Cutting the Gordian Knot of Educational Administration: The Theory-Practice Gap
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The theory-practice gap stands as the Gordian Knot of educational administration. Rather than be cut, it has become a permanent fixture of the landscape because it is embedded in the way we construct theories for use. As such we can expect continued and harsh criticism regarding the “lack of reality” in our preparation programs (see Imig, 2001). Our influence will continue to diminish as we are incapable of producing research that predicts, let alone explains, leadership. Consequently legislators and practitioners will continue to try to by-pass the courses and curricula within the university structure as irrelevant to producing either school leaders or school reform.

One of the historic hallmarks in developing theories is to determine their capacity to predict novel events. Lakatos (1999a) has made the development of such theories the center of his idea of a truly scientific research program. Social science theories, especially in educational administration, have been notoriously weak in the area of prediction. In fact they have been so incapable of engaging in robust prediction that Lakatos (1999b) commented that they were “on a part with astrology…” (p.107).

Exhibit 1 presents Lakatos’s (1999b) major criticism of social science theory. The typical research approach used in social science and many educational administration research studies is to:

1. engage in observation of some phenomena first hand or to perform a literature review.
2. select those variables, concepts, constructs or ideas that appear to have some promise, usually defined as explanatory power. These are then:
3. set into an hypothesis within an explicit or implicit theoretical frame(s); 
4. A new data set is then produced via a “study.” After an analysis of variance or some other test of statistical significance, 
5. correlations are run to ascertain if these concepts do in fact “explain” the relationships and “support” the original “facts.” High correlations are supposed to be indicative of the essential “correctness” and hence “truthfulness” of the theory or aspects of the theory apprised by the research. However, 
6. the correlations are simply the same terms, concepts or facts aligned to one another.

This approach in theory construction and use has been called “inductivism” by Lakatos (1999b, p. 36). It contains a logical flaw. “[A] fact may not be used twice, first in the construction of the theory and subsequently in support of it” (p.111). The practical outcome is that such theories that employ the same facts twice are believed to be promising because they have been shown to be highly correlative. However, since they have been apprised by no independent measure(s), they have no capability to predict anything not included in the original data field. The reason as Lakatos (1999b) observed: 
...[I]f the way the theory has been arrived at is relevant in appraising its worth, then the very notion of empirical support is heuristics-dependent” (p.112).

A variation of this procedure occurs when a researcher uses a specific theoretical frame to select their data or concepts to be tested from either observation or a literature review. However, when the researcher takes the concepts and applies them to a new data set using the statistical analyses to “prove” or “verify” the efficacy of the theory itself, its principal concepts have simply been inter-correlated.

I cite here two examples of research at last year’s AERA meeting in Seattle. The first was “The Interaction of District Interventions with Organizational Learning Processes at the District Level” (Elliott, 2001). In this case, a “conceptual framework” was devel-
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Logical Flaws in the Construction of Social Science Theory Based on Inductivism (from Lakatos 1999)
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The organizations were even if one didn't know what they were. A circular definition was offered that developed, which was drawn from the literature results:

A "learning organization is where people continually learn how to learn together" (p. 3). Ten school systems made up the sample gathered. The researcher commented on the conclusion reached in this study was: "In public school districts? (2) What are the structure, content and strategic roles of internal (intra-organizational) networks of public school districts?

Network theory "suggests that both the structure and content of networks can provide valuable insights to the strategic roles of both the individual actors and the network as a whole" (p. 2). Establishing the conceptual framework, a "learning organization" is defined as containing "organizational networks" that may influence "organizational strategic competencies" (Hite, Williams & Baugh, 2001, p. 7). In other words, all of these terms are synonyms. A good example of this phenomenon is that "bidirectional" is defined as being a "pair" involved in an administrative network. The correlational table in the report showed that "pairs" were correlated with "bidirectional" at .86, which was statistically significant at the .05 level. It was also highly correlated to "ties" (another name for pair and bidirectional) and "size" (when defined as a pair and bidirectional).

The findings of this study? "...[T]he analysis found that the proposed network boundary of public school administrators provided a relevant and well-perceived network. Members of the network were easily identifiable and were aware of each other" (Hite, Williams, & Baugh, 2001, p. 22). This second study, as well as the first, made no attempt at prediction using their data or theories. These studies are essentially self-fulfilling prophecies, examples of Bertrand Russell's VCP (vicious circle principle), which stated that a subset of a larger set cannot be used to define the set itself (Russell, 1908, p. 63). Lakatos's (1999b) observation simply shows we cannot test facts nor assess the rigor of theory by correlating it with its sub-components.

Perhaps the best indicator of the paucity of most social science theories in educational administration to offer much to the practice field is their incapacity to predict the known, let alone the unanticipated. One reason is that social science theories are regressive, that is, they fall behind anticipating facts and events. When the unanticipated or unforeseen occurs, the theory has to be patched up to continue to work at all, or the theory is dismissed as only correlative. Correlative theories include school climate and the "effective schools" research.

Exhibit 2

A Regressive Research Approach in Which Practice Runs Ahead of Theory Produces the "Theory-Practice Gap"
Exhibit 2 is based on the work of Lakatos (1999a) in which he shows that a progressive or scientific research program runs ahead of known empirical facts and predicts them.

The theory-practice gap is a direct result of continuing to use inductive methods in creating theories for use in studying schools and the practices in them. The creation of progressive or scientific theories in educational administration, where prediction runs ahead of practice, are not likely to come about under the way theories are constructed or currently applied in much of the present research.

Cutting the Gordian Knot means creating theories that are not grounded on being shown to be true by high intercorrelations as subsets within larger sets illustrative of Russell's VCP. In the natural sciences this has meant the creation of deductive theories that are not dependent upon the same empirics for validation as for creation and that predict novel events or facts, which were not used or known in their development. To undertake this task, educational administration as an applied discipline must free itself from two of its most staple root disciplines: organizational sociology and behavioral psychology. Such a move would reverse a forty-year dependence that began with the theory movement in the late fifties.

Finally, the fashionable antidote among practitioners and some of their organizations to the theory-practice gap has been to urge more emphasis on application in the form of fieldwork and the internship. This is wrongheaded. The theory-practice gap will be removed when we construct different and better theories that predict the effects of practice. Otherwise, all field experience is reduced to "practicing practice" (O'Neill, 1981, p.28) or as John Dewey (1963) observed that experience obtained without the benefit of being placed within a larger plan [theory] was "wholly in the air" (p.28).
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Professors of Educational Administration: Learning and Leading for the Success of ALL Children
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Welcome to the annual convention of UCEA. Our theme for this year is Leadership and Learning for the Success of All Children. What more appropriate theme could we have than combining leadership, our major premise, with a focus on what preparation ensures success for every child? My personal experiences as UCEA president, as a former Pk-12 educator and as a professor for the last twelve years will be shared today.

Twelve years ago, I felt the same way that many of you are probably feeling, not knowing anyone or just a few people. Little did I know that a while later, I would be addressing you as the president of this most distinguished consortium of educational administration professors. UCEA has afforded me the opportunity to make connections. I have been fortunate to interact and tap into the support of other colleagues at the national level. Now, as a full professor, this yearly reunion provides me with continuous reality checks that the work we do is connected with children.

The two main areas I will cover today are (a) a concept of professors of educational administration as borderlanders and (b) a description of how we as university professors play a role in leadership. While we preach leadership we oftentimes forget our roles as leaders.

In order to focus on the children in Pk-12 classrooms and our location in higher education settings, I propose the need to negotiate borders, not simply cross them. Because there are numerous kinds of borders, we are all borderlanders living on borders. It is up to us to transform borders to better meet the needs of each side, with one goal in mind, for all of us, it is children.

To best illustrate this concept, I will borrow from the work of a well-known Chicana writer Gloria Anzaldúa, and one of the most respected historians, an expert on borders, Oscar J. Martínez. Anzaldúa (1987) defines borders as a confluence of two or more cultures or groups or where people of different races or experiences inhabit a common area. On the other hand, Martínez (1998) describes a border as:

- a line that separates one nation from another or, in the case of internal entities, one providence or locality from another. The essential functions of a border are to keep people in their own space and to prevent, control, or regulate interactions among them. A borderland is a region that lies adjacent to a border. (p. 5)

For purposes of this speech, borderland and border will be used interchangeably.

I am a product of the border. I am what we call in Spanish a fronteriza. Interestingly, the exact translation of the word border in Spanish is frontera or frontier. It is this sense of the meaning that we will keep in mind as we discuss the different interactions that take place in the Borderlands Interaction Model (Martínez, 1998) that I will soon present to you. We will be exploring new frontiers or trying to reach these “frontiers” with a different perspective.

I was born in Hollywood, California. Yes, you heard correctly Hollywood, California. My family’s was a migration opposite to many. My parents decided that they were called back to the border. The children of revolutionary figures from Mexico, they decided to move to Juárez, Mexico, across from El Paso, Texas. Now this was a major anomaly, given that both had been born and raised on the U.S. side of the border. Thus, I grew up in an urban city, of more than one million people on the Mexican side of the border, crossing the bridge that connected the two cities every day for 21 years of schooling. I always kept one foot in one country and the other, figuratively speaking, on the other side. To the Mexicans I was considered very Americanized. My friends’ parents were shocked that I could date at age 16 without a chaperone. Ironically, in the U.S. I was viewed as very Mexican. Instead of taking sandwiches for lunch I took burritos. Mexican food was not as popular then as it is now.

Little did I realize that these early experiences with marginalization and living in a developing country, while at the same time crossing into an industrialized nation on a daily basis, witnessing hunger and oppression on both sides, would imprint the professional mission I feel today: to serve children from marginalized groups. I have always found strength in understanding both sides of an issue. These multiple perspectives have helped me thrive in the public schools and survive in higher education.

When I moved out of the Juárez-El Paso milieu borders continued to follow me. I feel that life on the border prepared me for the personal and professional life I have led as an adult. Martínez (1998) explained that borderlanders live and function in several different worlds. These worlds include:

- the world of their national culture, the world of the border environment, the world of their ethnic group if they are members of a minority population, and the world of the foreign culture on the other side of the boundary [and that] considerable versatility is required to be an active participant in all of these universes, including the ability to be multilingual and multicultural. By contrast, individuals from interior zones who live in homogeneous environments have no need to develop such multifaceted human proficiencies, or to be knowledgeable and sensitive to the perspectives of other peoples. (p. 20)

Martínez (1998) described a sense of “otherness” that occurs in borderlands. This experience is most real to those of us who have belonged to “other worlds”; that is, we came to higher education with former professional lives. For example, we become borderlanders when we move out of Pk-12 classrooms. This same phenomenon followed us as we moved from roles as school site-leaders to central office positions, and then into the world of academe. One foot remained in Pk-12 schools and the other in postsecondary education, straddling the worlds of administration and leadership. We continue to maintain the sense of “otherness” because we can still feel what it is like to be a principal, a teacher or a doctoral student. More importantly, we try to never lose sight of children and how the adults, who are supposed to work for them in education, impact their very existence.

I invite you to extend the practice of leadership into our higher education settings. It is not enough to simply preach, teach and
research leadership; we must practice it. This is the reason for my asking you to take a brief sojourn into how we, as professors of educational administration, are borderlanders negotiating different borders. Let me borrow again from Martínez to explain the issues of living on different borders and the idea of borderland interactions. Through this model, I will offer my perspective as a professor and discuss the directions I see our profession taking.

In his book Border People: Life and Society in the U.S.-Mexico Borderlands (1998), Martínez categorizes borderlands in order to understand the type of cross-border movements and interactions created by borders. There are features each border creates and four types of borderlands interactions are identified: alienated borderlands, co-existent borderlands, interdependent borderlands and integrated borderlands (1998).

I will discuss how each type of interaction can apply to certain situations in our own profession and how these interactions can offer direction to some of the changes that have taken place and still need to appear in our organization. Please bear in mind that I have taken liberties in applying the model to our world of the educational administration professoriate. However, I must reinforce the fact that there will always be borders and the interactions taking place within them define our progress on issues that continue to challenge us. The first borderland we will visit is the alienated borderland.

Alienated Borderlands in the Educational Administration Professoriate

Friction-ridden interactions reign in alienated borderlands. The border is "functionally closed, and cross-border interaction is totally or almost totally absent. Residents of each country interact as strangers" (Martínez, 1998, p.7). How does this concept of alienation apply to our profession and within our own departments?

Many of us arrive at the portals of academe wanting to make a difference. We come with different backgrounds. Sometimes within our own departments we marginalize each other. We may unknowingly develop alienated borders. For instance, those of us with extensive public school experience may look upon "others" as not being in touch with the reality of the schools. In turn, those who have opted to be professors without Pk-12 experience may tend to look at the "others" as too practitioner-oriented or not scholarly enough. Often it is an issue of intellectual and/or experiential arrogance. Let us dissolve this alienation. Either way, it is the child in the classroom we need to impact.

It is time we think of ourselves as a community. We need to erase borderland interactions that are divisive and fragmentary. Sometimes these interactions are manifested by the manner in which we conduct our inquiry. It does not matter to the principals in probationary schools, who are trying to provide the best education possible in the most at-risk of settings, whether our research is based on empiricism or is conducted qualitatively. They want our support, they need our help, and we can play an integral role through sound research that supports best practices.

How else can we build on the concept of a scholarly community? Let us expand this concept by presenting the issue of diversity in the professoriate. This is an important aspect to include because it has been a recurrent theme for several presidents since 1979. It could be part of the membership criteria for UCEA. I would be remiss not to address this as president and as a woman from an underrepresented group. I am not here to count the numbers. All one has to do is to look around the different convention sessions or to undergo searches in our own departments to realize the few professors of color in our field. However, I am here to discuss the quality of life within our departments that is critical to address this shortage. The book, Faculty of Color in Academe: Bittersweet Success (2001), presented a synthesis of research regarding professors of color. Coincidentally, it was co-authored by one of our own, a professor in educational administration, Caroline Sotello Viernes Turner. The research clearly points out that faculty of color feel alienated, isolated and excluded in the chilly climate of the ivory tower where subtle and not so subtle discrimination takes place (Sotello Viernes Turner & Myers, 2001). While the book attends to the issues of faculty of color, the same issues can be raised by faculty who come from other underrepresented groups including women, gays, lesbians, as well as any others who in some way are challenged for being different.

According to Sotello Viernes Turner and Myers (2001) several studies point out that faculty of color experience alienated borderlands because oftentimes different demands are placed on their time and energy than what is expected of other faculty members. For example, faculty of color are often asked, and feel compelled to serve on more committees and conduct more service activities than white faculty members....faculty of color feel they are expected to accept committee invitations, particularly when an opportunity to address minority issues is involved....faculty of color find that research on minority issues is not considered legitimate work, particularly if articles are published in journals that are not mainstream...research interests of faculty of color are denigrated, either because the research area is not traditional or because the faculty themselves are seen as inferior due to race or ethnicity. . . . Faculty of color report that colleagues expect them to be less qualified or less likely to make significant contributions in research. Some have noted a pervasive attitude of complacency: the belief that hiring one person of color in a department is sufficient. This contributes further to the isolation—of being “the one” in a department. (p.25-27)

Kulis and Miller’s study (as cited in Sotello Viernes Turner & Myers, 2001, p. 28) declared, tokenism “should be identified and abolished” and the “concomitants of tokenism, such as committee overload, professional isolation, and marginality should be monitored and redressed.” Therefore, let us ensure that the UCEA criteria describe programs of educational administration that are supportive of all faculty including faculty of color as well as other underrepresented groups.

However, it is not enough to talk about diversity. One must also address multicultural issues in our programs. In our course content it is not sufficient to bring in readings and discussions of diversity and multiculturalism. We must ensure that our readings are inclusive of researchers of color. How many of us include works by our esteemed colleagues of color including Judy Alston, James Bliss, Marmette Benokmen, Paula Cordeiro, Michael Danley, Ernestine Enomoto, Mark Gooden, Barbara Jackson, Kofi Lomotey, Gerardo López, Rosita Marciano, Larry McNeal, Sylvia Mendez-Morse, Khuala Muradwah, Grayson Noley, Rodney Ogawa, Flora Ida Ortiz, Martha Ovando, Robert Peña, Larry Parker, Pedro Reyes, Tina Reyes, Alan Shooh, Marilyn Tallierico or Linda Tillman to name but a few?

Another area to consider in building a scholarly community and trying to eliminate the interactions that promote a borderland of
alienation is to study the conduct of hiring processes. Care should be taken not to promote alienated borderlands when we go through faculty searches in our institutions. For example, in a study conducted by Sotello Viernes Turner and Myers (2001), a respondent: observed interviews for positions in urban education and reported being very mindful of the candidate’s knowledge of ignorance of diverse scholars, writers, and practitioners in the field. In “job talks,” candidates should display knowledge of work done by diverse scholars in the field. Otherwise, their thorough knowledge of their field as well as their ability to contribute to an inclusive departmental environment should be questioned. (p. 14-15)

As we undergo any hiring processes we should be mindful to include guidelines and expectations that demonstrate a candidate’s beliefs relative to inclusivity and multiculturalism. Since we are about all children it is not enough for the complexion of our faculty in educational administration to change. Our ideologies should reflect these changes as well.

Coexistent Borderlands in the Educational Administration Professoriate

The second type of borderland interaction is coexistent borderlands. In coexistent borderlands “stability is an on-and-off proposition. The border remains slightly open, allowing for the development of limited binational interaction. Residents of each country deal with each other as casual acquaintances, but borderlanders develop closer relationships” (Martínez, 1998, p. 7). I will begin with an exploration of the relationships between practitioners in the field and those in higher education.

As an organization, UCEA has tried to break down the barriers between the world of practice and that of higher education, especially at a national level. However, many times in our own departments this type of borderland still exists. Although we meet at the table to address the issues of administrator preparation and principal shortages, the organizations representing higher education sit on one side of the table while practitioner-oriented groups sit on the other side. As in coexistent borderlands, practitioner groups have developed closer relationships among each other, and academic groups have done the same. What we need now is a focus on efforts that enable us to face educational issues together. We must not remain mere casual acquaintances. The educational success of all children remains an untenable cause until all at the table realize that they are part of the solution. Scapegoating and finger pointing are wastes of time (Young, Petersen, & Short, 2001). Rather, energy should be concentrated on realizing that we are one educational pipeline, identifying the leaks, and working persistently in unison to ensure that the beginning and the ending of the schooling process are successfully negotiated by all.

While we may experience coexistent borderlands with practitioner groups, the same experiences can exist within our own institutions. In our own hallowed halls we have often kept to our own side of the fence. That is, many times we have isolated ourselves from involvement needed with other programs in our colleges. If we adamantly state that instructional leadership is the one characteristic that is raised in the literature as having the greatest impact on school success, then where are our courses from curriculum and instruction? Where do we include courses in counseling, in bilingual education, in special education and others to better address the needs of diverse learners in our schools? By the same token, do those in other fields take our courses given that the school reform literature expects that teachers, alongside all educators, should be leaders in their own right?

Our focus on leading and learning directs us to understand that this type of coexistent borderland interaction is not necessarily best for the children. If we want to impact their education then practitioners, hand-in-hand with academicians in the multiple fields of education, must go beyond coexistence. It is partnership that we must seek within a community of leadership. This sense of partnership will be evident as we visit the third type of borderland interaction, the Interdependent Borderlands.

Interdependent Borderlands in the Educational Administration Professoriate

Interdependent borderlands are characterized by a sense that: “Stability prevails most of the time. Economic and social complementarity prompts increased cross-border interaction, leading to expansion of the borderlands. Borderlanders carry on friendly and cooperative relationships” (Martínez, 1998, p. 7). It is within this type of borderland that I would like for us to visit the interactions taking place between our own students and us as professors.

Part of the UCEA membership criteria requires that “the program is characterized by systematic, written recruitment and admission plans that rely on multiple sources of evidence and show deliberate efforts to attract highly qualified applicants, including applicants from racial and ethnic minority groups and women” (UCEA Policy Manual, March 2000, p. 29). However, even with this requirement our programs continue to lack the diverse populations that we need to have. This shortage links us directly with our public school counterparts. We must recall “the image of a pipeline to describe the links between the availability of faculty of color, the training of minority graduate students, the accessibility of undergraduate education for minorities and the success of minority students at the elementary and secondary school levels. The presence of leaks in this pipeline provides one explanation for underrepresentation at all levels.” (Sotello Viernes Turner & Myers, 2001, p. 23) It is critical that we combine leadership with learning, as our convention theme suggests, so that we have success for all children in order to augment the pool of minority candidates in our own programs. Further, several studies “indicate that the problem of underrepresentation is one of supply and that the solution is to increase the number of doctoral recipients of color” (Sotello Viernes Turner & Myers, p. 23). We all know this to be a critical need, which brings in the next point relative to our negotiating the borderlands involving interactions with students. How we interact with our own students is crucial to the success of our programs.

Rendón (2000) a renowned scholar in the area of minority persistence and retention in higher education and one of the most recent presidents of the Association for the Study of Higher Education wrote a piece entitled, “Academics of the Heart.” In it, she describes relationship-centered teaching that brings meaning and connection to learning to foster a sense of community. Rendón proposes developing “a new model reconceptualizing traditions that have worked against community, the balance of reason and spirit, and the education of the whole person in higher education” (p. 3). She believes we must validate our learning communities by accommodating multiple views and revering varied ways of knowing. She also feels that our role is to help students see themselves as powerful learners early in programs by ensuring that core cur-
I curriculum is inclusive of diverse groups within higher education. Rendón further explains that having only one way of knowing is limiting in any environment. “We must open our learning community to engage those voices that have been traditionally silenced such as those of women, people of color, gays, lesbians, and bisexuals” (Rendón, p. 4).

Moreover, Rendón reminds us that learning environments allow for “error, imperfection, and reflection” (2000, p. 4). Let me share one simple example that brings this idea to light. When I asked a student from another department what impressed her of all the things her faculty does, she mentioned the kind notes one professor wrote to students who failed an important exam, encouraging them to not give up. How many of us are available to students even beyond our office hours, or do we still see them as interruptions to our research agendas? How do we involve our students as partners in team teaching courses or in undertaking collaborative research projects? Do we grant them the authorship they deserve when it is important for us to be listed first? Do they join us in service activities? For many of us the interpretation of the promotion and tenure process in our own campuses limits our accessibility to students and even from work with professional organizations, particularly at state and regional levels. Little wonder that our absence in the organizations that our students usually belong to creates the sense that we simply do not care for schools and that we are out of touch. These feelings of detachment begin in our own backyards, so to speak, and carry major ramifications at the national level as well.

It is my belief that how we treat all of our students, in general, is a reflection of our commitment to the schools. Many times we replicate the same type of doctoral interactions that we experienced with our doctoral committees and advisors even when our own experiences may not have been the most positive. Yet, it is this model that we follow and expect our students to survive. Students of color may be even more vulnerable in that there may not be enough faculty members to act as their advocates, mentors and/or role models.

Another benefit of our positive interactions with students is that this builds on social capital. In her study of three Latina superintendents, Ortiz (2001) states that social capital refers to the structure of social relations in communities in which these Latinas were successful in keeping their jobs. One of the major factors that was associated with their success was the extent and type of social networks to which these women were connected. Our success as a field and as an organization rests on the extent and type of social networks to which we are connected. This aspect is especially important given the criticism that is being leveled against our programs. I firmly believe that social capital begins in our own classrooms in the form of social relations. Our students, after they graduate, are the ones who respond to the surveys that ask whether they believe they were duly prepared for their administrative positions. It would be interesting to investigate the correlation between the relationship that they had with their professors and the ratings given to their preparation programs. I still believe that the criticisms against our programs are not so much a matter of the way we prepare our students but how we have engaged and inspired them. It is not just the mind that must be impacted but the heart as well. So then how do we go about interacting with all our students? It goes beyond just attracting students into academe or into our preparation programs. It is what happens once they are in them. The chill-
In the area of publications, UCEA continues to publish the most prestigious refereed journal in our field, the Educational Administration. Alongside research, our publications also address the teaching of educational administration through the Journal of Cases in Educational Administration. Lastly, the news and updates of our profession appear in the UCEA Review.

Another positive sign of our integration is our growth in membership. UCEA now has 67 members. At the Plenum Session we admitted five new member institutions: University of Arkansas, Brigham Young University, University of Dayton, Lehigh University and University of Louisville. We also have grown in terms of partner members with the participation of Tennessee State University, who recently partnered with the University of Tennessee.

It is impossible for me to discuss each of the recent UCEA accomplishments in detail. Let me say that UCEA will continue to take advantage of every opportunity to fully integrate the borderlands of professors, practitioners and policy makers because we are about the same things: children, leadership with learning and successful schooling.

In summary, each of us is critical in this integration process of “others” and “us.” The “others” are we. Although we all might not be able to be actively involved at the national level, each of us must do our share beginning at home, whether our focus will be to change relationships with our own faculty, with students or in promoting equitable treatment for people of color throughout our program’s climate and content. Collaboration with those in other departments as well as with practitioners throughout our regions, including policy makers at all levels, is essential. Let us become involved in activities that integrate us with the positive energy that must go to our schools. We must begin to practice that which we preach—leadership. As professors we are leaders. We are not merely teachers of leadership. We need to realize this before we expect anyone else to do so. As professors of educational administration, we must build on the concept of social capital in whatever form our integrated partnerships come. These may develop with students, our Pk-12 counterparts or policy makers. Let us capitalize on our relationships and interactions to make these an integral part of what we do.

Thank you very much for allowing me to share a few ideas with you today. I wish you a most exciting UCEA convention and may we all continue in our quest to build a cohesive community of educational borderlanders.

References


Interview with 2002 UCEA President Gail Furman

Interview conducted, results compiled by Jumoke Sanusi

1. How did you become involved with UCEA?

I was actually mentored into UCEA participation during my doctoral program at Washington State University. WSU was one of the founding member institutions of UCEA, and my advisors, Don Reed and Walt Gmelch, were very active in UCEA and supportive in getting graduate students involved. So, in 1989—the last year of my doctoral program—I presented my first research paper at UCEA and have attended the convention every year since. Over the years, as I entered the professorate, made new friends and began collaborating with colleagues around the country, UCEA became very important to me as my “professional community.” But the turning point for deeper involvement was becoming WSU’s plenum representative about six years ago and being elected to the Executive Committee in 1999.

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

It’s hard to pick just one. I can think of three, equally gratifying aspects. The first is the sense of professional community and friendship that UCEA provides for me, especially the chance to see and work with so many good colleagues at the annual convention and EC meetings. We really get to know each other through UCEA activities, and I have found few other forums for this in the profession. I feel like I belong in UCEA. The second gratifying aspect is the intellectual stimulation and inspiration I get from UCEA activities, like the access to outstanding current research at the convention and the chance to collaborate with many good colleagues. This has had a positive impact on my own scholarship and the standards for my work. The third gratification is the opportunity to provide service to the broader field through UCEA leadership roles.

3. Discuss your current goals for UCEA.

I believe that UCEA’s goals must be arrived at collaboratively and democratically through the work of the Plenum and the Executive Committee and in response to needs of the field and member institutions. This is exactly the process we have been engaged in at recent Plenum and EC meetings. So my current goals as UCEA president are shaped by this ongoing work. Having said that, my personal goals for this year include to:

- Move forward with our strategic planning process, especially regarding our efforts to link leadership to learning for all children.
- Participate in and contribute to the proceedings of the UCEA-sponsored National Commission for the Advancement of Educational Leadership Preparation (first meeting to be held at Wingpread in February); one of the potential goals of NCAELP is to develop a “model” preparation program for linking leadership to learning.
- Work with UCEA staff to expand our networking and outreach through adding more partner members and through closer collaboration with other professional organizations (e.g., AASA, NCPEA).
- Get some closure on our perennial issue of UCEA membership criteria! Just on a practical level, the membership application process needs to be streamlined so it doesn’t serve as a barrier to prospective members. On a more important level, we need to confront the perennial issue of “elitism” versus inclusiveness in regard to membership criteria.

It will be a pleasure to work on these and other goals throughout this year with UCEA’s dynamic executive and associate directors, Michelle Young and George Petersen, and the outstanding members of the Executive Committee and Plenum.

4. What are some of your professional goals and research interests?

Right now I am not in a university administrative position, for the first time in 11 years, and it’s kind of refreshing! But I could see myself in an administrative role again. My professional goals are not necessarily concrete and explicit—to be in such and such a position by the year X. What I want is to continue to “compose” my professional life around work that is most gratifying for me, intellectually and spiritually. The professoriate allows me the academic freedom to pursue topics that I have a passion for, as well as the opportunity for service to the field.

My scholarly work will continue to focus on the concept of public schools as “communities.” There is so much theoretical and empirical work that needs to be done here. I think that my passion for this topic is greater than ever, because it is so needed as an alternative way of thinking about schools. In my view, the current standards-assessment-accountability movement, which has such a stranglehold on public schools, has further “technologized” schooling, has taken what are essentially moral, creative and idiosyncratic processes and forced them into a “productivity” framework with untold damage to children’s self-esteem and authentic learning. Community, with its focus on belonging and democracy, offers an alternative for schools and school leaders and a way to focus on the most important purposes of school leadership. But we need to know more about leadership for the creation of community-like cultures in schools, especially in regard to community in the midst of diversity. So my current work focuses on the linkages across community theory, leadership theory, democracy and ethics. It is a life’s work in progress.

2001 President María Luisa González passes the ceremonial gavel to 2002 President Gail Furman
From the Director:  
**Appraising the Success of Our Efforts**  
Michelle D. Young, Ph.D.  
UCEA Executive Director

When the tragic events of September 11th occurred, no one could have predicted the aggregate impact on our country. One hope that was expressed by many (see for example, Castenell & Imig, 2001 and Smith, 2001) was that schools, which worked diligently to dispel fear and uncertainty in the aftermath of September 11th, would be recognized as the centers of communities, places of strength and respect, and places that preserve, protect and advance our shared democratic values. It was also hoped that US citizens would recognize that our democracy is dependent upon high-quality public schools.

Some evidence indicates that such positive changes are occurring. The 2001 Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup Survey on the Public’s Attitudes, for example, reported that US citizens gave the public schools in their own communities the highest ratings in the 30-year history of the poll. However, a general murmur of dissatisfaction and discontent continues to grow among the general public, particularly among those who do not have children in schools. If your experience has been anything like mine, it is not uncommon to have a family member, neighbor or acquaintance who, armed with statistics, launches a complaint about public education directly at you. These encounters, however, pale when compared to the attacks that are currently being unleashed on the preparation that colleges of education provide for teachers and school leaders.

In the area of teacher education, for example, the Ablee Foundation (www.abell.org), the Hoover Institute (www.hoover.stanford.edu) and the Manhattan Institute (www.manhattan-institute.org) have recently lambasted the preparation pre-service teachers receive in higher education. They have argued, in turn, that the research used to demonstrate a positive relationship between teacher certification and high student performance is flawed, that students taught by Teach for America recruits outperform those taught by traditionally trained teachers and that alternatively trained math teachers are more successful with high school seniors than traditionally trained teachers.

In the area of leadership preparation the attacks have yet to reach the level of those aimed at teacher preparation. Thus far, I have seen little research that discredits educational leadership preparation. However, sweeping criticism of educational leadership preparation programs abounds. Highly critical articles in newspapers like the New York Times and Education Week and in journals like the Kappan and Educational Leadership have become increasingly more common. Similarly, the content of national meetings of representatives of foundations, business, government and practice frequently involves criticism of traditional higher education preparation of school and school system leaders and/or the support of alternative preparation programs. Moreover, it appears that current popular opinion of university-based educational leadership preparation is being swayed by such criticism, and it may not be much longer before we begin to see work like that of Kate Walsh (2001) from the Ablee Foundation leak over into educational leadership.

Walsh (or someone like her), who says she reviewed every study that has been published on teacher certification and teacher quality, could easily conduct a similar study of educational leadership preparation. Moreover, given the lack of research that has been conducted on the relationship between leadership preparation and leadership quality, someone like Walsh would likely come to conclusions not unlike those the Ablee Foundation has been successfully communicating to policy makers and opinion leaders: 1) the available research that demonstrates a positive relationship is flawed and outdated, 2) course work requirements for teacher certification should be eliminated, 3) principals should be allowed to hire anyone with a bachelors degree who can pass a subject matter exam, 4) public schools should be given the responsibility of ensuring that teachers have the instructional skills and knowledge needed to teach.

We must not ignore or underestimate the extent and gravity of the criticism being lodged against our field. It holds very real consequences for you, your work and your programs. Many educational leadership programs are reforming and enhancing their programs (e.g., incorporating problem-based learning, collaborating meaningfully with practitioners, realigning courses, using cohort groups, requiring student portfolios). However, few faculty promote their program successes. There are many reasons for this silence, one of which is our lack of data linking these reforms to our purpose of producing quality educational leaders (McCarthy, 2001). Our general lack of data not only interferes with the ability to promote programs and their successful production of high-quality leaders to communities, policy makers, business leaders and journalists, but it also prevents us from effectively countering the allegations that university preparation for school leaders is inadequate.

There have been some promising developments in this area. Robert Kottkamp, for example, organized a well-attended conversation prior to this year’s UCEA convention around the development of research that measures the impact of educational leadership preparation. Additionally, the National Commission for the Advancement of Educational Leadership Preparation (NCAELP) commissioned a paper focused on an evaluation process for programs to use as they seek to understand how well they are achieving their goals and to improve their programs. Each of these efforts are based upon the understanding that we must have a wealth of data that includes but is not limited to perception studies.

For those of you interested in learning more about the work of the NCAELP, UCEA will be developing a digital video of the commission’s February meeting at Wingspread which will be available via the UCEA website (www.ucea.org) by late spring. Additionally, members of NCAELP will be reporting on the work of the commission at the annual AASA, AACTE, AERA, NASSP and NCPEA meetings later this spring and summer.

References
Smith, L. (2001, October 3). What are schools for? We should seize this moment to define our purposes. Education Week.
Frances Kochan Voted 2002 President-Elect
Frances Kochan is President-Elect of UCEA for the 2001-2002 year and will become President in November 2002. She has been a Plenum representative for six years and served as co-chair of the UCEA Voices Project. She is Interim Dean of the College of Education and Professor of Educational Leadership at Auburn University, Alabama. Prior to entering the professorship, Dr. Kochan served as an elementary teacher, a principal, an associate superintendent and superintendent. Dr. Kochan's research interests focus on collaboration at the individual, school, university and community levels and the role of beliefs upon practice. She has been involved in creating mentoring opportunities for individuals from young students to university faculty. Throughout her career she has developed numerous partnership initiatives focused on connecting schools and communities to improve both. She presently directs the West Alabama Learning Coalition, a group of eight school/university/community partnerships in an extremely impoverished area of Alabama. The coalition is focused on school improvement through community development. Dr. Kochan serves on the Holmes Partnership Board and is past president of the AERA Mentoring SIG. She is editor of a forthcoming book from Infoage Press, *The Human and Organizational Dimensions of Mentoring*.

The Administration and Supervision Program in the Department of Leadership, Foundations, and Policy, Curry School of Education, University of Virginia
Margaret Grogan, Whitney Sherman, (University of Virginia) & George J. Petersen (UCEA)

The Department of Leadership, Foundations, and Policy at the University of Virginia is designed to meet the demand for educational leaders who can combine vision and practice. It houses three integrated academic units: leadership; foundations; and policy. The leadership programs prepare leaders who are committed to social justice and formal education as a means of personal and civic improvement. Graduates of the programs go on to careers in school administration as well as university careers. Graduate students of the educational foundations programs learn concepts and skills related to research and evaluation, human development, learning and motivation, social and cultural contexts of education, multicultural education, new information technologies and education of gifted and talented students. They go on to careers in college teaching, research, instructional technology and administration. The policy studies programs are designed to help students understand and master the processes by which social, political and economic forces influence education policy. Graduates of these programs commonly assume positions in local, state and national or international agencies and organizations.

The Program in School Administration and Supervision
The Program in Educational Administration and Supervision, established in 1932 at the University of Virginia, is an instructional, research and service unit of the Curry School of Education. The major purpose of the program is the preparation of educational leaders for the public schools of the state and nation. The leadership program seeks to prepare leaders in the tradition of Thomas Jefferson - liberally educated men and women of broad vision and personal integrity who are committed to social justice, the life of the mind and formal education as a means of personal and civic improvement. It enjoys a long tradition of producing college and university administrators, superintendents, principals, and others who have gone on to distinguished careers. The program additionally seeks to contribute to human understanding and knowledge through continuing inquiry into the nature of educational leadership and leader effectiveness at all levels - elementary, secondary and post-secondary; local, state and federal; public and private.

Administration and Supervision offers masters degrees and doctoral, both Ed.D. and Ph.D., degrees. In addition, the department offers administration endorsements as part of a degree program or separately for those students who have already attained graduate degrees. The department also offers licensure for the superintendent.

Principal preparation programs that lead to masters degrees are offered on-grounds at the University of Virginia in Charlottesville and at several off-grounds centers including: Northern Virginia; Hampton Roads; Richmond; and Lynchburg. Doctoral programs leading to the Ed.D. or the Ph.D. are offered on-grounds at the university. Ed.D. Degree programs are also offered at off-grounds centers including: Northern Virginia; Hampton Roads; and cohorts in other localities.

Leadership and Policy programs also include Higher Education and Education Policy and Evaluation. The Center for the Study of Higher Education provides adult education leaders with the opportunity to explore established and emerging practices in higher education, to analyze current issues and programs and to think in a critical fashion about institutional priorities and commitments. The objectives of the Education Policy and Evaluation Program are to provide graduate students with an opportunity to acquire quantitative and qualitative skills required to interpret research and evaluation studies related to educational policy; to design and conduct research and evaluation policy studies; to acquire expertise to conduct policy research; and communicate the findings of policy research to multiple constituencies.

Educational Foundations programs include Social Foundations, Educational Psychology, Educational Research and Instructional Technology. The graduate degree offerings in Social Foundations are aimed at providing students with conceptual tools essential for a full understanding of educational processes that reach beyond educational specialists and practitioners and delve into the complex interrelationships between school and society, education and culture. The purpose of the Educational Psychology Program
is to prepare students to become professionals who apply the principles, empirical methods and accumulated knowledge of psychology to problems faced by educators. The Educational Research Program consists of a sequence of courses in quantitative methods ranging from elementary statistics to advanced multivariate techniques. The Instructional Technology Program is based on the systematic application of research and applied learning theory and the use of current learning technologies and methodologies.

Innovative Programs in the School Administration and Supervision Program

The Collaborative Masters Degree Program is tailored to the needs of three suburban school districts. Currently, professors of Administration and Supervision are collaborating with Chesterfield, Henrico and Hanover Counties in Central Virginia. School district representatives teach three of the courses offered in the master’s program and give input into the syllabi for additional courses. Some courses may be co-taught by university professors and school district representatives. Students participating in these master’s degree programs are also involved in Leadership Academies offered by the school district to prepare future leaders. The school districts administer internships to allow students to put theory into practice. In class, students from each of the school divisions share experiences and explore different district approaches. University professors provide a reflective piece to the internship as they encourage students to debrief their experiences and relate research to practice.

The Principal Preparation Internship Program is designed to meet the needs of students who wish to pursue masters degrees in administration and supervision and also complete internships as administrators. While students serve as administrative interns in schools, they attend weekend courses to gain their degrees. Internships are tailored to meet the needs of individual students so that they can remain employed while taking classes simultaneously. Internships range from six months to a year. Students are placed in school districts in several locations and are monitored by university faculty.

The Superintendency Program is created to allow practicing administrators to gain licensure for the superintendency while preparing for an Ed.D. degree. Oversight of the program and program development is provided by an advisory board of practicing superintendents. Practicing superintendents also serve as clinical instructors and work collaboratively with university professors to provide administrators with classes on a weekend basis so that they may remain employed. Students commute to the university from as far away as New York to do the program. Students in this program do a six month internship either with their own superintendent or one from a different district. The aims of the internship are to allow students opportunities for shadowing, debriefing and working with current superintendents.

Associated Centers:
UCEA Center for the Study of Leadership and Ethics
Virginia Center for Educational Policy Studies (VCEPS)
Thomas Jefferson Center for Educational Design
Virginia Association for School Superintendents

For more information on any of these programs or centers, please contact the University of Virginia, Curry School of Education, Charlottesville, VA.

CCEAM Conference 2002

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

Working Group 3.7 of the International Federation for Information Processing to hold Bi-Annual Conference

WG3.7 focuses on promoting the effective and efficient use of information technology in the management of educational institutions. Every two years WG3.7 holds a Conference to explore a wide range of issues and to demonstrate and explore directions for developing and improving all types of educational institutions. The conference theme will be Management of Education in the Information Age. This five day event will be held August 18-22, 2002 in Helsinki, Finland. More detailed information can be found on their website at http://ifip-item.hkbu.edu.hk
The National Commission
Looks at Leadership
Preparation: An Epilogue to
The First Six Papers
Naftaly S. “Tuli” Glasman
University of California,
Santa Barbara

There are several definitions for the term
“commission.” Personally I like to view it as a body of individuals
charged with performing some sort of a duty that is usually beneficial
to others as well as to themselves. Several years ago Professor
Jay D. Scribner suggested to me that a commission might also con-
stitute an agent for change (by virtue of its authority). The recently
established National Commission for the Advancement of Educa-
tional Leadership Preparation has already begun to perform its ini-
tial duties. UCEA, The National Policy Board for Educational Ad-
ministration and the Johnson Foundation, who have worked to-
gether in establishing the Commission, hope that the it will serve
as an agent of significant, useful and acceptable changes. Its au-
thority is broad and comprehensive. It includes representatives from
New York to Denver, Utah and Washington and from Minnesota
and Wisconsin to Alabama and Texas.

Like its older sister in the mid 1980s (The National Commission
on Excellence in Educational Administration), the current com-
mission has been established by UCEA as a result of the organization’s
recognition that a re-examination of leadership preparation is a must
because of the changing circumstances in and around schools. Funda-
mentally, this process seems to always begin with mounting dis-
satisfaction with schools. Demands are then made on the schools to
improve, and the role of educational leaders becomes the pivotal
target of everyone’s expectations. Before long, leadership prepara-
tion becomes the focus of very intense conversation.

Because of the widespread dissatisfaction with student achieve-
ment, public demands for improvement were accompanied in the
1990s with expectations of accountability. Three years ago I heard
from a woman, who could not read and write, the following ques-
tion: “Does the ‘boss’ know how to make my boy’s ‘test’ better?” I
had no clue as to how to start responding to her about preparation
of the ‘boss’ [principal] for enhancing student achievement. Now,three years later, we hear questions about who should be admitted
to leadership preparation programs; who should be recommended for licensure; what are adequate, curricular, budgetary and struc-
tural tools with which to prepare candidates; how costly and lengthy
programs should be; and what makes a program deserving of accredit-
ation. University faculty also ask themselves whether leadership
practice should be the major guide for preparation; how much time and effort should be devoted to the teaching of leadership
concepts; how one might demonstrate to students that leadership is
a process of growth (and other changes); and how one knows if a
program actually made a difference.

This brief article provides an overview of the first drafts of the six papers which were solicited by the Commission and first pre-
sented for discussion in the November 2001 UCEA Convention in
Cincinnati. The Commission’s goals have been to develop an un-
derstanding of the contexts of preparation, to examine existing ex-
ceptional programs, to define effective preparation and to create
collaborative action plans. The intention of this overview is to serve
readers with information as to where we are now.

The Commissioned Papers

The first paper is titled “The Complexity of Substantive Reform: A Call for Interdependence among Key Stakeholders.” In
this paper, Professors Michelle Young, George Petersen and Paula
Short focus on challenges facing educational leadership. Although,
the authors’ perspective is that of the universities, they also call
attention to the strong interests, which practitioners, professional
organizations, some foundations, and government agencies have
in the improvement of leadership preparation. According to the
authors’ analysis, preparation programs in educational leadership
as traditionally conceived are no longer adequate. They argue that
changes in schools and society require transformations in leader-
ship preparation. Such changes, however, move beyond national
standards, program content, and classroom pedagogy. Indeed, these authors also call for transformations in how programs are planned,
who delivers the programs, and how programs are supported. The
authors use the metaphor of a league to make the case that univer-
sity leadership programs are located within an interdependent web
of educational leadership preparation providers and stakeholders,
that collaboration among these groups is key to both the suc-
cessful transformation of leadership preparation programs and to
the effective preparation of school and school system leaders.

Professor Joseph Murphy wrote the second paper. Its title is “Re-
structuring the Profession of Educational Leadership: New Blue-
prints.” The author first provides an in-depth investigation of the
foundations of the educational leadership profession. He examines
constructs of leadership roles, leadership functions and leadership
tasks and then discusses the discipline-based knowledge and the
practice-based knowledge of educational leadership. Murphy fo-
cuses on the academic (technical) content as his third construct and
then proceeds to re-conceptualize the educational leadership pro-

tession itself. His goal is to shift from a phenomenon related to
“bodies of subject matter” to a phenomenon related to “valued ends”. Thus, instead of looking at the profession as being made up of, say, leading educational organizations, handling educational finance, engaging in personnel administration and the like, Murphy wants us to focus our attention on the central roles of the leader in educa-
tion. Murphy identifies three such roles: the “moral steward”, the
“educator” and the “community builder.” We must assume that the
author calls on those involved in leadership preparation to derive
implications for their activities from his re-conceptualization of the
profession for which preparation exists in the first place.

“Ferment” is the label Murphy gave to the situation in which
educational leadership has been during the years leading to the so-
llicitation of the six papers by the Commission. Professor Barbara
Jackson described these same years as “full of activities” and wor-
thy of a re-examination. Jackson’s paper, titled “Exceptional and
Innovative Programs in Educational Leadership”, elaborates on
leadership preparation programs via three different sections. Her
first section concerns deficiencies found in programs. These pro-
gram deficiencies are found in the areas of student recruitment, col-
aboration with school districts and the relation of program content
to licensure and the demands of the job. Jackson’s second section
highlights the efforts extended by a variety of professional organi-

grams that prepare individuals for the principalship and the superintendency.

Professor Kent Peterson is the author of the fourth paper, which is titled "The Professional Development of Principals: Innovations and Opportunities." The need for professional development while on-the-leadership-job stems from the understanding that trainees in pre-service programs are not in a position to learn everything about the job prior to practicing. Equally important, Peterson views professional development programs as an important and perhaps even necessary complement to pre-service preparation. In his paper, Peterson first offers information about sources of professional development including universities, professional associations, governmental agencies and not for profit organizations. He then analyzes each source and describes and examines a corresponding exemplary program offered by each source. His analysis focuses on the programs' purposes, curriculum, internal coherence, instructional strategies, location, length and use of information technology. The last section of the paper deals with the important linkage between professional development programs and the quality criteria required for funding by professional associations.

The fifth paper, "Defining Preparation and Professional Development for the future," was written by Dean Richard Andrews and Professor Margaret Grogan. This paper takes on both pre-service preparation and professional development for principals and superintendents. The authors begin with an analysis of leadership roles and then highlight the changes in these roles in the 1980s and 1990s, both in practice and in the way they have been conceptualized. This summary (a must read) leads the reader comfortably to the understanding of the current scene. Within the current context, the principal is described as a key player, having multiple roles, and the superintendent is viewed as a central agent of collaboration and an enhancer of professional development. The authors confirm that in both cases the shifts in roles have been brought about because of criticisms, expectations and evaluations. On the basis of the adjusted roles, Andrews and Grogan offer several recommendations for preparation programs and for professional development programs.

The sixth paper, written by Professor Naftaly Glasman, Associate Dean James Cibulka and Dean Dianne Ashby, is titled "Continuous Improvement of Leadership Preparation Programs: Adopting Principles of Self Evaluation." The paper begins with an analysis of incentives and disincentives for the self evaluation of preparation and professional development programs for educational leadership. Significant factors are identified. Among them are factors rooted in society as a whole, in the market, in the universities themselves and in other "powerful stakeholders". The authors then outline a self evaluation model for program improvement. Their model is anchored in outcome-based standards that have been recommended by NCATE recently for evaluating individual candidates for licensure. In the first phase of the evaluation model each standard is converted into specific evaluation questions with corresponding suggestions for the data to be collected and procedures for doing so. The second evaluation phase suggests ways of summarizing the data about individual candidates for licensure, for the entire cohort and for each outcome based standard mentioned. Closing the sixth paper is a set of procedural suggestions needed for an effective implementation of self evaluation. These suggestions constitute prerequisites for responding to the calls for self evaluation in the first place. In addition to suggesting both short- and long-term responses, the authors call for the alignment of leadership program components with pertinent outcome-based standards. They call for such an alignment through the development of learning communities of educational leadership stakeholders.

Benchmark Challenges

Collectively, the six papers identify a set of benchmark challenges to preparation programs in educational leadership that exist at the national, state and local level. These six papers collectively assess social, institutional and professional conditions that reflect on the general complexity involved in attempts to bring about time related reforms in educational leadership preparation, using evidence that is available at the time of the assessment. Unlike previous attempts to understand the complexity of leadership preparation, these six papers together place an extremely strong emphasis on the need for true collaboration among all stakeholders in the continuous enhancement of educational leadership preparation.

As the papers conscientiously argue, collaboration is a must at this time. Educational leadership has become quite complex and clearly, in part, political in nature. Who prepares future leaders for practice is a central question in such a context. The university professor, school district leaders, licensure agencies, professional associations, and others each seek to influence the preparation and development of school and district leaders. Each party has its vested interests, which includes but is not limited to issues such as financial gain. Indeed the future quality of educational leaders is at stake. Without collaboration today, no common vision can be developed regarding what preparation and development must involve if we are to ensure that all children are afforded a quality educational experience. And without a common vision, we will have a lose-lose situation. Program reform will be limping and misguided.

The current challenges put forth to preparation programs are essential:
1. Clearly defined and widely acceptable leadership goals, roles and tasks.
2. Effective delivery structures, organizational processes and useful and recognized individual and program-wide outcomes.
3. Evaluative systems based on outcome related standards that lend themselves to specific evaluation questions and meaningful answers.
4. Collaboration among key educational leadership stakeholders.

Preliminary Answers to Fundamental Questions

Reliable evidence is available in the six papers with regard to the contextual conditions that have given rise to the need for changes in leadership preparations programs. Collectively, the six papers provide preliminary answers to, what I believe, are three fundamental questions that must now be asked:
1. Why engage now in such a major self re-examination?
2. Which program dimensions should the self re-examination focus on first?
3. What are useful, acceptable and efficient tools that could be employed in conducting the self re-examination?

Answers to the first questions are not hard to identify in the commissioned papers. Some include: agitation within the field of practice; far reaching expectations from and for preparation programs; and university faculty’s own questions about student quality, faculty-student ratios, admission standards, resources, and the curriculum. Answers to the second question used to be debatable. For ex-
example, the curriculum (see papers 3, 4 and 5) used to drive one priority list while the desired product (see papers 2 and 6) drove yet another. According to the first paper, however, the entire structure through which educational leadership preparation is devised and delivered requires reexamination. The six papers provide some preliminary answers to the third fundamental question, too. One answer is a truly collaborative effort (see papers 1 and 5). Another is a learning community that includes all leadership stakeholders (paper 6). A third answer involves differentiating roles (paper 5) or valued ends (paper 2). A final suggestion is to apply whatever method are appropriate to each program (after the initial standards have been accepted).

Next Steps
Once the six papers have been critically reviewed, debated and revised, they will be, collectively, a useful addition to the scholarly literature about educational leadership preparation. In the meantime, they constitute a reflection of today’s conditions, needs and suggested first steps to attend to existing problems within our field.

Specific substantive ideas covered in the six papers that require additional in-depth conversations include a close look at the notion that educational leadership is a process of growth and change in general, and, thus, training should be viewed broadly as well. In fact, coordination between preparation and professional development programs is a most useful topic of discussion in this regard. There is quite a bit of new work to be done here because new roles and titles have been added in the schools (program specialist, grade level leader, team leadership).

The six papers were commissioned for specific purposes and thus do not deal with a number of issues that are considered important by many (e.g., how outcome based standards are to be used in the self evaluation of preparation programs for improvement, how to supplement a roster of high quality faculty scholars with experienced faculty observers of practice, or how to convert the recognized set of unmet needs into a well articulated and convincing set of requests for resources designed to maintain an on going high quality leadership preparation program). However, the papers as a group should be viewed as a first step in the direction of understanding how we might work toward the improvement of educational leadership preparation.

UCEA to Hold 2002 Annual Convention in Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania has been selected as the site of the 2002 UCEA Annual Convention. The convention will be held at the Pittsburgh Hilton downtown. Pittsburgh was founded in 1758. It is within 500 miles of over half the entire population of the United States.

Pittsburgh, having access to the over 9000 miles of rivers, is the largest inland port in the country. In the downtown area alone there are 15 major bridges - 720 total in the city limits. The city is home to Heinz ketchup and Mister Roger’s Neighborhood. At one time it was known as the "Steel city" for its tremendous steel industry.

Pittsburgh boasts a variety of attractions which are sure to be of interest to those who attend the 2002 Convention. The Strip district, just east of downtown, was once filled with warehouses and factories has now become a favorite weekend attraction for Pittsburgers as well as tourists. In this area one will find fine restaurants, bars, night clubs and a variety of retail shops. Wholey's Seafood, one of the region's largest seafood wholesalers, also has a large retail establishment with fresh & prepared fish, sushi, a butcher-shop and fruits and vegetables. Other Strip district favorites include Feinberg Novelties, USA Gourmet, Rubino Produce and Benkovitz Seafoods. The Senator Heinz Pittsburgh Regional History Center is also a great place for local city history and nostalgia.

Pittsburgh is also home to the Andy Warhol museum, which is one of the largest single-artist museums in the country. The museum hosts many concerts and other performances throughout the year. There are also three other Carnegie museums: The Carnegie Science Center, the Carnegie Museum of Natural History and the Carnegie Museum of Art. Pittsburgh visitors can also experience the Allegheny Observatory, which is known as one of the finest in the world. The city also features two opera houses, the Pittsburgh Opera, featuring operas in original languages, and the Civic Light Opera. Pittsburgh’s music scene is very diverse offering everything from the Pittsburgh Symphony Orchestra to the Metropol/Rosebud, an industrial dancing nightclub.

Another Pittsburgh attraction that would be of interest to those thrill seeking convention goers is Kennywood Park, an amusement park featuring the “Phantom’s Revenge” roller coaster. Sports fans can visit the newly built home of the Pirates (baseball), PNC Park, or the homes of the Steelers (football) or Penguins (hockey). Every November the holidays bring a seven week event called the Sparkle Season. During this period people can enjoy street theater, carriage rides, parades, outdoor concerts and holiday displays.

Proposals for the 2002 UCEA Convention will be accepted entirely online. Please visit the UCEA website at http://www.ucea.org/convention/index.html for more information including procedures and deadlines. (Note: Proposal submission deadline is May 3)
Scribner and Skrla Receive the 2001 Jack A. Culbertson Award

The Jack A. Culbertson Award was established in 1982 to honor UCEA's first full-time Executive Director who inspired many junior professors during his 22 year tenure. The award has been presented annually since 1983 to an outstanding junior professor for their contributions to educational administration. This year the award recipients were Jay P. Scribner and Linda Skrla.

Dr. Jay P. Scribner is an assistant professor in Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis at the University of Missouri-Columbia and was recently named the Director of the Consortium for Education Policy Analysis. Dr. Scribner received his Ph.D. in Educational Administration from the University of Wisconsin-Madison in 1997. His research interests focus on teacher and principal professional development, school leadership, and educational program and policy evaluation. Dr. Scribner was a 2000-2001 National Academy of Education Postdoctoral Fellow. His dissertation won the 1998 Best Dissertation Research award from the National Staff Development Council. He has recently published articles in Educational Administration Quarterly, the Journal of School Leadership and the Journal of Career and Technical Education. Dr. Scribner has worked in the field of evaluation research and program evaluation for over ten years. He has worked as an evaluator and policy analyst for the General Accounting Office, as an evaluation consultant for organizations such as Stanford Research International (SRI) and as an independent evaluator on numerous evaluation projects primarily in the field of education.

Linda Skrla is an assistant professor in the Educational Administration and Human Resource Development Department at Texas A&M University. She holds B.B.A. and M.Ed. degrees from Sam Houston State University and a Ph.D. from the University of Texas at Austin, where she was a Cycle XI fellow of the Cooperative Superintendency Program. Prior to joining the Texas A&M faculty in 1997, Dr. Skrla worked for 14 years as a middle school and high school teacher and as a campus and district administrator in Texas public schools. Her research focuses on educational equity issues in school leadership, including accountability, high success districts, and women superintendents. Her published work has appeared in numerous journals, including Educational Researcher, Educational Administration Quarterly, Phi Delta Kappan, Journal of School Leadership and the International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education.


Jackson Receives the 2001 Roald Campbell Award

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

Barbara L. Jackson, Fordham University, was chosen as the ninth recipient of the Roald F. Campbell Lifetime Achievement Award. Jackson, who is currently Chair of the Division of Administration, Policy and Urban Education at the Graduate School of Education at Fordham in New York, is the first woman and African American to receive this award. Before joining the Fordham faculty in 1987 she served as Professor and Dean at Morgan State University in Baltimore, Maryland and served as Associate Professor and Associate Dean at Atlanta University in Georgia. Jackson was directly involved in the establishment of educational administration programs at both of these historically black institutions. Professor Jackson received her Doctor of Education degree from the Harvard Graduate School of Education in 1970, her Masters degree from Teachers College, Columbia University in 1967 and her Bachelors Degree from Wellesley College in 1950.

Currently Dr. Jackson serves on the Advisory Board of the Boys Choir of Harlem Academy, the Board of Directors of the Institute for Responsive Education and Treasurer of the Metropolitan Council for Educational Administration Programs. Professor Jackson has served in other arenas as well. She has served as Director of Evaluation of the Experimental Schools Street Academy Project for the National Urban League in Wash-
Stephen Davis, accepting the 2001 Paula Silver Case Award

Washington, DC; Coordinator of the Supplementary Center for Early Childhood Education for New Jersey Public Schools in Englewood, NJ; Executive Director of Health and Welfare Council of Bergen County, NJ; and Music Teacher at Elisabeth Morrow School in Englewood, NJ. Jackson has also just completed a second term as an Executive Committee member for UCEA. She is also a Trustee Emerita of Wellesley College, Wellesley, Massachusetts.

Jackson has authored many published pieces both in books and journals. Her most recent book, Balancing Act: The Political Role of the Urban School Superintendent, was published by the University Press of America in cooperation with the Joint Center for Economic and Political Studies in Washington, DC. Her research project, Getting Inside History—Against All Odds: African American Women School Superintendents was published as a chapter in the book, Sacred Dreams: Women and the Superintendentcy, edited by C. Crissy Brunner, SUNY Press. She was also recently co-editor with Frances Kohn and Daniel Duke for A Thousand Voices from the Firing Line, which was published by UCEA in 1999.

Aside from winning the 2001 Campbell Award, Jackson has also received the Distinguished Alumni Award from Teachers College in November of 2000; Advocate for Justice recognition by AACTE in 1998; and the 1995 Kathryn I. Scanlon Award by Fordham University Alumni Association for her contributions to enhance the School of Education as a center of learning.

**Davis Receives the 2001 Paula Silver Case Award**

The Paula Silver Award is given annually to the author of the most outstanding case published in the last volume of the UCEA Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership. This year, Stephen Davis, currently an associate professor of educational administration at the University of the Pacific, received the Silver Award. Davis, who teaches courses in school law, leadership, organizational behavior and cultural diversity, is a former school district superintendent, personnel director and high school principal. He earned his doctorate at Stanford University in educational administration and policy analysis in 1987, and he received a bachelor's degree from Stanford in political science in 1971. He is currently writing a book on the intuitive dimensions of administrative decision making. His research focus has been on the leadership behaviors of public school principals.

Davis's case, Accusations of Discrimination, was published in the Fall 2000 edition of UCEA's online publication, the Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership. In Accusations of Discrimination, a high school principal is faced with an escalating crisis over a racially charged incident on campus. In the case, charges of racial discrimination against the school and one of its administrators triggers public outcry, media attention, faculty dissention, and an investigation by the U.S. Office of Civil Rights. This series of events challenges the principal's leadership and understanding of the law in areas relating to media access to campus; student confidentiality and collective bargaining. The case can be presented as a problem-based learning activity that requires students in teams of four to six to provide accurate memorandums, a mock interview and conduct a community meeting.

Nominations for the Silver award are now being accepted. Please contact Gary Crow (gcrow@gsce.utah.edu) or see the UCEA website for more details.

**2001 Convention Highlights**

The 2001 UCEA convention was held this past year in Cincinnati, Ohio and was co-hosted by the University of Cincinnati. The convention theme was “Leadership and Learning for the Success of All Children.” Despite the travel contrictions caused by the recent tragedies in September, the convention was heavily attended.

This year’s convention featured four keynote speakers, UCEA President María Luisa González, Paul Hill, Patricia Hill Collins and Eugene Garcia. For the first time in many years the Presidential Address was delivered at a General Session where it was very well received. Paul Hill delivered the Pennsylvania State University sponsored Mistifer Address on Saturday. It was entitled Leadership in a Reinvented School System. Saturday night’s convention banquet featured Patricia Hill Collins as the keynote speaker, whose lecture was entitled The Politics of Diversity: Issues and Challenges. Eugene Garcia was the convention’s final keynote speaker, and his speech was entitled The Troublesome “All” in the High Achievement for “All” Challenge.

The 2001 UCEA Convention again featured a Graduate Student Symposium to which all Graduate Students in attendance were invited. The first session’s theme was Conducting a Professional (and Successful) Academic Job Search, and the second was entitled Recruiting, Retaining.
and Sponsoring Graduate Students from Under-represented Groups. The third and final session was entitled Now What? Making the Transition from Student to Faculty Member. Conveners for these sessions included Scott McLeod, University of Minnesota; Kenneth Brinson, North Carolina State University; Donald Hackmann, Iowa State University; Bonnie Johnson, University of Kentucky; Alan Shoho, University of Texas-San Antonio; Linda Tillman, Wayne State University; Gerardo Lopez, University of Missouri; María Luisa González, New Mexico State University; Khaula Murtadha, Indiana University; David Quinn, University of Arizona; Megan Tschannen-Moran, College of William and Mary; and Pamela Tucker, University of Maryland.

The Annual Presidents' Reception was held on Friday night to honor and celebrate the contributions of UCEA's 40 past presidents. This reception also serves as an opportunity for convention attendants to interact in a casual atmosphere following the first full day of sessions. This event remains one of the most popular of the convention due to its networking possibilities. UCEA President María Luisa González, the UCEA Executive Committee and the UCEA staff host the event.

The UCEA convention had a strand of sessions to discuss the recent formation of NCAELP, the National Commission of the Advancement of Educational Leadership Preparation. The first of these sessions served as an introduction to the Commission and its work, the second dealt with A Focus on Effective Practice, and the third session's theme was Recommendations for Future Directions. NCAELP is being developed to address demands for a more literate, committed and technologically sophisticated work force that have come from educators, business leaders and policy makers during the past two decades. NCAELP's collaborative effort hopes to reach a consensus about the future of educational leadership preparation and professional development.

In response to the recent episodes of civil unrest in Cincinnati, UCEA and the University of Cincinnati developed a session to discuss the civil unrest and its impact on children and schools. The panel was organized and led by Lionel Brown from the University of Cincinnati. The panel members shared personal information and general views concerning the issue of Cincinnati police officers killing African American males. The panel concurred that everyone must find a way to address the problem of race relations in a way that improves the quality of life in Cincinnati and insures just and fair treatment for all citizens.

The 2001 Convention saw its second International Scholars' Breakfast entitled Accountability and Politics: An International Conversation about the Preparation of Educational Leaders. This session was organized by Betty Merchant, University of Texas-San Antonio; María Luisa González, New Mexico State University; and Ulrich Reitzug, University of North Carolina-Greensboro.

UCEA's 2002 Convention will be held at the downtown Hilton Hotel in Pittsburgh, PA and will be co-hosted by the University of Pittsburgh and Pennsylvania State University. The convention's theme will be Fostering Learning for All.

Prior to the banquet, UCEA Executive Director, Michelle Young, displays the proclamation from Mayor Charlie Luken, which named November 2, 2001 as UCEA Day in Cincinnati. UCEA is very honored to be welcomed so warmly and formally.

Honoring Multiple Leadership Perspectives. The purpose of the 2002 UCEA Convention is to engage participants in discussing research, policy and practice in education with a specific focus on educational leadership. Members of the 2002 Convention Program Committee are Nicola Alexander, Frances Kochan and Cynthia Reed. This year all proposal submissions will be electronic.

### Participation Guidelines and Proposal Deadlines for UCEA Convention 2002

Anyone involved in research, policy or practice in educational or youth-serving agencies may submit proposals for UCEA Convention 2002. All proposals will be submitted online this year through the UCEA webpage (http://www.ucea.org). The web page will provide clear guidelines for submission of proposals and all proposals will be subject to blind, peer review. 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. The deadline for submitting proposals is May 3, 2002. Again, all proposals must be submitted electronically.

### UCEA Welcomes New Members

At the 2001 Convention, the UCEA Executive Committee voted to admit four new members and one partner member. UCEA would like to welcome it's newest full members: the University of Alabama, University of Dayton, Lehigh University and the University of Louisville. Tennessee State University has partnered with the University of Tennessee - Knoxville making it our newest partner member. These additions bring the total number of UCEA members to 57. For information on applying for UCEA membership, please visit our website at http://www.ucea.org/membership/membership_policy_and_procedures.htm
CALL FOR CASES

The editorial board and staff of the *Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership* are currently soliciting cases. The journal publishes in electronic format peer-reviewed cases appropriate for use in programs that prepare educational leaders. The journal board and staff seek a wide range or cases that embody relevant and timely presentation of issues germane to the work and preparation of educational leaders.

Review Process
All cases will be subject to blind peer-review by the Editorial Board of the Journal. As is customary in most scholarly publications, authors should be prepared to work with the editorial staff in revising manuscripts in accordance with editorial policy. Cases will be reviewed with the following criteria in mind:

- Cases should focus on relevant and timely issues of educational leadership.
- Cases should be especially relevant to graduate students preparing for educational leadership roles and for educational professionals.
- Cases will also be reviewed in terms of their usefulness in graduate teaching environments and their potential for enabling analysis using multiple theoretical perspectives.
- Clarity in writing is essential.

Submission Guidelines
Manuscripts should be at least 5 but no more than 15 double-spaced, typewritten pages (12 point) (i.e., between 1200-2000 words, exclusive of teaching notes). All manuscripts should be submitted in triplicate, using American Psychological Association Style. A cover sheet including the title, author’s name, address, and email address should accompany the three copies of the manuscript. The body of the manuscript should include only the title of the case on each page. A PC compatible disk will be requested before final acceptance. Manuscripts may be submitted in either Microsoft Word or Wordperfect word processing formats.

All cases should include a one page “Teaching Note” that outlines how the material might be used in professional preparation programs for educational leaders. Within the “Teaching Note,” authors should include a short 100 word abstract describing the topic(s) of the case and brief synopsis of the case.

Those interested in submitting cases should send THREE copies of their manuscript to:

Gary Crow
Department of Educational Administration
The University of Utah
1705 E. Campus Center Dr. Room 339
Salt Lake City, UT 84112-9254

Questions concerning the journal can be directed to Gary Crow at 801-581 3377 or gcrow@gse.utah.edu
**STATEMENT OF PURPOSE**

The *Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership* publishes in electronic format peer-reviewed cases appropriate for use in programs that prepare educational leaders. Building on a long tradition, UCEA sponsors this journal in an ongoing effort to improve administrative preparation. The journal's editorial staff seeks a wide range of cases that embody relevant and timely presentations of issues germane to the preparation of educational leaders.
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Patrick B. Forsyth, Oklahoma State University - Tulsa  
Richard Fossey, University of Houston  
Frances C. Fowler, Miami University  
María Luisa González, New Mexico State University  
Stephen L. Jacobson, SUNY-Buffalo  
Barbara Y. LaCost, University of Nebraska-Lincoln  
Angus MacNeil, University of Houston  
Pedro Reyes, University of Texas-Austin  
Alan Shoho, University of Texas - San Antonio  
Paula M. Short, University of Tennessee Board of Regents  
Linda Tillman, Wayne State University  
Pamela Tucker, University of Virginia

**EDITORIAL STAFF**

Editor          Gary M. Crow, University of Utah  
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Cases published in *JCEL* may be downloaded and duplicated for non-profit use by an individual or educational/public agency. Such reproductions must bear the citation of the article, including author's name, title of case, journal name and issue. Commercial use of *JCEL* in whole or in part is strictly prohibited.

**CASES**

*Mountain State University Opportunity Scholarships: Encouraging Students of Color to Participate in Higher Education*
Amy Aldous Bergerson, University of Utah

*Out of the Mouths of Babes*
Darlene York Bruner, Valdosta State University  
Martha Livingston, Valdosta State University

*Dirty Dancing*
Michael F. DiPaola, The College of William and Mary

*When Everyone's Vulnerable*
Aimee Howley, Ohio University
**Call for Proposals**

**UCEA Convention 2002**

"Fostering Learning for All: Honoring Multiple Leadership Perspectives"

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania   November 1-3, 2002

I. **General Information.** The 16th annual convention of the University Council for Educational Administration will be held at the Downtown Hilton in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. The convention will begin at 8:00 AM on Friday morning, November 1, 2002, with an official opening session at 11:00 AM. The convention will close at 11:30 AM on Sunday, November 3, 2002. The purpose of the 2002 UCEA Convention is to engage participants in discussing research, policy, and practice in education with a specific focus on educational leadership. Members of the Convention 2002 Program Committee are Frances K. Kochan (Auburn University), Nicola A. Alexander (University of Minnesota), and Cynthia J. Reed (Auburn University).

II. **Theme.** The 2002 UCEA Convention theme, *Fostering Learning for All: Honoring Multiple Leadership Perspectives*, highlights the relationships among leadership, learning, equity, and social justice, particularly within the context of a global society. As members of UCEA we are responsible for preparing current and future leaders, challenging assumptions about educational leadership, and conducting research that strengthens the profession. As such, it is imperative that we, as an organization, broaden our conceptual frameworks about leadership to include multiple perspectives that honor varied definitions, values, and approaches to leadership, learning, and success. This conference seeks to explore multiple perspectives in order to foster greater understanding, awareness, and sensitivity to the unique circumstances facing leaders and those who prepare them as well as to offer opportunities for developing increased mutual respect between and among scholars, practitioners, policy makers, parents, students, and community leaders. Topics relating to this year’s theme will be explored at this conference including:

A. **Linking accountability, success, and leadership**
   - What counts as learning and who should decide?
   - When defining and judging learning, what should be measured, whose voices should be heard, and how should decisions be made?
   - What leadership qualities, strategies, and attributes foster successful learning for all students, educational leaders, and other adults?
   - What roles do educational leaders play in fostering equitable and socially responsible accountability practices?
   - What are the implications for educational leadership preparation programs?

B. **Re-conceptualizing and defining educational leadership in a global, diverse, and complex society**
   - How is leadership defined and viewed across cultures and communities?
   - In what ways has terrorism influenced leadership and learning?
   - Whose voices must be included when creating leadership definitions and concepts? Who should lead? How, when, where, and why?
   - What is the impact of the global society on educational leadership preparation and evaluation?
   - What links are needed to more effectively connect theory, research, and practice?

C. **Building coalitions that enhance leadership and learning**
   - How can leadership be redefined as a community development process?
   - How do successful leaders create collaborative internal and external communities and connect them for the well-being of children?
   - In what ways do educational leadership, political activism, and community development intersect?
   - How can relationships between educational leadership and economic development be enhanced? What are the barriers, concerns, and facilitating factors?
   - What are the roles and responsibilities of educational leaders when fostering educational equity and social justice?

D. **Uniting leadership and policy development**
   - What is the role of educational leaders in policy development?
   - What is the role of educational leadership preparation programs and educational research in shaping public policy?
   - What role should the leadership of UCEA take in setting agendas and framing national and state policies? What strategies work?
   - How can educational leaders support educational equity and social justice through policy development and enactment?
   - How can theory, research, and practice pertaining to educational policy become more closely linked?

Submissions are encouraged to 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 2002 UCEA Convention will include a variety of session formats that facilitate dialogue. Proposals must include a cover sheet and summary (3 pages or fewer, purged of author identification). All proposals must be submitted electronically.

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.

2. **Symposia.** A symposium should examine specific issues, research problems, or topics from several perspectives and allow for dialogue and discussion. Session organizers are expected to chair the session and facilitate discussion. Symposium participants are expected to develop and provide copies of papers.

3. **Conversations.** Conversation sessions are intended to stimulate informal, lively discussion often using a series of provocative questions or vignettes. Session organizers are expected to organize a panel of participants and facilitate and guide the conversation about critical issues, concerns, and perspectives. The proposal summary should describe the purpose of the session, the ways in which participants will be encouraged to engage in conversation, and examples of questions or areas to be addressed.

4. **Interactive Roundtables.** These sessions are intended for small group-focused discussions such as book discussions, “fireside” chats, research in progress, practitioner voices, and issues in teaching 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.

6. **Innovative Sessions.** Proposals utilizing innovative presentation/interaction strategies are encouraged. The proposal summary should describe the focus and purpose of the session, the innovative format, and how the format will enhance learning and 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); (4) relationship to convention theme and (5) the format of the session. All proposals must be submitted electronically and will be reviewed electronically.
Contributing to the UCEA Review

Catherine Lugg (Rutgers University) and Alan Shoho (University of Texas-San Antonio) are the Feature Editors for the UCEA Review. If you have ideas for substantive feature articles, they would be happy to hear from you.

Catherine Lugg, lugg@rci.rutgers.edu
Alan Shoho, ashoho@utsa.edu

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
adminucea@coe.missouri.edu

2002 Calendar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February, 2002</td>
<td>NCAELP Report to NCPEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 7-9, 2002</td>
<td>NCAELP Meeting, Wingspread Conference Center, WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 15-17, 2002</td>
<td>Conference Within A Conference, San Diego, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February, 2002</td>
<td>NCAELP Report to AASA, San Diego, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 16, 2002</td>
<td>UCEA/NCPEA/AASA Higher Education Reception, San Diego, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February, 2002</td>
<td>NCAELP Report to AACTE, New York, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March, 2002</td>
<td>NCAELP Report to NASSP, Atlanta, GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April, 2002</td>
<td>NCAELP Report to AERA, New Orleans, LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April, 2002</td>
<td>UCEA/Div A/Div L/Corwin Press Reception, New Orleans, LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 5-6, 2002</td>
<td>David L. Clark National Graduate Student Research Seminar, New Orleans, LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July, 2000</td>
<td>UCEA Executive Committee Meeting, Columbia, MO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1-3, 2000</td>
<td>UCEA Annual Convention, Pittsburgh, PA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Review

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
Charles Kuan-Yao Chiu .... Graduate Assistant
Jumoke Sanusi ........ Graduate Assistant