Based Principal Certification Program,” taught collaboratively by WSU faculty and K-12 administrators. She has been a proponent/designer of a state-wide Ed. D. program to be coordinated across WSU’s multi-campus system. She received the Faculty Excellence Award in Research from WSU’s College of Education in 2000.

Dr. Furman-Brown has been active in UCEA—her “professional community”—for over 10 years. She has served as a member of the Executive Committee for the last two years, WSU’s plenum representative since 1995, program co-chair for the 1998 convention in St. Louis, a faculty member for the David L. Clark Graduate Student Symposium at AERA 2000 in New Orleans, and on the advisory committee for UCEA’s Center for School Site Leadership. In addition to her work with UCEA, Dr. Furman-Brown has been active on the editorial board of Educational Administration Quarterly and in AERA, serving as a section chair for the Division A program in 1999.

Dr. Furman-Brown’s scholarship focuses on the concept of schools as communities. Her current interest is exploring the theoretical linkages across community theory, leadership theory, democracy, and ethics. Her work on school community was recognized with the 20th William J. Davis Memorial Award for her article, “Postmodernism and Community in Schools: Unraveling the Paradox,” which appeared in the August 1998 issue of Educational Administration Quarterly. She is the editor of a forthcoming book from SUNY, School as Community: From Promise to Practice, and co-author (with Carol Merz) of Community and Schools: Promise and Paradox (1997). She served as guest editor of a special issue of Educational Administration Quarterly on “School as Community” (February, 1999) and has published articles in Education and Urban Society, the International Journal of Educational Management, the Journal of Reading, and Urban Education, as well as chapters in several edited books.
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UCEA Seeks Culbertson and Campbell Award Nominations

Jack A. Culbertson Award

At the discretion of the review committee, this award is presented annually to an outstanding junior professor of educational administration, in recognition of his/her contributions to the field. Individuals nominated must have been professors for six years or fewer, and currently serve in a UCEA university. Nominations must be received no later than May 15th.

Roald F. Campbell Lifetime Achievement Award

UCEA instituted this award 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. The award recipients are selected by the UCEA Executive Committee. Donations to the Campbell Award Fund are tax deductible. Nominations must be received no later than May 15th.

Please visit the UCEA website at http://www.ucea.org/awards for more information on each of these awards. (e.g. selection criteria, deadlines, history, etc.)
Convention 2000 Highlights

UCEA’s annual convention was held this past year at the Hilton hotel in Albuquerque, New Mexico. The convention was co-hosted with the University of New Mexico and New Mexico State University. This convention was the most heavily attended to date. Registrations exceeded 500 for the first time in the convention’s history, up nearly 15% from last year in Minneapolis. Many more graduate students were in attendance than at previous conventions. The convention theme “Schools, Leadership, and Democracy in the New Millennium” was intended to spark thought about the issues that those in the field would face in the upcoming years.

This year the convention featured three lecturers. Tsianina Lomawaima, University of Arizona, delivered the opening lecture entitled “Diversity, Humanity, and Educational Opportunity.” The Mitstifer Lecture, sponsored by Pennsylvania State University, was delivered by Marta Tienda, Director of the Office of Population Research at Princeton University, and was titled “Minorities in Higher Education: Troubling Trends and Promising Prospects.” William F. Tate, a scholar in residence at Dallas ISD, closed out the convention with his speech, “From Ivory Tower to Inner City: Lessons from the field in Science, Mathematics, and Technology Education.” All of these General Sessions were well received.

The 2000 Convention featured, for the first time, an International Scholar’s breakfast. This meeting offered an opportunity for scholars from the United States, Canada, and overseas to converse about issues they face in each of their different geographies. Betty Merchant, UT-San Antonio and Roberta Derlin, NMSU, organized the event.

Although the room was small, the past president’s reception on Friday evening was heavily attended. This reception provided opportunity for attendants to network and relax after the first full day of sessions. This reception honored and celebrated the contributions of UCEA’s 39 past Presidents. 1999-2000 UCEA President Mary E. Driscoll, the UCEA Executive Committee, and the UCEA staff hosted the event.

All graduate students at the convention were invited to attend the Graduate Student Symposium. Gary Ivory of NMSU, John Mondragon of UNM, and Vita Saavedra of UNM convened the event. There were several topics of discussion: “Nuts and Bolts of Finding a Faculty Position” by Scott Mcleod of UC, Ohio; “Negotiating Your First Academic Position” by Alan Shoho of UT-San Antonio; “Expectations at Different Types of Universities” by Donald Hackman of ISU; “Research on the Transition from School Administration to Academe” by India Broyles and Kenneth Nye of USM; “Bridging Academe and the Real World of the Schools” by Khuala Murtadha of IU; and “Surviving in the World of ‘Publish or Perish’” by Mario Martinez of NMSU.

Those who attended the banquet on Saturday night were treated to both pre and post dinner entertainment, an element not found at previous convention banquets. The pre-banquet entertainment featured the Ballet Folklorico, a dance group composed of students from the Albuquerque area schools. Several awards were given at the banquet including the Program Center Awards, which recognized the efforts of several of UCEA’s Program Centers. The Paula Silver Case award, an honor to the most outstanding article in the online Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership; the Jack A. Culbertson award for an outstanding junior professor; and the Roald F. Campbell award for Lifetime achievement were also given. A special award was also presented to Richard Hatley to recognize his efforts as UCEA’s Interim Executive Director. After the dinner and award presentations all convention attendants were invited to a dance which featured the music of Ysleta Poor Boys.

The exhibit hall was again a success. This year’s exhibit hall featured a few exhibitors who either had not attended a UCEA conference in the past, or had not attended in several years. The exhibit hall allows conventioneers to browse books and speak directly with publishers about the newest titles to hit the shelves.

UCEA’s 2001 Convention will be held November 2-4 at the Omni Netherland Plaza in Cincinnati, Ohio. The convention theme will be “Leadership and Learning for the Success of All Children.” The event will be co-hosted with the University of Cincinnati. More information and proposal submission forms for the 2001 convention can be found on page 22-23.
Maiden Receives 2000 Culbertson Award

Jeffrey Maiden (University of Oklahoma) was chosen as the 18th recipient of the Jack A. Culbertson Award. He was honored at UCEA's 2000 Convention for his outstanding contributions to the field of educational administration. Maiden was nominated by Grayson B. Noley (University of Oklahoma). The award was presented by James R. Yates (University of Texas-Austin) during the Convention banquet.

Jeffrey Maiden was nominated for his considerable contributions to research in educational finance, his course development in educational technology, and his revisions to the Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) program at the University of Oklahoma. Furthermore, Maiden provides advancing leadership qualities in his teaching and offers exceptional guidance and mentorship to his doctoral students.

Maiden’s initial research area within educational finance has been in fiscal equity. And while he continues to publish in this area, Maiden has broadened his research into the fiscal effects of educational reform. He has published articles that include “An Examination of Fiscal Effects of Statewide Education Reform on Oklahoma School Districts” in The Journal of School Business Management and “Financing Statewide Education Reform in Oklahoma” published in Educational Considerations. In addition, Jeffrey has published articles on his examinations of the effects of textbook adoption processes on funding reform and the effects of class size restrictions on the adequacy and equity of state education funding.

Maiden has also shown concern for reform in educational technology. As well as being a research interest, Maiden has developed a new course at the University of Oklahoma titled Technology in Educational Administration. This course is offered online, so it provides participants first hand experiences of using technology. The course focuses on preparing future administrators to utilize technology for administrative duties as well as facilitate its use among faculty and staff.

In order to combine educational research and organizational leadership, Professor Maiden has led the development of a major revision to the Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) program. The new Executive Ed.D. doctoral program is a three-year cohort for full-time administrators or teachers who seek preparation for executive level leadership positions. The program is designed to link research and leadership by providing courses such as statistics for practitioners, politics, and policy development.


Cunningham receives 2000 Campbell Award

Luvern L. Cunningham (University of Akron) was chosen as the 8th recipient of the Roald F. Campbell Lifetime Achievement Award. Cunningham has been a research professor and university administrator for more than thirty-five years. Cunningham received his B.A. from Midland Lutheren College, his M.Sc. from the University of Nebraska-Omaha, and his Ed.D. from the University of Oregon. He began his career as a teacher, principal, and superintendent of three school systems in Nebraska. He served as Dean of the College of Education at Ohio State from 1967 to 1973. Prior to that, he was the Director of the Midwest Administration Center at the University of Chicago. He held professorships at the University of Chicago and the University of Minnesota before joining The Ohio State.

Cunningham’s research concentrations include the governance of education with emphasis on policy development and analysis. His other research and scholarship interests include the American school superintendency and interprofessional education and practice. He is a co-author of Organizational Control of American Schools, 1990 with over six editions published. Cunningham has lectured and served as a consultant throughout the United States and in other countries. His books monographs, and research reports are widely used by students and policy makers.

Cunningham has become closely identified with the problems of urban education, and his professional activities include the Executive Directorship of the San Francisco Public Schools Commission and the Detroit Education Task Force. He also served as the Special Master Commissioner of the Columbus Public Schools desegregation case. In addition he has provided professional services to the
Luvern Cunningham (left), University of Akron, received the 2000 Roald F. Campbell Award for Lifetime Achievement. The award was presented by William Boyd (right), Pennsylvania State University.

Seashore and Smith Receive 2000 Silver Award

The 2000 Paula Silver Case award was given this year to Karen Seashore, University of Minnesota, and BetsAnn Smith, Michigan State University.

Seashore and Smith’s case, “Changes at Big Mountain High School,” is intended to foster discussion of some of the most common and stubborn dilemmas faced by high school teachers and administrators. The case asks how teachers and administrators should be involved in decision making; how curriculum should be developed; and what roles should teachers, department chairs, and administrators play in stimulating change. Depending on the interests of the group, a discussion of what should a “rigorous curriculum” look like and what is the role of electives versus required courses in the high school curriculum could also be stimulated.

Karen Seashore received her doctoral degree in sociology from Columbia University, and she has worked in a variety of policy research and academic settings over the past 15 years. Most of her research and consulting has focused on how to improve schools through organizational design and development, research utilization, and better planning and implementation processes. She is currently an Associate Professor in the Department of Educational Policy and Administration at the University of Minnesota.

BetsAnn Smith received her Ph.D. from the University of Minnesota. She has worked with several national research centers studying urban school reform, school organization, restructuring, student achievement, and teaching as a profession. Smith has conducted and authored extensive research on Chicago school reform and is involved in the longitudinal evaluation of the Chicago Annenberg Challenge. Her current research interests focus on theories and models of urban school development.

The Silver award is given annually to the author (in this case authors) of the most outstanding case published in the last volume of the UCEA Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership. Nominations for the Silver award are now being accepted. Please contact Gary Crow (gcrow@gse.utah.edu) or see the UCEA website for more details.

See the enclosed insert (blue) for more information on the current issue of the Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership, and visit the UCEA website at http://www.ucea.org/cases/index.html

St. Louis, Chicago, Cleveland, Dallas, Kansas City, New Orleans, Omaha, Philadelphia and Seattle school districts, many colleges and universities, state boards of education and state departments of education. He was one of the lead consultants to the Task Force on Education Reform in Kentucky and has been called upon by the Texas Education Agency to serve as a Monitor for the Dallas, Texas Board of Education. Dr. Cunningham completed a study of education and other human services in Ohio for the Governor’s Education Management Council and the Ohio Department of Education. He has also served as a consultant to the Ohio Department of Education for the Cleveland desegregation case and in the development of the Urban Schools Initiative. Cunningham directed the Ohio Commission on Interprofessional Education and Practice and was the chair of the National Consortium on Interprofessional Education. As a senior faculty at the Mershon Center at The Ohio State University he concentrated upon leadership development for school superintendents and school board members.

He has received many awards most recently the 1999 Ohio Pioneer in Education Award from the Ohio Department of Education and jointly with his wife and partner, Lila Carol, the 1999 Buckeye Association of School Administrators Presidents Award for strong leadership and quality education.

The Roald F. Campbell Lifetime Achievement Award was instituted by the 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 celebrates the remarkable pioneering life of Roald F. Campbell, whose distinguished career spanned many years and exemplified these characteristics.
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The 2000 Paula Silver Case award was given this year to Karen Seashore, University of Minnesota, and BetsAnn Smith, Michigan State University.

Seashore and Smith’s case, “Changes at Big Mountain High School,” is intended to foster discussion of some of the most common and stubborn dilemmas faced by high school teachers and administrators. The case asks how teachers and administrators should be involved in decision making; how curriculum should be developed; and what roles should teachers, department chairs, and administrators play in stimulating change. Depending on the interests of the group, a discussion of what should a “rigorous curriculum” look like and what is the role of electives versus required courses in the high school curriculum could also be stimulated.

Karen Seashore received her doctoral degree in sociology from Columbia University, and she has worked in a variety of policy research and academic settings over the past 15 years. Most of her research and consulting has focused on how to improve schools through organizational design and development, research utilization, and better planning and implementation processes. She is currently an Associate Professor in the Department of Educational Policy and Administration at the University of Minnesota.

BetsAnn Smith received her Ph.D. from the University of Minnesota. She has worked with several national research centers studying urban school reform, school organization, restructuring, student achievement, and teaching as a profession. Smith has conducted and authored extensive research on Chicago school reform and is involved in the longitudinal evaluation of the Chicago Annenberg Challenge. Her current research interests focus on theories and models of urban school development.

The Silver award is given annually to the author (in this case authors) of the most outstanding case published in the last volume of the UCEA Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership. Nominations for the Silver award are now being accepted. Please contact Gary Crow (gcrow@gse.utah.edu) or see the UCEA website for more details.

See the enclosed insert (blue) for more information on the current issue of the Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership, and visit the UCEA website at http://www.ucea.org/cases/index.html
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Call for Proposals
UCEA Convention 2001
“Leadership and Learning for the Success of All Children”
Cincinnati, Ohio November 2-4, 2001

I. General Information The 15th annual convention of the University Council for Educational Administration will be held at the Omni Hotel in Cincinnati, Ohio. The convention will open at 8:00 a.m. on Friday morning (November 2, 2001) and close at 12:00 a.m. on Sunday (November 4, 2001). The purpose of the 2001 UCEA Convention is to engage participants in discussing research, policy, and practice in education with a specific focus on educational administration. Members of the Convention 2001 Program Committee are Gail Furman (Washington State University), V. Darlene Opfer (Georgia State University), and Linda Skrla (Texas A&M University).

II. Theme
The 2001 convention theme, Leadership and Learning for the Success of All Children, acknowledges the importance of leaders in the learning process. Few in the educational administration field would argue that learning and success for all children should be at the center of our research, policy analysis, and practice. Despite decades of research and successive waves of school reform, however, the connections between the scholarship and practice of school leadership and learning in classrooms remain unclear and contested. Likewise, there is little consensus on and much critique of definitions and measures of “learning” and “success.” The resolution of these issues is of crucial significance for the educational administration profession as the 21st century begins. Escalating federal, state, and local accountability initiatives now require school leaders to demonstrate increasing student achievement, often on standardized tests. Concurrently, proliferating racial, cultural, socioeconomic, and linguistic diversity demand that school leaders and those who prepare them rise to the challenge of creating schools in which successful learning for literally all children is a reality. The context created by the requirement of increased student achievement and a more diversified student body raises a number of questions for research, practice, and preparation of school leadership:

- What are the relationships between leadership practice and student learning?
- How do we prepare school leaders to promote learning and success for all children?
- What are appropriate definitions and measures of “learning” and “success”?
- What roles should social justice and educational equity play in defining and measuring learning and school success?
- What research is needed to help us understand the connections between leadership and learning?
- How do we establish standards and accountability for programs that prepare school leaders?
- How do we develop and mentor educational leadership professors for programs that focus on learning and success for all children?
- How are practicing school administrators best engaged in their own learning in order to promote success for all children?
- What are the political and policy implications of leadership that promotes learning and success for all children?
- What are the roles of other educational stakeholders (e.g., parents, communities, businesses) in supporting leadership for student learning and success?

Submissions are encouraged that respond to these critical questions. Proposals that focus on the connections between leadership and learning from a broad and inclusive range of approaches are especially welcomed.

III. Session Formats and Proposal Requirements
The 2000 UCEA Convention will include a variety of session formats that facilitate dialogue. Proposals must include a cover sheet and summary (3 pages or fewer and purged of author identification). Send 6 copies of the proposal, only 3 with cover sheet.

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. Presenters will be allotted approximately 20 minutes each. A discussion leader will be assigned to facilitate dialogue during the final 30 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. Conferences. 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 in educational leadership. The proposal summary should describe the focus and purpose of the session and the format(s) used to engage participants.

5. Point-Counterpoint Sessions. Point-counterpoint sessions are intended to stimulate review, debate, and discussion around a specific and current issue of controversy related to the field of educational leadership. The proposal summary should describe the focus of the session, the competing or opposing points to be presented, the format in which the various points of view will be aired (e.g., debate format), and opportunities for audience participation. Session organizers are expected to chair the session and facilitate discussion.

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 the proposed presentation; (3) theoretical framework, methods, and analysis (for empirical research); and (4) the format of the session (for symposia, conversations, roundtables, and point-counterpoint sessions).

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 7, 2001.

Send proposals to:
UCEA Convention 2001
University Council for Educational Administration
205 Hill Hall, Columbia, MO 65211-2185
Proposal Cover Sheet
2001 UCEA Convention
Cincinnati, Ohio
November 2-4, 2001

DEADLINE: MAY 7, 2001

1. Proposal Title: ______________________________________________________

2. Preference (please check): ( ) paper ( ) symposium ( ) conversation ( ) roundtable ( ) point-counterpoint

(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: ______________________________________

ii) Name: ______________________________________
Affiliation: ______________________________________
Address: ______________________________________
City: ___________________State______Zip______
Phone: ___________________Fax________________
E-mail: ______________________________________

iii) 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:

v) 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 25 copies of the paper (or prepared remarks for symposia), and a 25 word abstract (must be electronic, preferably in MSWord, SimpleText, or Notepad) for the UCEA website.

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 Omni Netherland Plaza (513) 665-2377 or Fax (513) 564-6408. Arrangements and payment for other equipment are the responsibility of individual users. Individuals whose paper proposals are accepted agree to provide 25 copies (paper or diskette) at the presentation.

PROPOSALS MUST INCLUDE SIX (6) SETS OF THE FOLLOWING:
1. Proposal cover sheet(Only 3).
2. Summary of three pages or fewer (without any author names for blind review).

Send proposals to: UCEA Convention 2001
University Council for Educational Administration
205 Hill Hall
Columbia, MO 65211-2185
Contributing to the UCEA Review

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

C. John Tarter
School of Education
St. John’s University
8000 Utopia Parkway
Jamaica, NY 11439
e-mail: ctarter@aol.com
FAX: (718) 990-6096

Elton Boone provides the editing and layout for the Review. If you have any suggestions for future issues or comments on current ones, please contact him at the UCEA office.

Elton Boone
UCEA
205 Hill Hall
Columbia, MO 65211-2185
boonee@missouri.edu

2001 Calendar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 26-28</td>
<td>UCEA Executive Committee Meeting</td>
<td>Omni Netherland Plaza, Cincinnati, OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 29</td>
<td>Deadline for nominating students for the David L. Clark National Graduate Student Research Seminar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 16-18</td>
<td>Conference Within A Conference</td>
<td>Orlando, Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>David L. Clark National Graduate Student Research Seminar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 15</td>
<td>Deadline for nominations for the Culbertson, Campbell, and Silver Awards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 7</td>
<td>Deadline for submitting proposals for UCEA Convention 2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>National Policy Board in Educational Administration Meeting, Washington, D. C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>UCEA Executive Committee Meeting</td>
<td>Omni Netherland Plaza, Cincinnati, OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>UCEA-Johnson Foundation Wingspread Conference, Racine, WI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1-2</td>
<td>UCEA Governance Meetings</td>
<td>Omni Netherland Plaza, Cincinnati, OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1-2</td>
<td>UCEA Convention 2001</td>
<td>Omni Netherland Plaza, Cincinnati, OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1-2</td>
<td>UCEA Graduate Student Seminar</td>
<td>Omni Netherland Plaza, Cincinnati, OH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

UCEA Staff
Michelle D. Young ........... Executive Director
George J. Petersen...............Associate Director
Elton R. Boone ........... Assistant to the Director
Lisa C. Wright, CPA ......... Financial Director
C. John Tarter ................... UCEA Review
Jeffrey A. St. Omer ........... Graduate Assistant
Charles Kuan-Yao Chiu ....... Graduate Assistant
Bonnie L. Kilmer .......... Graduate Assistant