Good morning. As you saw from the opening slides with the movie theme, this Presidential Address is rated “I” for Interactive. Consequently, the full contents of this address will be partly determined by feedback you provide online, so you’ll have to read the complete version in the next UCEA Review. One of my objectives is to do something a little different from the traditional UCEA Presidential Address by providing some thoughts to engage you about the state of our field.

Before I begin in earnest this address, I want to insure everyone has his or her cell phone ready to participate. As some of you know, I am one of the few people in this room who doesn’t have a cell phone. You may wonder why. The easy answer is to say I’m waiting to see if cell phones are a fad or whether it really catches on. Hopefully, the issue of change or, in my case, the failure to change and its consequence, will come across throughout my address today. By the way, is there anyone in the audience who doesn’t have a cell phone? Don’t be shy. It’s okay to be a noncarrying cell phone user. I want to make sure everyone has an opportunity to participate in today’s session, although you will be able to participate until Friday, November 12 by following the directions on the sheet of paper placed on your seat for texting information. However, you can only participate once in each of the closed-ended poll questions, but many times in the open response questions.

Now that we’ve gotten the technology out of the way, I want to refer back to the opening slides. As you saw, I have been thinking about this Presidential Address for 729 days and by my count, I estimate I have been asked the question, “How is your speech coming along?” about 465 times. You may wonder how I derived at that number. Well, approximately 100 are from colleagues, but the other 365 are from my dog, Lucky. She has suffered through 2 years’ worth of listening to me practice this address during our 4:00 a.m. walks in the morning, and like man’s best friend, while she doesn’t talk, she has given me that look of “how’s the speech coming along?” It’s a question I won’t be disappointed not hearing again after today.

Like my predecessors, one of the prerequisites for preparing a Presidential Address is to read all the previous Presidential Addresses available—in my case, the last 17 years available through the UCEA website. If there are any UCEA Past-Presidents in attendance, will you please stand? Can we please acknowledge their presence and contributions to the organization? As I read all the Presidential Addresses from Pedro Reyes in 1993 to Jim Korschoreck last year, two things struck me. First, each of my predecessors shared timeless insights, which are no less valid today than when they were delivered. For example, in 2001, Malu Gonzalez talked about professors as borderlanders and stated, “It is not enough to simply preach, teach, and research leadership; we must practice it” (p. 5). In other words, we must align our espoused theories with our theories in use.
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1997, Dan Duke talked about the preparation of school leaders re-
quiring fluency in two languages, “the language of immediate con-
cerns and the language of anticipation” (p. 14). I’m going to pick up on
this language of anticipation later on, because I believe it is one of
the keys to our field’s future success and ultimate survival. Fi-
nally, in 1996, Paula Short shared the reflections of the first UCEA
Presidential Address by Samuel Goldman in 1972 and recounted
how the field was “terribly demoralized by the societal mood of the
nation” (p. 12). Does this sound familiar given the current econom-
ic crisis many of our institutions are experiencing? Yet, as Goldman
reflected 25 years later and Paula Short captured, “what may seem
ordinary today could be extraordinary tomorrow” (p. 12).

The second thing that struck me about all the previous UCEA
Presidential Addresses was the overlapping themes of being proac-
tive, accepting the social responsibility of the field, extending our
community beyond the ivory tower and the silos within it to tight-
ening the linkages to K-12 practitioners, and probing ways for our
work to become more relevant and meaningful to the children and
schools we purport to serve. Today, my goal is to reinforce some of
these themes as well as humbly contribute to the illustrious legacy
of my predecessors.

To start off, my Presidential Address is entitled, “Rise? Or
Demise?” Notice I have a question mark behind each word, because of
the uncertainty about the direction our field is likely to experi-
ce during the next decade and beyond. In my address today, I plan
to share two main ideas for moving our field forward, so that we
experience the “rise” and not the “demise” as noted in my title. The
first idea is “learning from failure” and the second is asserting what
I call “affirmative leadership.” Before I articulate the importance of
learning from failure, I want to assess where you envision the
field to be in the next decade, whether we are on the rise, decline,
or neither. Please take the next minute to text your response to the
poll question shown, “As you envision the next decade, is the field
of educational leadership on the…”?

Of the 108 responses, 53% indicated the field was on the rise,
33% felt the field was in decline, and 14% responded the field was
in neither rise nor decline. There are two ways to view this result.

One way is to interpret this result as the optimism to push forward
needed changes. A second way to interpret this result is with con-
cern that the field is in a state of denial and doesn’t understand or
know the fundamental changes required to sustain its viability. Only
time will tell which is the correct interpretation.

Based on your responses, I will lay out two diverse scenarios
during my address, knowing that reality is likely to lie somewhere
between these two extremes. The first scenario is something we
don’t want to envision, the demise of our field or programs, so why
address it? The reason to address the demise scenario is because
if we don’t acknowledge its possibility and examine why programs
decline and collapse, we may end up like the lobster in the pot of
slowly boiling water, unaware that it is about to become someone’s
dinner. Could it happen? I hope not, but given the current eco-

nomic crisis and hostility that many higher education institutions
are facing, it’s not out of the realm of possibility that university
presidents and boards of trustees, in an effort to cut costs, could
look for programs and departments they view as unessential to their
core mission.

According to Willis Hawley in a 2010 report entitled, The
by the Wayside, impending external changes to universities “togeth-
er with unprecedented criticism of university-based teacher-
and leader-preparation programs from some in the Obama administra-

tion, sank many colleges of education, or left them clinging to life
rafts going nowhere” (p. 29). Despite this gloomy forecast, Hawley
goes on to expound that some colleges of education will emerge
as strong or stronger in 2015 than they were in 2010. The keys to
this strength are four factors: (a) They developed solid evidence to
demonstrate that their graduates improve the learning of students
they serve; (b) they change the composition of the faculty, using
differentiated workloads and responsibilities; (c) successful colleges
of education capitalized on research that supported and provided
direction to schools and policy makers; and (d) successful colleges
of education collaborated with other entities on developing new
learning technologies to provide high-level learning and profes-

sional development.

From what I’ve seen and read in the Chronicle of Higher Educa-
tion over the past 10 years, the days of the cafeteria-style university

Contributing to the Review

The content of the UCEA Review is not peer reviewed, and
any opinions printed in the Review should not be viewed as
a statement by UCEA, UCEA Executive Board members,
UCEA member institutions, or UCEA faculty. The opinions
expressed are those of the authors alone. The UCEA Review
serves as a source of information and news and a place where
program innovations are shared and critical questions are
raised. Members use the review for debate, to share opinions,
and to engage the educational administration community in
conversation and debate. If you have ideas concerning sub-
stantial feature articles, interviews, point/counterpoints, or
innovative programs, UCEA Review editors would be happy
to hear from you. The Editorial Team (see back page of the
Review) meets twice a year. One to two features appear in each
issue of the Review, which is published three times a year.
is over. There are anecdotal signs that this is already occurring at flagship institutions. Just ask our UCEA colleagues at the University of Las Vegas where their department was eliminated, although their program will continue (unfortunately, without any of their junior and clinical faculty, who are being laid off). Or at another UCEA institution, the University of Iowa, where there was discussion by the university administration about program elimination last year. While these instances may represent isolated cases, it could signify the beginning of an uneasy trend towards university leadership preparation collapse where alternative providers including New Leaders for New Schools and MBA programs grab hold or scale up. An example of this was recently announced in September 2010; the George W. Bush Institute, housed at Southern Methodist University in Dallas, is planning to recruit and prepare 50,000 noneducators to become principals by the year 2020 (this represents approximately 50% of all the principals in the country). They plan to initially launch sites in Dallas, Fort Worth, and Plano, Texas, along with Indianapolis, St. Louis, and Denver. Their initiative, entitled Alliance to Reform Education Leadership, is a partnership with Teach for America and New Leaders for New Schools and is being led by Jim Guthrie, a former Professor at Vanderbilt University, so this is a formidable challenge and not one to be taken lightly. This initiative has powerful allies with financial resources; slick public relation campaigns; political clout; and strong connections to local, state, and federal policy makers.

From my perspective, we are getting outmaneuvered by powerful forces that would just assume eliminate university programs and institute alternative programs like New Leaders for New Schools, regional service centers, MBA programs, and other alternative programs. They are controlling the “narrative.” One of our challenges is to create a compelling narrative that counters the damaging effects of what Jared Diamond (2005) calls, “hostile neighbors.” While this narrative must rely on the best research available, we cannot presume the rational argument based on research will resonate with the public. This is where we must learn from others about developing effective marketing campaigns (and using social media like Facebook and what Erik Qualman (2010) entitles “socialnomics”) to get our message to go beyond people’s heads, but to their hearts. As you know, there has been a lot of publicity surrounding the recent release of the documentary, Waiting for Superman. How many of you have seen it? I saw it 2 weeks ago and to be honest was disappointed, because it is a very distorted and biased presentation of the challenges facing education and the solutions to improve it. At the same time, I watched the audience in attendance with me and was surprised at how captivated and supportive they were of the message. While I respect the efforts of Geoffrey Canada and the Harlem Children’s Zone, the simple fact is Superman is a fictional character and there are no supermen or superwomen. It concerns me that we may be reverting to the days of the hero leader when what we need are the Level 5 leaders that Jim Collins (2001) articulates in Good to Great. As I will share with you later, there are only ordinary people doing extraordinary jobs, and to expect superheroes to come along and save the day is unrealistic and a distraction to the real efforts to develop effective leaders.

The second scenario views our current difficulties as a great opportunity to advance our field’s standing if we are willing to make some difficult decisions. A little over a year ago, I attended a Wallace Foundation conference in Washington, DC, where Secretary of Education Arne Duncan was one of the keynote speakers, and to be honest I only remember one thing he said. He shared a story about Rahm Emanuel, the former Chief of Staff for the President, and how people in the administration were having a difficult time moving the President’s agenda forward due to the economic crisis, health care debate, and the two war fronts. The Secretary of Education quoted Rahm Emanuel as saying, “Never waste a good crisis.” In keeping with this sentiment, we shouldn’t waste the current crisis or challenges we’re experiencing. Similar to the economic recession, there are always opportunities if we are willing to seize them. The key is do we have the “will” to recognize the need for change in the field and make the necessary shifts in our thinking and habits? The time for change is not when your back is against the wall, but rather when you don’t have to change to survive.

Launch Pad and Space-Level Perspectives

Over the past 2 years, I’ve had the privilege of representing UCEA at a number of national meetings. In her 1998 presidential address, Paula Cordeiro emphasized through the use of a metaphor the importance of having a balcony and ballroom view of events, which I believe she meant refers to having an insider’s and outsider’s perspective. While I liked Paula’s use of the balcony and ballroom metaphor, being a former electrical engineer who can’t dance, sing, or act and will never be invited to perform on stage or on America’s Got Talent or Dancing With the Stars, I thought there had to be a more applicable metaphor to use.

Well, 3 weeks ago, as I was preparing this address, I had a case of writer’s block, so I decided to watch a movie in hopes that it would inspire me to pen some magical words to share with you today. The movie I watched was Apollo 13. How many of you have watched Apollo 13, with Tom Hanks? After watching the movie, I reflected on what it must have felt like to be Commander Jim Lovell on Apollo 13 as he soared into space. What do I mean by this? Well, as Jim Lovell was leaving the earth’s orbit going to the moon, he looked back at the earth and shared how beautiful the view was. Similarly, as I reflect on my 2 years as President-Elect and President, I’ve had the privilege to meet some of the most talented people and exciting programs in our field, and like one of my opening slides showed—it’s been priceless. In particular, as part of the site visit team to assess where UCEA’s new home will be starting next summer, I got to visit three of UCEA’s finest institutions. This ground-level perspective allowed me to see what quality leadership preparation programs look like and gave me inspiration to want to scale up this work to encompass more programs as well as steal whatever I could and share it with my UTSA colleagues. Is it any wonder why Penn State is located in a place called Happy Valley, especially when you have a Dean like David Monk. And if you want to see an exciting place that practices being a professional learning community, visit the University of Connecticut and Casey Cobb and his colleagues. And last of all, it was inspiring to be at a place where leadership is at the heart of the institution’s overall mission and where you could feel the presence of Thomas Jefferson on the grounds of the University of Virginia. My only advice is when you visit the Rotunda at night and wish Mr. Jefferson a good night, you may have some naked company right next to you.

Yet, as I sit in my UCEA space shuttle and marvel at what some of our member institutions are doing on the ground, like Jim Lovell, I also see the bigger picture of the field from space and the
environment we are in and think, “UCEA, we have a problem.” Similar to the problem NASA encountered during the Apollo 13 mission, solving our challenges won’t be simple, as shown in the following video clip from the movie: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6gTiGkVf9zg&feature=related.

Like the Apollo 13 crew, the problem of devising a square CO2 filter to fit into a round hole to clean the air the astronauts were breathing, using nothing but parts available to them, required “generative” problem solving on the part of the engineers on the ground. In other words, the NASA engineers charged with inventing a solution had to see beyond the obvious and imagine what’s possible. Similarly, we must do the same. Is this going to be easy? No, because change is uncomfortable, but it is possible, as President John F. Kennedy exemplified in 1963 when a reporter asked him, why go to the moon? His response: “Because it’s hard.” In other words, President Kennedy knew that in order to make America’s space program the best, he had to shoot for the stars and do something hard that no other country had accomplished, rather than settling for what’s easy. Similarly, I believe we must make some hard choices to enhance the quality of our field.

At this point, I want to see how you respond to the second poll question: What kind of changes, if any, does the field of educational leadership have to take?

For this poll question, 101 responses were recorded with 87% indicating the field needs to take major, drastic changes, while 11% felt the field required minor, incremental changes, and 2% indicated the field doesn’t need to change anything and it just needs to keep doing what it is currently doing. Given the responses to the first two polling questions, the audience who participated was optimistic, yet they understood the need that major shifts in thinking and operations were required to create and sustain a vibrant field.

A third poll question asked audience participants for their ideas on how the field could improve its standing in the public eye. Thirty-three people shared their responses, and two major themes emerged. The first theme is to better articulate the narrative being portrayed about educational leadership programs in universities and to be more proactive in our public relations. This was illustrated by the following thoughts shared by respondents: “Focus on cultivating social engagement between the public and our schools,” “Need to communicate value that our programs bring to schools,” and “Seek alternative forms of publication that are more accessible and readily available to wider audiences.” The second theme is to create tighter and more collaborative meaningful linkages to school districts and practitioners. While many respondents identified the second theme, they used different ideas that encompassed the following: “Eliminate the disconnect between practice and theory,” “Build stronger alliances to state leadership associations,” and “Move the field closer and engage practitioners as equal partners as researchers.”

Learning From Failure

As noted earlier, I envision two possible scenarios for our field. The first scenario entails the demise of our field. Some may ask, why talk about failure? The simple answer is, understanding failure is the key to success. Another reason is I’m damn good at it. Unlike many of you, I have never had a manuscript accepted as is. They might as well call me, Dr. “R & R” (Revise and Resubmit) in the best case and Dr. Reject and Resubmit in the worst case. And just to let you know that UCEA has standards and doesn’t favor anyone, especially presidents, I’ve had more than my share of conference proposals and manuscripts rejected.

For me, the issue of learning from failure is a natural process. As a former electrical engineer, or some may label me a premodernist or prehistoric, I was taught to learn from failure, and it was only through failure that you could be on the leading edge of innovation. It’s also important to understand why entities collapse, whether they are societies or university programs or schools. Unfortunately, program failure is not a popular topic, and no one wants to be the subject of a study on failure. So in the absence of research on educational leadership programs that collapsed, I draw on research outside our field to inform us why certain societies and other university programs/collages either thrive or collapse.

There are two books I’m going to refer to extensively during my address. The first book is by Jared Diamond (2005) entitled, Collapse: How Societies Choose to Fail or Succeed. Diamond examines both past and modern societies that collapsed or are on the verge of collapse, including the Anasazi, Maya, Vikings, Easter Island, Rwanda, and Haiti, along with several others. It should be noted that societal collapse did not occur immediately, but rather over a long period of time, 200 to 400 years. What can we learn from societal collapses?

Diamond (2005) developed a five-point framework of contributing factors to societal collapse: (a) environmental damage, (b) climate change, (c) hostile neighbors, (d) friendly trade partners, and (e) society’s responses to its environmental problems. By using transference of Diamond’s framework to our field, I’m going to focus on the last three points in Diamond’s framework, i.e., hostile neighbors, friendly trade partners, and society’s responses to its environmental problems.

For our purposes as a field, hostile neighbors are the forces who believe in free market and privatization reforms, alternative pathways to certification and licensure, and view universities as unresponsive or slow to respond to factors affecting schools and in particular leadership preparation. Potential friendly trade partners are organizations like AERA, NPBEA, NCPEA, NASSP, NAESP, AASA, school districts, and other professional organizations. And how society responses to its environmental problems translate to Dan Duke’s notion of language of anticipation and whether we create our destiny by being proactive or have our destiny created for us by being reactive. So how do we deal with each of these three contributing factors to collapse?

According to Diamond (2005), the way to hold off hostile neighbors is to be collectively strong. The key question is how do we become collectively strong and what does it mean? I argue one way to develop and maintain a collective strength is to establish and require high-quality leadership program features such as those found by Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, Meyerson, Orr, and Cohen (2007) as well as others (Jackson & Kelley, 2002; Orr, 2007):

- Research-based content that clearly focuses on instruction, change management, and organizational practice.
- Coherent curriculum that links all aspects of the preparation experience around a set of shared values, beliefs, and knowledge about effective organizational practice.
- Rigorous selection process that gives priority to underserved groups, particularly, racial/ethnic minorities.
- Cohort structures that foster collaboratively learning and support.
- School–university collaborations that create a seamless and coherent program for students.
• Field-based internships that allow individuals to apply their new knowledge and skills while under the guidance of expert leaders.
• Supportive organizational structures that support student retention, engagement, and placement.
• Systematic process for evaluating and improving programs and coursework.
• Low student–faculty ratio (i.e., 20:1) and active, student-centered instruction.
• Full-time tenure-track faculty members who make significant efforts to identify, develop, and promote relevant knowledge focused on the essential problems of schooling, leadership, and administrative practice.
• Professional growth opportunities for faculty.

One of our field’s biggest challenges is dealing with the wide variability across programs. While there is something to be said for variability—and I want to be absolutely clear, I am not advocating standardization or a one-size-fits-all model—one of the field’s dilemmas is the vast differentiation in quality among the 590 (Hackmann & McCarthy, 2008) and growing leadership preparation programs in the country, most of which are in universities. Hostile neighbors contend that the free marketplace weeds out the weak and only the strong programs survive. Unfortunately, we all know this is untrue when it comes to university leadership preparation programs, and what tends to happen is the weakest programs often provide leaders to the schools and districts that can least afford to have weak or unqualified leaders. Should we as an organization and field stand by idly and let this happen, knowing that the children most likely to be impacted are from impoverished backgrounds?

If you allow me, I’d like to take the liberty of a presidential moment to ask a question. How many of you are parents or grandparents or uncles or aunts with young relatives in or soon in school? Please raise your hands. Am I safe to assume you want the best teachers and principals for your kids, grandkids, nieces, and nephews and would advocate for them? If so, do we have any less of an obligation as a field to insure that all programs that produce school leaders we would entrust our own children/grandchildren/nieces/nephews to? From my perspective, that’s the highest or gold standard we should aspire to. If we can’t prepare people or vouch for programs to entrust our own children with, what gives us the legitimacy or the moral high ground to prepare future leaders to go into schools where children and families are marginalized and don’t have a voice?

The second factor contributing to societal collapse is the decreased support by friendly trade partners. In terms of educational leadership, this means we have to be aware of the support or lack of it from friendly trade partners like our professional associations and school districts. Raise your hand to the following question: Do you think your local/state professional practitioner associations and school districts would fight for your program if it were faced with the possibility of program elimination? While I think it’s fair to say that UCEA and leadership preparation programs have maintained cordial, albeit distant relationships at the national level, there are signs of opportunities for this relationship to warm up and become mutually beneficial, especially as UCEA moves its headquarters to the University of Virginia and its proximity to Washington, DC, where all the professional organizations are located. As I will share in a little while, this is where affirmative leadership comes into play. I can’t emphasize enough the need to cultivate relationships that are symbiotic or greater, as noted by Bruce Barnett and his collaborators when they developed a typology for partnerships and promoting innovation (Barnett, Hall, Berg, & Camarena, 2010; see Figure 1). If we develop strong partnerships with friendly trade partners, there’s no limit to the opportunities for collaboration, in terms of research and leadership development and interdependent learning. It’s a win-win. In addition, by cultivating strong relationships with school districts and professional organizations, if our programs ever encounter the threat of program elimination, we’ll have vested friendly trading partners who come to our defense. This will speak volumes louder than anything we could do in defending ourselves. The key is to start now in anticipation of the worst-case scenario, program eliminations or economic crisis for the future. If we wait until the slippery slope of demise gains momentum, it may be too late, and we shouldn’t be surprised if our friendly trade partners don’t come to our assistance.

The third and final area of Jared Diamond’s (2005) framework for collapse translates into how does our field responds to the challenges ahead of us. As Diamond noted, different societies respond differently to similar problems. While there are multiple ways to respond successfully, Diamond points out there are common threads associated with failed societies, which have direct relevance for our field. The one relevant to this talk is the failure to anticipate a problem. The reason for focusing on anticipation is because it implies a proactive stance through ongoing assessment for improvement rather than a reactive stance associated with responding to an accreditation review or other challenge. As a field, how do we create a culture of anticipation where potential problems and issues can

---

**Figure 1.** Typology of partnerships for innovation. Conceptual framework of the types of partnerships between an external resource system and school districts. From Barnett et al., 2010.
be averted? One way is something UCEA, in particular Michelle Young, and others like Linda Darling-Hammond have encouraged scholars to do in recent years: Publish your work in nontraditional formats like policy briefs and disseminate directly to others beyond the scholarly community like practitioners and policy makers. Develop communication mechanisms using today's technologies like blogs, wikis, etc. I'm sure Scott McLeod, our Associate Director for Communication, would be willing to guide you in this endeavor. Write in journals with high influence like the Kappan or Educational Leadership, which may not be peer reviewed, but they have great influence in the field due to their large readerships. By forming closer relationships with practitioners and policy makers, we gain a better feel for the pulse of what is coming down the pipeline before it actually hits us in the face.

A second way is to participate in multi-institutional teams organized through an organization like UCEA from across the country and world to assess the pulse of the field and lay out various pathways and their likely probability for achievement. While this is very unpredictable work, similar to predicting the weather, and cynics would disparage its usefulness, the truth is developing early warning mechanisms, whether it be for weather or earthquakes or tidal waves, has saved lives. With all the brainpower sitting in this room, we as a field can create an operational system to help us anticipate future hurricanes and their likely trajectory. By doing so, we can prepare and be ready for impending storms. If we don't, it's symbolic that we are in New Orleans, because of what happened a little over 5 years ago during Hurricane Katrina. While no amount of anticipation can prevent a hurricane like Katrina, we can and could have prevented some of its devastation and saved lives if a language and culture of anticipation had been operational.

The second book, Changing Course, Making the Hard Decisions to Eliminate Academic Programs by Peter Eckels (2003), lays out four case studies (University of Maryland, Oregon State University, University of Rochester, and Kent State University) where programs were eliminated in the 1990s. In each case, university leadership cited economics and cost cutting as the primary rationale for program elimination. Eckels provides a revealing analysis that identifies four major reasons why programs were exposed to elimination: (a) Programs did not have champions on or off campus willing to take up their cause, (b) program or departmental leadership tended to be novice or ineffective, (c) their alumni was small or dispersed, and (d) program faculty were disconnected from the campus power circles.

Eckels provides several examples of programs that were able to stave off elimination. The key ingredient is building internal and external coalitions to gain support as well as actively keeping opposing coalitions from forming. This ingredient is consistent with Diamond's work on dealing with hostile neighbors and friendly trade partners. It is also critical to support and cultivate strong departmental leadership. We should heed Eckel's advice that if our departmental leader fails or is unsuccessful, our whole department is likely to fail or, at the minimum, not reach its maximum potential effectiveness.

Seizing the Opportunity Through Affirmative Leadership

As noted above, we can learn from failure and prevent collapse, but it takes the “will” to make “difficult” decisions. The second scenario views the next decade as a great opportunity to enhance the field of educational leadership through what I call “affirmative leadership.” What is “affirmative” leadership? Affirmative leadership involves four tenets: (a) Be proactive and anticipate possibilities, (b) be vulnerable and open to engaging friendly trade partners, (c) cultivate relationships for the long term, and (d) take care of friendly trading partners and they will take care of us.

The first tenet is where leaders take proactive steps to foresee issues of concern from rising to a level where they are difficult to confront despite all the empirical evidence. Affirmative leadership does not imply standing against something or taking a “siege” mentality, but rather it means to stand for something. Affirmative leadership uses core tenets such as those identified earlier by Darling-Hammond and others of what constitutes effective leadership programs. The key issue is, can we as a field come to consensus on what these core tenets are? If we can't and we continue to debate to futility and never identify core principles to represent the field, then maybe our critics are right about our field not being responsive in a timely manner. Sometimes you have to just put things forth and adjust as need be. Waiting for perfection or unanimity is time we can’t afford.

The second aspect of affirmative leadership I propose is the willingness to be vulnerable and open to engaging in meaningful and substantive two-way dialogues and relationships with our friendly trading partners. This means asking our friendly trading partners for insights on what we are doing and not being defensive, but rather understanding about things we don’t want to hear. Only through this type of give and take will we develop the type of symbiotic or greater types of partnerships for innovation that Barnett and others illustrated earlier.

The third piece of affirmative leadership is cultivating relationships for the long term. Although the payoff for relationship building rarely bears fruit today, tomorrow, or next year, it does bear fruit when you water, fertilize, and take care of it. One example of this is the work of my UTSA colleagues, Encarnacion Garza and Elizabeth Murakami-Ramalho. For the past 6+ years, they have been working in San Antonio Independent School District in various capacities. Their longstanding relationship has afforded our department the opportunity to have four district cohorts, one of which is graduating this December, and many of them are here at the conference presenting their work this week. This type of collaboration would not be possible if they had not built the type of relationship over a long period of time with the district’s leadership team. Given their staying power, I suspect my colleagues have a certain level of carte blanche within this school district when it comes to conducting research. The key is this did not happen overnight, and it took their affirmative actions to create a relationship of mutual trust and benefit.

The fourth and final tenet of affirmative leadership is counterintuitive to what many have been brought up to believe. If you believe in Maslow’s hierarchy of needs, you know that in order to get his fifth level of self-actualization, you first must have your physiological needs met. I offer up an alternative perspective based on Eastern philosophy that says if you take care of your friendly trading partners, they will care of you. In other words, if UCEA and its membership take care of our friendly trading partners like school districts and professional practitioner organizations, then they will assist us. As you can see by the diagram in Figure 2, I envision affirmative leadership as a process that begins with anticipation and proactive behavior and ends with an interdependent dynamic of collaborative partners.
At this point, I want to illustrate what affirmative leadership looks like with some examples (Figure 3). Does anyone know who Chiune Sugihara is? Mr. Sugihara is often referred to as the “Japanese Schindler.” As a Japanese diplomat in Lithuania, Mr. Sugihara is credited with saving up to 10,000 Polish Jews who were fleeing Nazi persecution. And due to ensuing generations, over 40,000 Jews can attribute their lives directly to Sugihara’s actions.

What about Natalie Randolph (Figure 4)? She is currently one of the few female high school head boy’s varsity high school football coach in America at Coolidge High School in Washington, DC. When asked why she was hired when there were two former NFL players in the applicant pool, the hiring committee cited that Ms. Randolph was the only person who articulated what she would do for the students and not her own career.

And finally, does anyone know who Saburo Okinaga is (Figure 5)? I would be shocked if anyone knows Mr. Okinaga, because he is my grandfather. Mr. Okinaga was a founder of one of the first Japanese Language Schools in Hawaii. Right after Pearl Harbor, he was detained for being a leader of the Japanese Language School.

It was through experiences like this that I have become concerned about how we treat marginalized groups today like Muslim Americans. As my grandfather once shared with me, the U.S. Constitution is not a document of convenience, but one that tests the will of its people during times of crisis. Mr. Sugihara, Ms. Randolph, and Mr. Okinaga are all people who have demonstrated what I have talked about today, affirmative leadership. It’s the ability to transcend moments of difficulty and act selflessly to better the lives of others around them.

To conclude this address, we have a great opportunity to advance our field forward. At the same time, the window of opportunity is closing and we face a number of challenges. Two questions will determine whether we rise or demise. The first question is similar to what George Counts asked the Progressive Education Association in 1932: Dare we have the collective “will” to make the hard decisions to advance forward? And the second question is dare we create our future, or will we have our future created for us by others? The choice is ours to make. As you will see in this final video clip from the movie, Dead Poets Society, Mr. Keating (portrayed by Robin Williams) encourages his students to seize the day (“Carpe diem”) by creating their future rather than standing by and letting others create it for them. Our day is now and we must seize it or be seized. What legacy do we want to leave the ensuing generation of scholars in educational leadership? [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qQtmGcGdSDAI]

Thank you for listening to my first and probably last keynote address. If you will indulge me, I have one last presidential act to perform. As noted in my talk today, I addressed affirmative leadership and I’ve been fortunate over the past 2 years to work with someone who exemplifies the four tenets I addressed of being proactive, being open to seeking out new ways of doing business, who is and has cultivated relationships long-term for UCEA, and is a selfless leader who’s made my job as president one of the most professionally rewarding experience of my life. I’d like to ask Michelle Young to join me on the stage.

Michelle, on behalf of the Executive Committee, plenum representatives, and UCEA, I want to present you with a gift expressing our appreciation for 10 years of leadership as Executive Director. To honor this occasion, with the cooperation of Michelle’s husband, Derek, the executive committee put together a video tribute to show you and everyone in the audience.
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Many of us who have been part of the public school system for years will readily acknowledge challenges and problems, and we have worked for many years to address them. We should be just as ready to share our stories of success and how those successes were realized. Unfortunately, we don’t hear much about public school success stories (just as we do not hear enough higher education leadership preparation program success stories). We tend to hear only about the failures.

Still, parents and the public seem to recognize that good things are happening within the public schools. The most recent Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup Poll tells us that 77% of parents assign a grade of A or B to the school attended by their oldest child, and 49% of Americans assign a grade of A or B to the school in their community. According to Phi Delta Kappa, both of these numbers are the highest percentages ever obtained in the two categories. So where is the strong dissatisfaction with public education that is reported by the media coming from?

A number of rhetorical devices have been put into play to create this image. For example, the widely viewed and strongly promoted film Waiting for Superman paints a distorted and disparaging depiction of our nation’s public schools. The schools represented in the film obviously need to be fixed and deserve major attention, resources, and help. The problem is that the viewer is given the impression that the film’s portrayal of public school failure is the story of America’s public schools.

In addition to clever rhetorical devices, a legitimate focus has been placed on the lowest performing schools in the country, which represent 5% of our nation’s schools. In fact, every state has been asked to identify their bottom 5% so that they can be targeted for transformation. The other 95% percent of America’s public schools, however, have become erroneously assumed to be problematic as well. This simply is not the case, yet this portrayal has had negative ramifications for children, communities, educators and our nation.

The Huffington Post recently ran a piece titled “Why I Am Not a Defender of the ‘Status Quo’ in Education—Because the ‘Status Quo’ Is Failed Ed Reforms.” This piece, written by a public school education parent, addressed the above concerns as well as the tendency to disregard many success stories in the public education system. Teachers and school leaders are perceived as part of the problem. Furthermore, preparation faculty from colleges and schools of education are painted as out-of-touch gatekeepers with little of value to offer future teachers and leaders. Thus, the very individuals who have dedicated their professional lives to ensuring high-quality and equitable school experiences for all children through preparation and practice are increasingly painted as the problem rather than as part of the ongoing work for solutions.

On the other hand, solutions to improve public schools disregard the many success stories in the public school system. When we do hear success stories, they are usually reported in marginal outlets or focused on alternatives to public schools. Such was the case in the Superman film.

As many of you know, the film portrays charter schools as the silver bullet of school reform and emphasizes that charters can and should be proliferated across the country. No attention, however, seems to have been given to the research on charter schools, such as the finding that only 17% of charters do better than public schools or that 37% of them do worse—among other significant and troubling facts. The fact sheet published by FairTest, which is reprinted in this issue of the UCEA Review, overviews this research.

It is important that we recognize public education as an enactment of democracy. As such, it holds great promise for the vast majority of students who enter public classrooms each day. Rather than lambasting our schools, the energies of public school critics could provide a greater service for our nation’s students by addressing the debilitating effects of poverty and segregation on students, by challenging the significant disparity in funding that negatively impacts poor school districts, and by promoting education as a strong profession.

There is no Superman who will swoop in and address the multiple challenges impacting upon our nation’s schools. There are, however, countless smart and committed teachers, leaders, and university professors who are dedicated to understanding and implementing practices that will lead to high-quality education for all students. As a profession we need to do a better job of sharing our successes, even as we are working hard to address the challenges.
The Real Facts About Waiting for Superman

Reprinted with permission from FairTest

Waiting for Superman (WFS) may be good melodrama, but the movie fails the test of accuracy, and its purported solutions will not improve education. We agree: Too many young people, mostly low-income, do not graduate from high school or get a strong education. The questions are why, and what can be done about it. WFS and its unprecedented hype risk leading us dangerously astray from real solutions to real problems by making a number of misleading or factually incorrect claims in a number of important areas.

Public school quality. The most recent Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup poll found that 77% of Americans would give the public school their oldest child attends an A or a B. Does this suggest our public schools are doing well, as WFS says? In international comparisons, most of our middle class schools do well. Underresourced schools that serve low-income kids who are disproportionately African American, Latino, or recent immigrants, do far less well. However, they face challenges that schools, alone, can never address adequately. Improving schools is part of the solution—but the changes must help all children obtain a high-quality education.

Poverty. Poverty matters a lot—and the movie shows that it does, even while trying to tell us it does not. The Harlem Children’s Zone (HCZ) spends heavily to provide services to needy children and their families, services the government does not provide. Two thirds of HCZ funding is private, not public—making it like a well-funded private school. Who will pay for these services for all the children who need them?

Unions. States with the most unionized teachers do better than states with weaker or fewer unions, and countries with strong educational systems mostly have strong teacher unions. WFS’s demonization of unions ignores the real evidence.

Tenure. Tenure says you cannot be fired without due process and a good reason; you can’t be fired because the boss wants to hire his cousin, or because you are gay (or Black or…), or because you take an unpopular position on a public issue outside of school. A recent survey found that most principals agreed they could fire if they needed to. While WFS may have its own opinions on the value of tenure, it may not have its own facts.

Charter schools. Charter schools get public money but are run by private groups, which means there is less public oversight. The most extensive national study found that 46% of charters did about the same as regular public schools, 37% did worse, and only 17% did better. Meanwhile, charters routinely accept fewer students with disabilities and fewer English language learners. Since charters only serve 4% of the nation’s K-12 students, they represent a distraction and a drain from the focused work needed to renew quality schools for all children. They are not a solution.

Using standardized tests like MCAS to evaluate teachers. The National Research Council and many other researchers say that evaluating teachers based on student test scores is inaccurate and unfair. Several reports found that some 20-25% of teachers in the bottom groups one year are in the top groups the next—and vice versa. This is because many more things affect student learning or teacher’s rankings than just the teacher’s own efforts.

Using standardized tests to tell us if schools are successful. Most test score differences are not due to what schools do, but to the kids’ ZIP codes. As opportunity, health and family wealth increase, so do test scores. When schools focus on boosting scores on tests like MCAS, they ignore important subject areas and teach to the test, leaving children less prepared for the future. We need a lot more than test scores to know if schools are doing well and to help schools improve.

How students learn. Most people know what science confirmed years ago: Learning is an active process. Pouring disconnected information into kids’ heads, as the movie shows, has no lasting value, and it does not educate students for citizenship, college, lifelong learning or employment. Why didn’t the movie show us what excellent teaching looks like?

Competition. There is no evidence for the claim that competition will improve education. Teachers competing against each other will endanger cooperation among teachers and reduce their ability to help children most in need. Since No Child Left Behind, the rate of school improvement has declined! This film pushes for another generation of failed reforms.

Don’t wait for Superman. Take the time to inform yourself, to find out the real stories from teachers, parents and principals. Get the real facts on which to base your opinion, and consider how you can make a difference by doing what is right and good for children, not what “Superman” tells you to do.

For more information and genuine ways to improve schools, see www.fairtest.org & www.citizensforpublicschools.org. For more on WFS, see www.NOTwaitingforsuperman.org.

www.fairtest.org/real-facts-about-waiting-superman
Point/Counterpoint:
Racing With Superman

Mónica Byrne-Jiménez
Hofstra University

Recently, two educational documentary films have emerged on the (very) public stage to challenge existing models of education. One, Waiting for Superman, exploded onto the stage. The other, Race to Nowhere, has been a slow but persistent groundswell, difficult to ignore. Despite the glitzy opening, reminiscent of a Hollywood red carpet, of Waiting for Superman, media attention is steadily turning towards Race to Nowhere (see Ashbrook, 2010; Gabriel, 2010). The media roll-out is only one of the significant differences between these two documentary films. Philosophical and political differences notwithstanding, these two films also symbolize the increasing control of the “education” narrative by those peripherally engaged in education and not themselves educators. With this increasing public scrutiny has come the increasing belief that anyone can “do” education, particularly educational leadership (e.g., the selection of Catherine Black as Chancellor of New York City public schools), despite a long tradition of research, theory, and best practices. This prevailing belief puts children, schools, and educators at the mercy of prevailing political and policy whims; think tumbleweed versus oak tree. These films, while presenting vastly different lenses on schooling, offer a clear challenge for the field of educational leadership to “reclaim” the narrative and communicate our best thinking to a skeptical public.

In this Point/Counterpoint, Diane Gardner, Associate Professor in Educational Administration and Foundations at Illinois State University, offers a critique of Race to Nowhere. In her review, she discusses the impact of the developing high-stakes testing culture on families and communities. And while Race to Nowhere reflects the experiences of well-resourced communities, the challenges for students of navigating differing expectations, testing pressures, and developmental needs are the same across most communities. In addition, Dr. Gardner frames the film as a necessary, and often ignored, commentary on the purpose of schooling and, within that, our purpose as educational leaders. Joseph Polizzi, Assistant Professor in Education and Educational Leadership at Marywood University, offers his critique of Waiting for Superman and the role of unions and charter schools in current educational policy. Dr. Polizzi also offers an interesting commentary on the need to differentiate between documentary film and propaganda. Lastly, he reminds us, rightly so, that how narratives are constructed and communicated have lasting impact, especially with the lack of any countervailing voices.

As a field we have been slow to embrace the power of new and interactive technologies and other forms of communication. Both Drs. Gardner and Polizzi make it clear that not only does the medium matter, but the medium also often shapes the message, who hears it, and how it is understood. In this, we as a field are being outpaced by others who have more savvy around developing the medium than in-depth knowledge of the message. It is clear that if we are to get “our” messages out and challenge existing education narratives (e.g., the corporatization of schools), then we will need to break with existing assumptions and prejudices of “scholarly” venues and embrace the notion that there are some well positioned to help us translate those messages into more effective and easily digestible sound bites. We have the choice to continue to disseminate our messages through traditional, self-affirming media or join the public in a more interactive, immediate, and open environment. They will be there with or without us...which will it be?
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Race to Nowhere

Diane Gardner
Illinois State University

When I was asked to review the documentary Race to Nowhere, I thought of a phone interview we had with a retiring superintendent applying to fill a vacancy in our leadership preparation program. Because my background and scholarly interests are in assessment and evaluation, it is my designated role to take over the interview when these topics come up. I asked my then would-be colleague about his work as a superintendent in student learning assessment, and he answered, “Well, first of all, you don’t let the district go test score crazy.”

In the ensuing conversation, I recognized him as one of a handful of superintendents in Illinois who recognized the leadership role inherent in the standards and testing regime. As a result, he had me at “hello,” and we hired him to prepare leaders for schools and districts who can address the complex adaptive challenges inherent in high-stakes testing and a host of related policy initiatives. Without leadership, the testing mandates and achievement rhetoric, coupled with an economy perceived as offering ever-fewer genuine opportunities, quickly produce in our PK-12 and higher education organizations a narrowly tailored emphasis on performance, achievement, and competition. This narrow emphasis, arguably promoted by high-stakes testing, rhetoric about raising standards, and the educational practices these encourage, prompted Vicki Abeles to make Race to Nowhere and develop it for community-based release. The film’s narrative about the negative impact of current educational policy raises visceral questions about the purposes of schooling.

Abeles, a parent alarmed by observing her own overscheduled children as they struggled with the demands of high-stakes schooling, made the film not only to share her concerns about the well-being of children, families, and communities but also to promote dialogue and action. Abeles finds that pressure for grades, test scores, and college admissions (and the parental anxieties these promote) rob children and adolescents of their sleep, their health, and ultimately, the life-affirming learning experiences that can’t fit so easily into narrow definitions of success. The film assembles education scholars, teachers, administrators, parents, and students to question the purposes of education, recognize them as contested, and ask how the current policy environment slants these purposes.

“As a mother, I experienced the stress firsthand and realized
that no one was talking about it” Abeles told the Washington Post reporter who attended a community screening in Bethesda, Maryland.

I saw kids who were anxious, depressed, physically ill, checking out, abusing drugs and, worst case, attempting suicide. I felt compelled to speak out about this crisis by making a film and giving voice to the students, teachers, and parents. I wanted to expose a deeper truth about our education system. We are graduating a generation of robot-students, unable to think and work independently, creatively and collaboratively.

The phrase “race to nowhere” is a quote from a student, although it resonates with the current federal Race to the Top language as an unintentional indictment of policy makers.

In a counterpoint to the narrative in Waiting for Superman, which focuses on failing urban schools, Race to Nowhere is a smaller film with a bigger agenda. The community release of the film encourages facilitated discussion and action, raising courageous questions about the regime of high-stakes testing and the high-stakes schooling that it encourages. One important limitation of the film is its presentation of well-situated families with few convincing countervailing examples from those who struggle in a system that expects little of them or their children—where there is little pressure and little hope of access to educational and economic opportunity. The film ultimately takes no significant note of the different experiences of students in circumstances unlike the pressure cooker that captures Abeles’s attention despite her stated desire to include “communities of all kinds.”

To its credit, Race to Nowhere does show that no one is well-served by current policies including Abeles’s own privileged children. But those looking for critical or social justice narratives will be disappointed. The film also does not address the wide acceptance of the status quo across communities, including the community of educators, and its crucial role in maintaining privilege and conventional educational practices. The film does keep its promise to create discursive spaces in communities, real and virtual, and to offer action steps designed for the general public, educators, students, and medical professionals. It calls to mind the psychology courses educators take as undergraduates but seemingly forget at the schoolhouse door. For example, why do educators fail to push back when policy makers ask for 2 years of achievement in 1 calendar year, given the normal developmental arc of childhood and adolescence? I just wonder why we need the reminder.

I have been an educator for 36 years, first as a teacher, then as a teacher educator, and now as a leadership educator. I have witnessed the momentum that the testing and standards regime has gained from the 1983 publication of A Nation at Risk through the development of state-mandated testing through the 1990s, and into the 2000s when No Child Left Behind ostensibly galvanized the country around high-stakes testing and the achievement rhetoric that functions beyond any clear thinking about learning, its social and relational nature, human development, and individual differences. I have seen high-stakes schooling take place in all communities, even those languishing for anything other than another scathing critique or the annual humiliating mention in local media.

But most of all, I have been frustrated repeatedly by the failure of educators to offer an alternative vision to that of high-stakes testing and its offspring, high-stakes schooling. This is despite rich and varied resources from the popular to the scholarly that could serve as a platform for unconventional visions. When testing became first state and then national policy, educators, including educational leaders, were caught like deer in headlights, unable to appreciate the threat that high-stakes testing represented to the well-being of children, families, and communities or to offer our best knowledge about how people learn and education’s potential for creating opportunity. As those who prepare leaders for schools and districts, our credibility and that of our students is increasingly questioned. Nothing is more urgent than to develop in our students the ability to lead schools and districts under policy mandates like No Child Left Behind or Race to the Top. But they are unlikely to succeed in the absence of a larger dialogue about education and its purposes, in other words, a kind of community release of our internally held concerns. Race to Nowhere, as a piece of advocacy with the potential to draw communities into tough conversations about the purposes of education, may offer some broad guidance to educators of school and district leaders. This short list of clues is intended to be suggestive.

One clue suggested by Abeles and her team is the use of media other than print, the preferred medium of higher education. Expanding definitions of scholarship support multiple perspectives and conversations about education’s purposes, where performances, films, novels, poems, personal ethnographies, podcasts, video games, and more are taken seriously as alternatives to publication. Discussions about education’s purposes are old conversations to those in the academy, but they are perennial ones that academicians are in a unique position to raise and to reference. I had a professor in graduate school that used to say, “The 20th century was Thorndike versus Dewey. Thorndike won.” Unless we are content to allow Thorndike’s hegemony to continue, we need to engage this conversation, and not necessarily with more ink in more peer-reviewed journals.

A second noteworthy approach is the community release format and web-based resources. Race to Nowhere must be sponsored by community members who assume responsibility for publicity, access, and facilitation of community dialogue and action. Our plan to screen the film for 100 people from the College of Education grew to 250 community members, the maximum number the room would hold, registered to attend. More were turned away. The Race to Nowhere website (www.racetonowhere.com) offers options for engagement and advocacy, and virtual communities have moved the discussion and follow-up actions forward. This contrasts with traditional notions of dissemination where the cybernetic loop is closed until another scholar takes up the work. Communication and feed-back from constituent communities is missing, leaving many scholars frustrated at what little impact great efforts produce. Where the release of the work is communal, the possibility is opened for sharpening and sharing insights about the purposes of schooling.

Finally, the novel dialogic, action-oriented approach taken by the filmmaker addresses the capacity for leadership often given the shorthand label distributed leadership. No English word suffers from as much definitional confusion as leadership, but Abeles’s advocacy of more child-centered approaches that use current scholarship to guide practice and advance a collective review of education’s purposes would fit any definition of that word. Communities are natural sources of distributed leadership, without which schools will continue to draw more criticism than support. We do not have the power to “distribute” leadership. It is an existing resource that this
Waiting for Superman
Joseph A. Polizzi
Marywood University

I have always been an advocate for both charter schools and unions alike. When I was in graduate school I wrote my qualifying thesis on small schools and the charter school movement in New York City in the early 1990s. Soon after, I taught in a number of small, progressive public schools where I also served as a union chapter leader. No matter how unpopular, I always thought and still think that unions would be ideal charter school operators. Now, in my role as a university professor, I am currently assisting a private school in Scranton, PA, in their fight to convert to charter status. Being in support of charters and a believer in unions is a curious mix, especially in light of the film Waiting for Superman, which gives me reason to reflect.

I will not be discussing the demerits of teacher unionism, tenure, rubber rooms, charter schools, and market-based reforms that are the prevailing narratives in the documentary film Waiting for Superman. Nor will I discuss the abhorrent display presented in the film of the selection process, the lottery system that charter schools use to admit their limited number of students each fall. Most major news, media, and other organizations have weighed in on Waiting for Superman, and whichever way the reviewers lean on the message, because of the sheer volume of dialogue generated, it is a major reason for educational leaders to take note.

Although I will briefly address the overall narrative arc of the film, what I am most concerned about in the case of Waiting for Superman has more to do with the idea of the documentary film as a valuable tool in the educational leadership curriculum, as well as an underlying message in the film that warrants significant consideration. I disagree with Randi Weingarten when she is quoted as saying, “It’s only a film.” Because, in the case of Waiting for Superman and other films like it, the influence of a documentary film as means of setting a public agenda is evident and a considerably new phenomenon in the field of education. Waiting for Superman offers some compelling arguments that warrant further attention on the part of educational leadership professors and seemingly supports an agenda that needs to be challenged.

Two major themes run through the narrative of Waiting for Superman: the role that teachers’ union practices play in the obstruction of innovation in public education and the charter school system as an alternative, albeit exclusive system that is “better” than the failing traditional public schools. Both narratives and the topics warrant significant consideration beyond what I can offer in this short review. Having recently read Diane Ravitch’s (2010) book, The Death and Life of the Great American School System, I find that her arguments, along with the well-documented research, videos and op/ed pieces posted on the social activist website www.notwaitingforsuperman.org offer well-reasoned and challenging accumulated responses to this film.

It is clear that neo-reformers have gone to war with the unions, and they simply do not accept that unions are part of the real world of school administration, as educational leadership professors, not so comfortably, already have. Teacher unions and charter schools have altered the landscape of public education, and both are here to stay. Unions have been a constant voice for the professional status of teachers; charter schools offer bureaucratic relief and educational innovation. But, there are poorly performing charter schools where students are not taught well, administrative and financial practices are not transparent, and nonunionized teachers are subject to antiquated rules and regulations (Ravitch, 2010). What was supposedly left on the cutting room floor of Waiting for Superman was the historically significant collective bargaining agreement signed by Green Dot Charter Schools and the United Federation of Teachers, adapted to meet the nature of the Green Dot’s vision and mission for education and to be an example of union–charter collaboration. This collective bargaining agreement includes a just cause standard for dismissal and allows for longer school days and additional professional development time. The salary offers a 14% pay premium above the traditional salary scale, with salaries topping out at $114,000. This landmark contract gives reason, I believe, to revisit some of the fundamentals that are driving the charter and choice movements alike.

The training and preparation of charter school leaders and the contractual work environment practices employed in charters and traditional public schools are necessary studies. There are approximately 4,200 charter schools in operation across the United States and more to come. Yet from my understanding there are relative few university-based educational leadership program concentrating on charter developers/leaders (the University of Arizona and Central Michigan University and Seton Hall have offerings). Curious, I searched the 2009 and 2010 UCEA Conference programs and discovered there was a combined total of 15 papers that discussed charter schools. More telling, though, is in these 2 years there were only two papers that approached discussion of teacher unions and none that addressed contracts and collective bargaining agreements.

In 1964, Marshall McLuhan aptly said that “the medium is the message.” My first impressions regarding the film were that it is quickly becoming a necessity of training/learning how to bring research to life through other media in conjunction with the written word. The visual medium offers symbolic and iconic representations that aid in the reporting and narrating the art of intellectual discourse and persuasion beyond the borders of the journal page in which an academic’s research resides. From my experience, most researchers rarely consider the multiple media available as outlets, myself included. In some modern ways, a documentary film rivals and outperforms the research article published in a high-impact academic journal, and the producers of the film Waiting for Superman know this. Guggenheim and his cowriter, Billy Kimball, former Harvard Lampoon contributor and a writer for The Simpsons, lay out their well-funded lesson plan that questions the value of tenure for K-12 teachers, overwhelmingly advocates charter schools, and broadly disparages traditional public schools in visual form—similar to how professors prepare their notes before a lecture. The difference, though, is the scale of interconnectedness that with the
adelve of social action media produces multifaceted messages able
to cut through and reach mass quantities of people due to visually
networked outlets—McLuhan’s reminder resounds. The necessity
of researchers and university professors to become masters of a
variety of visual and technological media becomes an act of civic
responsibility as well as a much-needed tool in the arsenal for fram-
ing issues and presenting alternative, counter-cultural visions and
arguments.

“A documentary film stimulates epistemophilia (a desire to know)
in its audience; a documentary film conveys an informing logic,
a persuasive rhetoric, or a moving poetry that promises information
and knowledge, insight and awareness” (Nichols, 1991, p. 40). This verisimilitude is dangerous in the case of Waiting for Superman
because careful analysis of the film reveals it is a clear example
of propaganda. According to Sheryl Tuttle Ross (2002), in order
for a work to be considered propaganda it must meet four condi-
tions: It must be epistemically defective, used with the intention to
persuade the beliefs, opinions, desires, and behaviors of a socially
significant group of people on behalf of a political organization,
institution, or cause. Waiting For Superman easily meets all four of
these criteria.

When incorporated into the curriculum of the educational
leadership classroom, a documentary film can provide an oppor-
tunity for intellectual probing unique from that offered by the tra-
ditional academic medium. Documentary film analysis requires
the activation of new levels of critical investigation that pull the student
away from the familiar and comfortable consideration of a
textbook case study or the analysis of research findings presented
in an article. The documentary film has the power to project re-
search findings, and ideas that can be unsettling and even epistem-
ically defective, into the actuality of the everyday life of a school
leader. This requires the viewer and educational leadership student
to look through what is portrayed on the screen to objective aca-
demic sources that reveal a deeper truth.

Today, with significant federal power stemming from No Child Left Behind and Race to the Top that influence state and lo-
cal school systems, the idea of less bureaucratic control, as charters
operate under, would seem a welcome response to many who cur-
rently serve the traditional public schools, administrators and teach-
ers included. In that sense, Waiting for Superman can be looked at as
a call for the field of educational leadership to create a common
ground, an active engagement, so to speak, that shows deep un-
derstanding but calls for careful scrutiny of unions, school choice
advocates, and charter school practices and proponents alike. Our
work should proclaim the aims and goals of a public school system
that has room for the many types of progressive practices that both
unions and choice advocates call for. It is also a wake up for the
field to ask how we can use the powerful idea of choice to improve
the school system while retaining the essential purpose of public
education (Kolderie, 1990). This query needs careful thought,
simply because some of the practices that fly under the banner of
choice and the way in which charter schools “compete” with public
schools do not hold firmly to the ideas of the common school, of
equality and of public purpose.

Having spent almost 10 years as a New York City public
school teacher, I came up through the ranks believing in the ben-
efits of teachers unions, and I still do. Working around and studying
charter schools, I have come to believe there are elements of this
movement, currently in its 20th year, that now need re-engineer-
ing. Yet, I am still left with an underlying sense of failure simply
because of an overwhelming lack of serious societal responsibility
for creating a significant infrastructure of schools able to prepare
and insure children from impoverished communities to lead a pro-
ductive and satisfying life. In the end, this film draws blood—let it
be blood drawn that ultimately flows in the best interests of serving
children.
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High School Reform in New Orleans: O. Perry Walker College and Career Prep High School and Community Center

Liz Hollingworth
University of Iowa

On a hot, rainy afternoon in October, a busload of UCEA Plenum Session Representatives (PSRs) unloaded into O. Perry Walker High School, in Algiers, the part of New Orleans on what is called the West Bank of the Mississippi River, which didn't flood when the levees broke in August 2005 after Hurricane Katrina. Walker was selected as one of several schools for PSRs to visit during the annual UCEA Convention in New Orleans in order to explore the movement to revitalize public education in New Orleans.

Walker had been performing below state standards before Katrina, and new state rules enabled the Algiers community to turn O. Perry Walker into a charter school in 2005. Under this charter, the school operates under the jurisdiction of the Algiers Charter Schools Association. Post-Katrina, the Algiers Charter Schools Association, in conjunction with the Orleans Parish School Board, has established charter schools to address the needs of families living on the West and East Banks of New Orleans.

O. Perry Walker now admits students from all over New Orleans as an open-enrollment school of choice. Walker’s enrollment limit is 800 (200 per grade, Grades 9–12) and open to the first 800 students to register.

The PSRs were gathered in the school’s Media Center to meet Walker’s administrative leadership team: Principal Mary L. H. Laurie and Assistant Principals Brian Gibson, Mark Bailey, and Taisha Williams-Payne. Without question, the success of the school’s turnaround efforts can be attributed to the leadership of Principal Mary Laurie, known to the students as “Mama Laurie.” To set a new climate for Walker, Ms. Laurie instituted a Morning Gathering, where students gather to celebrate the success of other students and to hear important school information. Morning Gathering is set in a family atmosphere that conveys the awareness that O. Perry Walker is a united body. Consistent with this philosophy, Ms. Laurie explained to the PSRs that Walker provides free school bus service throughout the city for all O. Perry Walker students, regardless of how far away they live. The buses run after school in three shifts (at 3:30, 5:30, and 7:30 p.m.) to accommodate students in after-school activities. Ms. Laurie is adamant that transportation should not be a barrier to education.

Curriculum and Unique Student Services

After meeting the school leaders, the PSRs were broken into tour groups led by the assistant principals to walk through the school and to visit classrooms. All freshmen and sophomore students study in same-gender classes. It was explained to us that research has found that students in same-gender classes are more likely to perform better in class than when combined with students of the opposite gender. Our tour guide explained that the most common student complaint about the same-sex classrooms in Grades 9 and 10 is transitioning to mixed classes in 11th grade.

We toured a band rehearsal, led by the band director, Wilbert Rawlins. Before Katrina he was a legendary bandleader at George Washington Carver High School in the Lower Ninth Ward. When the levees broke, Rawlins evacuated to Beaumont, Texas, where the school board offered him a bandleader’s job at a well-funded high school. But Rawlins wanted to come home to New Orleans, and, when Carver didn’t reopen, he accepted a job at Walker. Almost half of Walker’s students are now members of the marching band and the auxiliary, which includes the color guard, the twirlers, the dancers, the flag team, and the cheerleaders.

Many students participate in O. Perry Walker’s Dual Enrollment program. Walker has developed partnerships with local higher education institutions for dual enrollment opportunities for students. The Dual Enrollment program gives students the opportunity to earn college credits while in high school. Partnering colleges and universities include Dillard University, Delgado Community College, Louisiana State Technical College, Nunez Community College, Southern University at New Orleans, and Tulane University. The program has been a success; more than 85% of O. Perry Walker’s alumni go on to further their educational experience at a college or university.

Students also attend classes at Walker High School on Saturdays. Ninth graders are required to attend O. Perry Walker’s Saturday Academy, which is designed to enhance student test-taking skills in preparation for the I-LEAP Test, which the state of Louisiana requires of all ninth graders is a predictor of success on the Graduate Exit Exam. Saturday School is offered for credit recovery each Saturday. Through this process, students are given the opportunity to make up seat time from unexcused absences, thereby making them eligible to receive a passing grade by meeting the minimum attendance requirements.

Posttraumatic stress disorder is unfortunately common among the student population. To address this need, Walker has a school nurse on the campus every school day, and a Louisiana State University Medical Health Clinic was opened on the campus. The clinic is open to all students during the school hours. In addition, the DEAL (Drop Everything and Listen) Center is designed to meet the mental and emotional needs of Walker’s students. Led by Walker’s two social workers, the purpose of the center is to provide a safe haven to students and to connect students and parents to mental health services in the school and community.

Pay for Performance

The Algiers Charter Schools participate in the national System of Teacher and Student Advancement pay-for-performance program. In 2009, the majority of students in the Algiers Charter Schools Association raised their standardized test scores from one year to the next, according to an analysis of state testing data that tracks individual student growth over time. As a result, 340 teachers and principals were rewarded with $900,000 in bonuses. Unlike other reform measures that narrowly focus on school accountability, teacher learning or school test scores, the System of Teacher and Student Advancement links instructional effectiveness directly to student
achievement. For teachers this means that their instructional decisions are made based on student data, and for students it means that they receive targeted instruction based on their individual learning needs. Professional development for teachers is individually tailored to meet the needs of each educator. As Principal Laurie said, at any time you are either teaching or learning. The support for the teachers at Walker is certainly one of the keys to its success.

Links

Website: http://www.opwchargers.com/
Algiers Charter School: http://www.algierscharterschools.org/

Call For Nominees:
2011 Excellence in Educational Leadership Award

The Award: The Executive Committee of the UCEA is asking for nominees for the 14th Annual Educational Leadership Award, in recognition of practicing school administrators who have made significant contributions to the improvement of administrator preparation. This distinguished school administrator should demonstrate an exemplary record of supporting school administrator preparation efforts. This distinguished school administrator should demonstrate an exemplary record of supporting school administrator preparation efforts. This award, one of national recognition, provides a unique mechanism for UCEA universities to build good will and recognize the contributions of practitioners to the preparation of educational leaders. Funds to establish the Educational Leadership Award were donated to UCEA by the Network of University Community School Districts, a consortium of school districts in university towns. However, UCEA now fully funds this important initiative.

The Procedure: The UCEA Plenum Representative (PSR) at each participating university should consult with colleagues and other constituencies designated by faculty to identify a worthy recipient. The PSR (or a designee) should plan to make the award presentation at an annual departmental, college, or university ceremony. To nominate a candidate, please fill out the nomination form at www.ucea.org and submit it with the following (postmarked by March 7, 2011):

- Letter of Nomination
- Information supporting your university’s selection of this individual
- Brief professional bio of no more than 300 words
- Optional—stamped, preaddressed envelopes for dissemination of press releases.

Deadline: March 7, 2011
www.ucea.org

UCEA Amazon Bookstore

http://astore.amazon.com/u0b4-20

UCEA, in partnership with Amazon, now offers one-stop shopping for all your professional print and e-book needs through its online Amazon Bookstore. Purchase books published by UCEA members or authored by Convention 2010 keynote speakers and browse topics of interest.
Innovative Programs

University of San Diego
Educational Leadership Development Academy

Rose Linda Martinez
Paula Cordeiro
Richard Thome
University of San Diego

Created in 2000, the Educational Leadership Development Academy (ELDA) at the University of San Diego offers professional learning opportunities to aspiring and practicing administrators. ELDA is a leadership development program affording master teachers opportunities to develop their leadership skills, novice principals opportunities to reflect and act more deeply on their practice, and veteran principals and central office leaders opportunities to enhance their learning. This continuum of leadership development opportunities has grown dramatically in scope as aspiring principals and novice principals asked the faculty in the Department of Leadership Studies to expand learning opportunities for them. Thus, these original programs begun in 2000–2001 now include the Aspiring Leadership Program (ALP) for the preliminary administrative credential and the New Leaders Program (NLP) for principals and assistant principals in their first 5 years of practice resulting in a professional administrative credential.

Today, ELDA consists of three programs, four types of professional development opportunities, and a collaborative. Leaders Exploring Administrative Opportunities (LEAP) is a yearlong program for master teachers who are interested in exploring the possibility of obtaining a California administrator credential. It consists of a series of primarily experiential activities that include visiting a variety of school sites, completing a series of projects for a mentor principal, and better understanding themselves as leaders. The next leadership development opportunity, the ALP, will be discussed in the second half of this article. The NLP takes place when an administrator already holds a building-level position. NLP involves extensive work on site with the novice administrator supervised by a university coach, the development of a work plan, reflection seminars, and advanced modules in topics such as school law.

ELDA offers a variety of in-depth, ongoing professional learning opportunities constructed around themes identified by the Superintendent’s Collaborative, a key element in ELDA. These professional learning opportunities are outlined below.

The Spotlight Series

Spotlight is annual five-part speaker series tied to a particular theme. Following each session, all participants receive materials to assist them in connecting the presentation and discussion with initiatives or activities in their school or district.

Summer Institute

The ELDA Summer Institute is tied to the theme of the Spotlight Series and involves school teams discussing, researching, and reflecting upon how program topics tie to the work of a participants’ district. As in ELDA’s ALP, project-based learning is built into each institute. The institute lasts 4–5 days and attracts participants from across California.

The Forum

Open to any graduates of ALP and NLP, the Forum involves groups of 8–10 practicing administrators meeting every 4–6 weeks for 2–3 hours to discuss issues and questions of importance to them. Prior to the first session each group receives a half-day group process training. Forum sessions are facilitated and organized by the participants. Currently there are four Forum groups, two of which have been meeting for several years. Two groups are for principals and the other two for vice-principals. These are closed sessions, and new members only join when invited by Forum participants.

Principals’ Ongoing Support and Training (POST) Program and Linked Learning

ELDA staff are active grant writers and, in collaboration with school district partners, a variety of long-term professional development opportunities is offered. The POST program, Linked Learning (a high school model of college to career) trainings, and workshops revolve around grants and are targeted to the professional development of experienced principals.

Superintendents’ Collaborative

The Superintendents’ Collaborative is a forum to bring together district leaders from the 42 districts in San Diego County. Discussions are held regarding current concerns and strategies that are critical to successfully navigating the changing climate in the public school environment. Discussions include how to thrive in an environment of reduced resources, changing demographics, schools of choice, and how globalization and enhanced technology are changing the educational landscape. Members of the collaborative are invited to take part in the ELDA Spotlight Series and Summer Institute. Superintendents meet in the San Diego University School of Leadership and Education Sciences and have an opportunity to focus on their own professional learning. They are proactive in determining the topics, themes, and speakers for ELDA offerings.

The Context

The University of San Diego is located in Southern California in the County of San Diego, which has 3.1 million people. San Diego County is bordered by the Mexican state of Baja California 10 miles to the south; Riverside County to the north; and to the east, Imperial County, which is a rural farm community. Thus the school districts served by the University of San Diego range from the San Diego Unified School District with 132,000 students to rural Spencer Valley with a student population of 32 and a superintendent/teaching principal. The county has a dynamic mix of urban and rural schools and large number of immigrants who speak more than 80 different languages. The county also has one of the largest concentrations of charter schools in the nation.
ALP

ELDA programs are located in the Department of Leadership Studies. Although this department includes education, the main focus is on the development of leadership in all types of nonprofit and government-related organizations. The framework for the program differs from many other school leadership programs that are typically located in a Department of Educational Leadership. Both of ELDA’s credential programs have five broad goals centered on developing a leadership voice. These goals are designed to cultivate:

• the skills necessary to create a purposeful, coherent, and sustainable learning environment for students and adults in the school;
• the ability to actively empathize with others and to understand ourselves as world citizens;
• the ability to identify and act upon issues related to ensuring all students have equitable and effective opportunities for learning;
• the desire to expand one’s social imagination and build the capacity to negotiate fear; and
• the assurance of basic competence in technical administrative skills (e.g., budgeting, data management and analysis, law).

This program is now in its 11th year, with 10 cohorts of approximately 150 students having obtained an administrator credential. Below we describe four curriculum features of ALP. Since the inception of the program, problem-based learning has been used and three relatively new features have been added: the World Educational Leadership Link (WELL) initiative, the V3 Model, and Performance Assessment for California Teachers (PACT) training.

Problem-Based Learning

Both simulated and real-time projects in problem-based learning are used in ELDA programming. Faculty develop projects using actual school data. Working in teams, students collect and analyze information for the project and present their results in front of an audience of practicing educators. In addition, students are trained in various group-processing techniques that are then employed as they work in their teams. Their team performance is assessed and individual feedback is provided.

WELL

Given the global nature of education, ELDA has opened a dialogue with experienced educational leaders in other nations. The purpose is to create connections and exchange ideas between aspiring leaders and experienced school-based administrators around the world. The goal of the project is to bring people together to build the professional relationships necessary to construct effective leadership practices and support social justice. This project is called WELL. The name implies reaching deep into the well of resources that currently exist in leadership practitioners throughout the world. ELDA students connect with their international mentors through a variety of online practices, including e-mail, blogs, Skype, and video exchange. In addition, when possible, either our students visit a school abroad or the mentor principals and the students meet in a variety of locations throughout the United States.

V3 Model

V3 is shorthand for a cycle of videotaped teaching and coaching activities conducted by ALP students. In collaboration with the Department of Learning and Teaching, faculty work with students who are teacher candidates and have early field experiences (practicum) in their teacher preparation program. Each teacher candidate is placed in the classroom of an ELDA candidate, or in the case of ELDA candidates with roving assignments, a school where the ELDA candidate has an internship assignment. In the V3 model the preservice teacher candidate tapes herself/himself teaching a lesson. (This tape is V1.) The ELDA candidate meets with the preservice teacher candidate and coaches her or him using V1 as the data. The coaching session is taped (V2). The ELDA candidate presents V2 in the ELDA evaluation and coaching class and receives critique from the course instructor and cohort students. This session is also taped (V3). The cycle is then repeated a second time. Thus ELDA candidates have two in-depth opportunities to review, critique, and receive feedback on their analysis of classroom practice.

PACT Assessor Training

Also conducted in collaboration with the Department of Learning and Teaching, each ELDA student is trained as a PACT assessor and conducts assessments of student teachers in the School of Leadership and Education Sciences. California requires all student teachers to pass one of two performance assessments. Since the University of San Diego is a member of the PACT consortium, ELDA students (who are all master teachers) are trained in the assessment system. The training is calibrated. This training and practice afford them multiple opportunities to deeply explore the professional development of novice classroom teachers.

In June 2011 ELDA will celebrate its 11th birthday. It has expanded considerably over the last decade. The challenge now is to maintain quality in all of the many parts of this leadership development academy and to ensure academy activities continue to reflect the changing needs of schools.

http://www.sandiego.edu/soles/centers/elda/
Incorporating Coaching Into a Principal Preparation Program

Ann O’Doherty
The University of Texas at Austin

Development of educational leaders has become a global interest. “Governments are investing substantial sums in leadership development because they believe that it will produce better leaders and more effective school systems” (Bush, 2009, p. 382). Research supports that school leaders have an indirect impact on student achievement, and at least some school leaders’ effectiveness may be attributed to a sense of personal efficacy, open-mindedness, flexibility in thinking, and resilience in the pursuit of education for all (Leithwood, Harris, & Hopkins, 2008). But how do preparation programs develop leaders who have the personal efficacy, flexibility, and resilience needed to overcome the challenges faced by today’s schools? A promising practice that has grown significantly in the past decade is coaching.

Growing Interest in Coaching

Early examples of coaching in education centered on the principal coaching teachers or on teachers coaching teachers through instructional coaching, peer coaching, literacy coaching, and other content models (Knight, 2009). In the past several years, coaching models designed specifically to coach school principals have begun to emerge (Bloom, Castagna, Moir, & Warren, 2005; Ellison & Hayes, 2006; Reiss, 2007; Robertson, 2008). Indeed, research has identified coaching and mentoring as components of exemplary principal preparation programs (Darling-Hammond, Meyerson, LaPointe, & Orr, 2010; Davis, Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, & Meyerson, 2005).

In 2009, The University of Texas at Austin Principalship Program (UTAPP) incorporated coaching into its internship model. The purpose of this article is to serve as a resource for other principal preparation programs considering a coaching model. The following briefly examines why UTAPP chose to adopt a coaching model; defines what coaching is; explores several coaching resources specific to school leadership; and offers insights into how preparation programs might adopt, adapt, or develop a coaching model specific to aspiring school leaders. Finally, the article concludes with a call for further research on the impact of coaching.

Why Coaching?

The catalysts to explore coaching at UTAPP sprang from two related concerns. First, the mentor model we relied on to help interns navigate the complexity of school leadership was too dependent on whether or not the student’s on-site supervisor was a willing and able mentor. The second issue was that some of the willing mentors merely distributed wisdom. Rather than guiding reflection, these mentors simply told the intern what to do. If effective school leaders need to develop efficacy, exercise flexible thinking, and exhibit resilience, we needed a system that would guide deep reflection and tap into the intern’s own resources. To meet these needs, we adopted a coaching model with hand-selected, highly trained, and motivated external coaches.

What Is Coaching?

The International Coaching Federation (ICF), established in 1995, has 17,000 international members. ICF (2010) has defined coaching as “partnering with clients in a thought-provoking and creative process that inspires them to maximize their personal and professional potential.” While this description is succinct, education and business sources reveal a profusion of coaching models with great variation in purpose, process and design. The absence of a consistent approach or definition necessitates examining coaching through individual models.

Coaching Models Designed for School Leaders

A search of journals and book publications returned an overwhelming number of resources on coaching. To select models for this article, layered criteria were established. First, models were located that had been designed for leaders in general, then these sources were culled to identify those focused on education, and finally narrowed further to those specifically designed to support educational leaders. A final criterion that the selected models demonstrate empirical evidence was abandoned as there were alarmingly few examples. Whereas some coaching models suggest application to any leadership or organizational context (Crane, 2007; Hargrove, 2008; Reeves & Allison, 2009), this article explores four resources specifically designed to support school leader development: Cognitive Coaching™ (Ellison & Hayes, 2006), Blended Coaching (Bloom et al., 2005), POWERful Coaching Framework™ (Reiss, 2007), and Coaching Educational Leaders (Robertson, 2008).

Lennard (2010) identified three major domains that commonly serve as theoretical foundations of coaching: adult learning, transformative learning, and cross-cultural learning. A review of the coaching models selected above revealed similarities in the underlying theories used to support coaching, such as Goleman’s emotional intelligence (Bloom et al., 2005; Ellison & Hayes, 2006; Reiss, 2007), Argyris and Schön’s double-loop learning (Bloom et al., 2005; Robertson, 2008), and various adult development theories (Ellison & Hayes, 2006; Reiss, 2007; Robertson, 2008). Of the four sources, Robertson (2008) included the most robust description of theory and directly connected her model to experiential learning, social constructivist theory of professional learning, and action research. For a more thorough description of related theory on Cognitive Coaching, see Costa and Garmston (2002).

Examination of the major components of selected models uncovers how each addresses what, with whom, and by whom (see Table). What is the purpose or intended outcome of the particular coaching model: self-directed learning, direct instruction of specific knowledge, skills and abilities, or school improvement? Who is the target of the coaching? Is the model designed for individual development or organizational improvement? Who serves as the coach? Is the coach external or internal to the organization? Does the model require the coach to be an expert in the field of the person being coached? The following provides a synopsis of each of the identified coaching resources through these lenses.

Cognitive Coaching. The first resource, Effective School Leadership: Developing Principals Through Cognitive Coaching (Ellison & Hayes, 2006), was built upon a coaching system originally designed to develop teachers. In the past 25 years, the teacher model has been the subject of numerous studies (Edwards, 2010; Knight, 2009). “The mission of Cognitive Coaching is to produce self-directed persons...
with the cognitive capacity for high performance both independently and as members of a community” (Costa & Garmston, 2002, p. 16). The person being coached drives the content of the conversation, goal setting, action steps, and follow-through. The coach serves to mediate thinking—not to advise, instruct, direct, or judge.

The model strongly differentiates between four support functions: coaching, collaborating, consulting, and evaluating. Coaching is designated as the preferred function. Three structured conversation maps guide in planning (future), reflecting (past), and problem resolving (present). Coaches are trained to mediate thinking and support development of efficacy, craftsmanship, flexibility, interdependence, and consciousness. Coaches may observe and provide nonevaluative data for the principal to interpret, and coaching conversations can occur spontaneously. Outcomes are centered on individual growth and, unlike other models reviewed here, are not required to be linked to school improvement or changes at the organizational level.

Cognitive Coaches can be internal or external to the organization, and the coach does not have to have prior leadership or education experience. Peer coaching between principals is recommended and provides an opportunity for participants both to coach and be coached. Cognitive Coaching has a required 8-day certification program delivered by designated consultants.

**Blended Coaching.** The second resource, *Blended Coaching: Skills and Strategies to Support Principal Development* (Bloom et al., 2005), was developed at the New Teacher Center at the University of California, Santa Cruz, to support principals and other school leaders. “The goal of school leadership coaching has to be systems change that has a lasting and positive impact upon students” (Bloom et al., 2005, p. 51). Organizational change achieved through coaching serves as the focus. The coach guides and may at times drive the process.

Blended Coaching, represented by a Möbius strip, combines consultative, collaborative, and transformational roles located along the continuum to address “ways of doing” (instructional strategies) and “ways of being” (facilitative strategies). By embedding consultative and collaborative functions, Bloom et al. (2005) acknowledged an intentional divergence from Cognitive Coaching, stating, “coaches need to be able to fluidly draw upon a broad repertoire of strategies” (p. 57). Coaches observe the coachee (person being coached) at work, utilize 360° Survey data, review school-based data, and even conduct classroom observations to assist the coachee in identifying growth areas.

Desired outcomes include moving the coachee’s thinking beyond current problems to identify root causes, surface patterns, and develop long-term solutions. Blended Coaching is the only model reviewed here aligned to Interstate School Leader Licensure Consortium Standards (Council of Chief State School Officers, 1996).

Since coaches must be able to offer instructional insight, prior educational leadership experience is recommended, but coaches do not have to be exceptional school leaders or principals. The third model explored here, POWERful Coaching, offers similar resources.

**POWERful Coaching Framework.** In *Educational Leadership Coaching for Principals*, Reiss (2007) wrote, “Coaching is about action—doing something different to yield a desired change” (p. 160). In contrast to Blended Coaching, POWERful Coaching differentiates coaching from consulting and instruction. Unlike the Cognitive Coaching model, collaboration is emphasized. At times, the coach may drive the process.

The POWERful Coaching Framework sets out a five-part process to guide every coaching session. After initial sessions to uncover desired results and set personal and/or organizational goals, the coach and coachee enter into a weekly cycle of “goal-action-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coach resource</th>
<th>What: Stated purpose</th>
<th>With whom: Target of coaching</th>
<th>By whom: Who coaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Coaching™</td>
<td>“Mission…produce self-directed persons with the cognitive capacity for high performance” (p. 32)</td>
<td>Individual: Principal Organization: Possible indirect impact on culture</td>
<td>Coaches: Internal or external Prior education experience: No Training required: Cognitive Coach Certification (8 days of training with certified trainer).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ellison &amp; Hayes, 2006)</td>
<td>Focus: Self-directed persons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blended Coaching</td>
<td>Coaching is “deliberate support to another individual to help him/her clarify and/or to achieve goals” (p. 5) delivered through a blend of facilitative and instructional support. Focus: Systems change</td>
<td>Individual: Principal Organization: Drive school improvement and make a difference for students</td>
<td>Coaches: Recom. external only Prior education experience: Yes Preferred: Prior experience in mentoring and/or specific coach training. Training: Provide specific training in model and ongoing support through community of practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Bloom et al., 2005)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POWERful Coaching Framework™</td>
<td>“Coaching is about action—doing something different to yield a desired change” (p. 160) Focus: Change</td>
<td>Individual: Principal Organization: Goals may be organizational or personal</td>
<td>Coaches: Internal or external Prior education experience: No Preferred: International Coaching Federation (ICF) certification Training: provide training on ICF 11 core competencies and provide metacoach opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Reiss, 2007)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching Educational Leaders</td>
<td>“Coaching…is a special, sometimes reciprocal, relationship between (at least) two people who work together to set professional goals and achieve them” (p. 4) Focus: Self-efficacy and agency</td>
<td>Individual: Principal Organization: Action research focused on school improvement</td>
<td>Coaches: Internal or external Prior education experience: Yes Required: Both partners must serve as principals. Preferred: Principals serve in similar school contexts. Training: Ongoing structured model with designated facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Robertson, 2008)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
accountability-new actions” (Reiss, 2007, p. 177). Coachees submit weekly logs of updated progress to the coach prior to the next session. The model supports a focus on both personal growth and organizational improvement.

POWEROful Coaching can incorporate either external or internal coaching relationships and is not restricted to educational settings or to educators coaching educators. Coordinators are urged to secure already certified ICF coaches or at least view potential coaches through ICF’s 11 core competencies. Coaches should demonstrate an aptitude for setting the foundation, cocreating a coaching relationship, communicating effectively, and facilitating learning and results. Reiss (2007) offered suggestions for training and how to break through resistance of unwilling coachees. Appendices in Reiss’s manual contain a self-assessment, sample coach agreement, and weekly planner.

Coaching Educational Leaders. The final resource, Coaching Educational Leaders: Building Leadership Capacity through Partnership (Robertson, 2008), described a dynamic school leader professional development model created for coaching partners in New Zealand. “Coaching…is a special, sometimes reciprocal, relationship between (at least) two people who work together to set professional goals and achieve them” (Robertson, 2008, p. 4, emphasis in original). Three years of empirical research with program participants influenced the evolution of the model. Connections to underlying theories supporting this and other coaching models are explored.

Robertson (2008) emphasized building capacity through reflective practice and viewed the “leaders as knowers” rather than the “coaches as knowers” (p. 9). Unique to this model, the coach and person being coached switch roles, alternating between sessions who serves as the coach and who is coached. The model is delivered through a series of facilitator-led, just-in-time training and structured visits to each other’s schools. The focus is on developing self-efficacy and agency that lead to individual development and school improvement. Through an action research process, partners coach each other to set specific, measurable goals and explore relevant options and strategies. To augment the structured coaching sessions, partners conduct shadow observations, collect data, engage in self-reflection, and share feedback.

Similar to Cognitive Coaching, the coached person is the driver; however, this model is the only one that requires training for both the coach and person being coached. Both members must agree to the coaching partnership. It is recommended that each partner have input in selecting his or her coach. A third party, the coach facilitator, serves a crucial role that includes organizing and leading training as well as providing ongoing support to the coaching partners.

Summary of models. The resources reviewed here represent divergent views about coaching leaders. Although the models have many similarities, different purposes are emphasized: developing self-directed leaders (Ellison & Hayes, 2006; Robertson, 2008), improving student achievement (Bloom et al., 2005), enacting change (Reiss, 2007), or increasing self-efficacy and agency (Robertson, 2008). Three of the models directly address organizational change and include structured goal setting with progress reviews and accountability for results (Bloom et al., 2005; Ellison & Hayes, 2006; Reiss, 2007; Robertson, 2008). Two of the models strongly support the person being coached as the driver (Ellison & Hayes, 2006; Robertson, 2008), with Coaching Educational Leaders requiring mutual coaching between matched partners. Finally, while two models do not require prior leadership or education experience (Ellison & Hayes, 2006; Reiss, 2007), a third calls for coaches to have knowledge of the educational context (Bloom et al., 2005), and the fourth requires that coached partners serve the same role in preferably similar school contexts (Robertson, 2008). Clearly, these models exhibit different approaches to coaching; however, they demonstrate greater agreement in declaring what is not coaching.

What coaching is not. The authors of the four models explored here concurred on three areas that are not coaching. Coaching is not a remedial process reserved for the leadership deficient; any leader, and all leaders, can benefit from a coaching relationship (Bloom et al., 2005; Council of Chief State School Officers, 1996; Ellison & Hayes, 2006; Hargrove, 2008; Reeves & Allison, 2009; Reiss, 2007; Robertson, 1997, 2008). Coaching is not a one-time event: It requires ongoing, personalized, one-on-one conversations with a committed coach (Bloom et al., 2005; Ellison & Hayes, 2006; Reiss, 2007; Robertson, 2008). Coaching is not synonymous with mentoring (Bloom et al., 2005; Ellison & Hayes, 2006; Reiss, 2007; Robertson, 2008). Whereas many mentors may coach, and coaches may serve some mentor roles, typical mentor models assume a more experienced mentor supports a newer-to-the-field leader (Gross, 2009). In the coaching models explored here, the person being coached is not necessarily new to the position and the coach is not expected to be more knowledgeable or experienced than the person being coached.

How Can Preparation Programs Meet the Needs of Aspiring Leaders?
The preceding section briefly reviewed four coaching models developed for school leaders. Programs interested in selecting an established coaching model may benefit from the summaries of various education models included in Knight’s (2009) Coaching Approaches and Perspectives. Lennard (2010) explored theories that undergird coaching and offered suggestions for creating a unique model. The following section describes a process for preparation programs interested in implementing coaching: (a) articulate a theory of action, (b) select or develop a model, (c) secure and/or develop coaches, (d) match coaches to participants, (e) provide layers of support, and (f) develop an evaluation plan.

Theory of action. Before selecting or developing a coaching model, preparation programs might consider articulating a theory of action aligned to the preparation program’s purpose. This backward design approach (Wiggins & McTighe, 1998) clarifies what graduates-participants will know and be able to do as a result of being coached. This process should establish what will be the purpose of the model; whom the model is intended to coach; and identify the by whom, or who will deliver the coaching.

Select or develop coach model. After establishing the theory of action, purpose and parameters, a coach model can be selected, adapted, or created that most closely represents the specific program’s aims. Consider what type of training will be needed; how will the training be deployed; and when, where, and how often coach sessions will occur. At UTAPP, we selected a previously established model designed to develop self-directed leaders. Sup-
ported by U.S. Department of Education grant funding, we hired Cognitive Coaching consultants to tailor the design of training to the unique needs of our program.

**Select and develop coaches.** After selection of a model, coaches will need to be secured and/or trained. All of the models reviewed here (see Table) include guidance on how to select and develop coaches. In training design, consider the needs of your coaches. Even previously certified coaches benefit from participating as a member of a community of practice that meets regularly to discuss issues connected with coaching (Bloom et al., 2005; Ellison & Hayes, 2006; Reiss, 2007; Robertson, 2008). We intentionally selected UTAPP graduates to train as coaches. Our certified UTAPP coaches meet at least twice a semester in metacoach triads (Costa, Garmston, Ellison, & Hayes, 2010). During these 2-hour sessions, UTAPP coaches take turns being coached, observing, and gathering data in order to activate personal reflection, hone skills, and internalize the coaching process.

**Match coaches to participants.** The coach relationship is a personal one that requires a high degree of trust and confidentiality. Participants should be involved in selecting who will serve as their coach (Ellison & Hayes, 2006; Reiss, 2007; Robertson, 2008). UTAPP hosts a half-day gathering for interns to observe a coaching session and mingle with all coaches in small groups. Afterwards, interns submit three coach choices. Program staff ensure each intern is matched to one of these choices.

**Layered support.** Just as one size does not fit all, one relationship, even with an effective coach, cannot meet all needs. University programs, in partnerships with school districts, might explore multiple layers of support with delineated, yet somewhat overlapping roles (Barnett, Copland, & Shoho, 2009). UTAPP interns have a support triad composed of a UTAPP Cognitive Coach, university faculty advisor, and on-site supervisor. The coach serves as a confidential, external partner who, in at least bi-monthly meetings, mediates the intern's thinking through conversations focused on planning, reflection, and problem solving. The university faculty advisor observes, gathers, and shares data with the intern; reviews internship artifacts; and assigns the internship grade. Minimally, the internal on-site supervisor completes job-related evaluations; however, on-site supervisors are also encouraged to support the intern through day-to-day guidance, assignment of meaningful leadership opportunities, and brokering district relationships.

**Evaluation plan.** Coaching can be costly in terms of time and financial resources required to train and, depending on the model, compensate coaches. It is imperative that programs conduct ongoing evaluation to ensure the selected model is being delivered as planned and participants receive the support outlined. UTAPP interns complete a monthly coaching log and rate the effectiveness of each coaching conversation. At the end of the yearlong internship, interns and coaches complete an anonymous survey and participate in focus groups and/or interviews with the external evaluator of our U.S. Department of Education grant. In addition to ongoing evaluation of program delivery, UTAPP has begun to conduct research on the impact of coaching on the coach and the person being coached. Using a longitudinal design, we intend to follow graduates and coaches over 3 years to identify whether coaching has had an impact on leadership practice.

**What Else Do We Need to Know?**

Leadership matters, and all children in all schools deserve quality leaders. “Preservice programs have a shared purpose to develop individuals’ ability to function effectively as educational leaders” (Os- terman & Hafner, 2009, p. 304). Although coaching might indeed support development of aspiring leader practices, it lacks supporting evidence. As Bloom et al. (2005) have lamented, “Coaching is all the rage, yet it enjoys no common definition, and little research has been done on its efficacy” (p. 3). A recent search of peer-reviewed literature in the EBSCO database using terms such as leadership preparation, principals, and coaching returned fewer than 30 articles. These included just a few empirical research studies on coaching principals and no studies on coaching aspiring leaders. Further research is needed to determine what effect, if any, structured coaching has on the practice and dispositions of aspiring educational leaders.
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May I extend a warm invitation to join us at the Robinson Executive Centre at Wyboston Lakes near Cambridge, for the 2011 BELMAS Conference. This event has become a fixture in the calendar for those interested in leadership in education, and it attracts professionals from a broad spectrum of educational interests along with delegates from around the world.

This year promises to be no exception, and this is demonstrated in the outstanding quality of our three guest speakers. Themed around the title of “Educational Leadership in an Age of Globalisation,” there are contributions from Professor Michael Apple, who is the John Bascom Professor of Curriculum and Instruction and Educational Policy Studies at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, Professor Tony Bush of Warwick University, and Maggie Farrar Strategic Director of Policy and Research at the National College.

In addition to this there are other exciting “set pieces” in the form of a Practitioner Workshop and a Leadership in the United Kingdom session. Embedded in these sessions is our wish to involve a broader range of professionals, especially those in nursery, primary, secondary, and college settings. Practitioners in all educational settings are invited to apply for our new Practitioner Prize, which will go to the best example of leadership practice in any educational setting, as delineated in papers submitted for the conference.

Colin W Russell
Chair of Conference

www.belmas.org.uk
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www.ucea.org/publications/

Previous “From the Director” articles are archived at www.ucea.org/from-the-director

Implications issues are now archived at www.ucea.org/implications-from-ucea
There have been numerous attempts to characterize the nature of educational administration as a field of study (e.g., Domnoyer, 1999; English, 2002). Scholars in the field have explored scholarship in educational administration from a number of perspectives: scholarly output (Oplatka, 2007), epistemological dimensions (English, 2002), and principal preparation and administrator standards (Hess & Kelly, 2007). Oplatka (2007, 2009, 2010); Eacott (2009); and Murphy, Vriesenga, and Storey (2007) examined in detail the historical and contemporary scholarly products of academics. Bates and Eacott (2008) have researched teaching resources in educational administration programming in Australia. Wallace, Foster, and daCosta (2007) have compared credentializing and accrediting in university programs offering educational administration in Canada. Rusch (2008) stated that there are striking differences in the structure of programs and the political ideology behind preparation programs. In our own work, we have ascertained that considerable differences in curricula exist from country to country (Burgess & Newton, 2008).

In this ongoing study, we explore the nature of educational leadership, administration, and management (ELAM) as an intellectual discipline through course descriptions found at universities in (to date) 17 countries. Our primary question for this study is “what is being taught, and how do those responsible for the content understand the knowledge base of ELAM?” By using content analysis of courses, we hope to explore the commonalities across programs as well as the variability among programs internationally. We expect that a dialogue about the conceptual foundations of ELAM in postsecondary institutions will take place, and that comparison across regions and institutions will contribute to a more robust understanding of the conceptual and intellectual foundations of the ELAM.

**Method**

Due to the highly specialized needs of this project, a web-based database application was written in the MySQL and PHP languages by the principal investigators. The application permitted online access for both the principal investigators and a team of undergraduate and graduate students during the data collection phase. Access to the database for searching, coding, and analysis was restricted to the principal investigators and one doctoral student. Data collection and data entry were entirely web based. Researchers conducted electronic queries of Internet search engines for publicly accessible course descriptions from universities.

Individual course descriptions were assigned individual records within the database. Several metadata were collected for each description in addition to the course title: (a) the country of origin; (b) the name of the institution; (c) the name of the college, faculty, department, or other institutional subunit; (d) required or elective status; (e) undergraduate or graduate level; (f) prerequisites; (g) the course number or designation; and (h) any additional comments or notes assigned to the course description in its original context.

Our study is characterized by a mixed deductive and inductive approach. We began by employing a well-established and internationally employed code schema (developed by the U.S. Library of Congress) as subject matter descriptors, and other codes emerged as analysis proceeded. Initial codes numbered 164 and were reduced to 46 final coded knowledge clusters for the courses. Quantitative descriptive statistics were drawn from the coded data. To date, 3,585 courses from 257 universities in 17 countries have been collected and analyzed for this study. At this point, we have only collected U.S. data from UCEA member institutions. Because of the large number of postsecondary institutions in the United States, we initially made the decision to limit our data collection to UCEA member universities. Because most of these institutions are research-intensive universities, it has become apparent that this decision has introduced an unacceptable bias in these data from the United States. Therefore, we are continuing to collect data to be more inclusive of a variety of types of postsecondary institutions in the United States. We hope to include additional U.S. institutions in comparative reports in the near future.

**Limitations**

The most significant limitation is that our analysis depends on the information encoded within course descriptions and titles. We are aware that the courses taught may differ slightly or even significantly from the syllabi or descriptions published on websites; however, as a starting point, we hold the assumption that these descriptions represent some conceptualization of the knowledge clusters that occupy the field of ELAM. In future research, we hope to explore other sources to confirm our understandings presented here.

**Preliminary Findings**

Our most extensive analysis to date was presented in October 2010 and includes comparative data from Australia, Canada, Hong Kong, India, Malaysia, New Zealand, Pakistan, Singapore, South Africa, and the United Kingdom (Burgess & Newton, 2010). In our comparative analysis of these 10 Commonwealth countries, the most common topic clusters overall are as follows: Leadership Theory (11.98%), School Management and Organization (8.37%), Educational Policy Studies (7.82%), Organizational Change (5.14%), and School Effectiveness and School Improvement (5.03%). There is considerable diversity among these countries. For example, the following topics are ranked in the top five of at least one of the 10 Commonwealth countries: Leadership Theory, School Management and Organization, Educational Policy Studies, Organizational Change, Organizational Theory, School Effectiveness and School Improvement, Finance, International and Comparative Education, Professionalism, Staff Development, Curriculum, Educational Planning, School Supervision, Aboriginal/Indigenous Issues in Educational Administration, Community, Contemporary Issues in Ed-
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**International Educational Leadership, Administration, and Management Program Inventory**
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Presently, we are collecting data from higher education institutions in the United States. We have, to this point, reported on a comparison of course descriptions among several countries and have completed a comparative analysis of programs in Commonwealth countries for conferences in Canada, South Africa, the United Kingdom, and Australia. We hope to complete a comparative analysis that includes U.S. data in the near future. We would welcome inquiries for future collaboration on this project. For more information please contact:

Paul Newton, PhD
Department of Educational Policy Studies
University of Alberta
7-119 Education North Edmonton, Canada T6G 2G5
pmnewton@ualberta.ca

David Burgess, PhD
Department of Educational Administration
University of Saskatchewan
28 Campus Drive Saskatoon, Canada S7N 0X1
david.burgess@usask.ca
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UCEA-Sponsored Events at the 2011 AERA Meeting:
April 8-12, 2011, New Orleans, Louisiana

Thursday, April 7–Friday April 8
31st Annual David L. Clark National Graduate Student Research Seminar in Educational Leadership & Policy

Friday, April 8
Barbara L. Jackson Scholars Spring Workshop
William I. Boyd National Mentoring Workshop in the Politics of Education

Sunday, April 10
Division A & L, UCEA and The University of Texas College of Education, and Sage Publications Joint Reception, 8:00 p.m.

UCEA Employment Resource Center

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

UCEA Job Posting Service
UCEA provides, free of charge on its website, links to job position announcements. To submit a posting for the website, please e-mail the URL for the position announcement (website address at your university where the position description has been posted) to ucea@austin.utexas.edu. A link will be provided to the job announcement from the UCEA job posting page: www.ucea.org
First International Successful School Principal Project (ISSPP) Conference Held May 2010

Stephen Jacobson  
*University at Buffalo*

Rose Ylimaki  
*University of Arizona*

After almost a decade of presenting International Successful School Principalship Project (ISSPP) findings at major conferences around the world, including UCEA, Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration and Management (CCEAM), Eastern Educational Research Association, International Congress for School Effectiveness and Improvement, and British Educational Leadership Management and Administration Society (BELMAS), teams from 11 of the 15 nations that currently participate in the ISSPP met in May 2010 at the National College for Leadership of Schools and Children's Services on the campus of the University of Nottingham, England. This first-ever event lasted 3 days and began with visits to a variety of schools in Nottinghamshire, England. The initial day of school visits was followed by a 2-day seminar addressing the ISSPP's work on Successful Leadership in Times of Challenge.

Professor Christopher Day of the University of Nottingham, who has served as lead coordinator for the project since its inception in 2001, convened this event and subsequently drafted a summative report that can be found on the UCEA website under the heading Current International Research: http://www.ucea.org/current-international-research/.

During the 3 days, more than 120 delegates took part in workshops, presentations, and discussions about the common qualities, skills, attributes, approaches, and practices of educational leaders whose schools have sustained improved outcomes for students over time. Participants examined international perspectives on successful school leadership, focusing on instructional leadership, sustainability, change, and closing the achievement gap with sessions co-led by ISSPP researchers and principals.

At the end of each day, participants broke into discussion groups to reflect on what they had learned, generate emerging themes, and identify unanswered questions for future research. The following 10 themes resulted from these dialogue sessions:

1. Principals need to create opportunities for collaboration and reflection.
2. Productive school–community relationships require distributed leadership.
3. Successful school leaders have common core values and moral purpose driving their efforts.
4. The next generation of principals will need time to reflect and look beyond managerial and organizational aspects of leadership.
5. Principals’ judgment is undervalued by policy makers; however, good leaders use policies to leverage needed improvements and exercise creative insubordination at times.
6. Charismatic principals create conditions for sustainability.
7. Distributing leadership is essential.
8. Effective principals help teachers and other school members create a collective vision.
9. Issues need to arise from the ground up because of the diversity of school contexts.
10. There is need to better understand how funding links to improved student attainment.

Nottingham conference delegates included members of ISSPP teams from Australia, Cyprus, Denmark, England, Israel, Mexico, New Zealand, South Africa, Sweden, Turkey, and the United States; principals and head teachers from those countries whose schools were studied; and school leaders from across England who, as members of the National College's research associate program, have engaged in their own research about sustained school success in challenging times.

With contributors from 15 nations, including six teams from the United States (University at Buffalo, Boston College, Arizona University, The University of Texas–San Antonio, Indiana University, Hofstra University/Bank Street, and Clemson University), the ISSPP has become the largest and longest running research network on successful school principals. Team members frequently comment about the collegiality and productive learning experiences of the group. As Leif Moos (Denmark researcher) put it,

One of the surprising things in this project [ISSPP] is that when we started in 2001-2002, we could never agree with colleagues from other countries what a good school is because the Nordic way of looking at schools was very different from England and America. These days we seem to agree more: We all know what a good school is from this project.

Over the past decade the ISSPP had produced more than 100 case studies, contributed more than 70 papers to internationally refereed journals, and produced three books. The most recent book, *U.S. and Cross-National Policies, Practices, and Preparation: Implications for Successful Instructional Leadership, Organizational Learning, and Culturally Responsive Practices* (Rose Ylimaki & Stephen Jacobson, Editors) provides theories and ISSPP case study examples as they are shaped by political, economic, and cultural factors in seven different national contexts. This book will be published March 1, 2011, and is currently available for preorder from Springer-Kluwer and Amazon.com.

This spring (June 8–12, 2011), Dr. Lauri Johnson is organizing a second ISSPP conference to be held at Boston College, which will once again seek to blend site visits with presentations and discussions among academics and practitioners, all in service of utilizing research to inform best school leadership practices. Further details will be forthcoming and made available through the UCEA Review as well as at the website of the UCEA Center for the Study of School Site Leadership: http://www.ucea.org/school-site-leadership.

**UCEA on Facebook & Twitter:**  
www.ucea.org/social-media
2010 Convention Showcased Important Trends in International Research & Development

Bruce Barnett
The University of Texas-San Antonio

As UCEA continues to support and publicize international research and development projects, the annual convention has become an excellent resource for colleagues around the world to learn about and share ideas. The most recent impetus for international representation at the convention occurred in 2007 with the encouragement and support of then-UCEA President, Stephen Jacobson. Since that gathering in Washington, DC, international participation and perspectives have continued, and this year's convention was no different. Presenters from 16 countries outside the United States shared research findings from these regions around the globe:

- Africa (Morocco, Tanzania, Uganda),
- Asia (China, Hong Kong, Korea),
- Australia,
- Central and South America (Costa Rica, Brazil, Chile),
- Europe (Estonia, Republic of Georgia),
- Middle East (Egypt, Israel, Pakistan, United Arab Emirates),
- North America (Canada, United States, Mexico),
- Scandinavia (Denmark, Finland, Norway, Sweden), and
- United Kingdom (England, Scotland).

A review of these sessions reveals a variety of important issues being investigated around the world. In many instances, comparative analyses were conducted between two or more countries. These reports of international research and development fall into six areas: (a) policy and governance, (b) democratic schools and equity, (c) student and parental involvement in schools, (d) leadership practices, (e) higher education, and (f) leadership development. Illustrations of the topics associated with each area are listed below, including session numbers.

1. Policy and Governance
   - School governance in Denmark, Finland, Israel, Norway, Scotland, Sweden, and the United States (Session 9.1)
   - School governance and distributive leadership in the Republic of Georgia (Session 10.7)
   - Policy and school practices in the United Kingdom and the United States (Session 11.12)
   - Influence of national policies on leaders in Chinese and American schools (Session 14.8)
   - Policy mandates and advocacy in Canadian and American schools (Session 19.11)
   - Politics and policies of school finance in Israel (Session 19.13)

2. Democratic Schools, Ethics, and Equity
   - Leadership in international baccalaureate schools in Hong Kong (Session 1.3)
   - Equity and quality in Chinese and American rural schools (Session 6.6)
   - Israeli teachers’ lateness and school ethics (Session 6.11)
   - International perspectives on moral literacy in educational practice (Session 8.14)
   - Inclusive learning environments for students with disabilities in Korea, Egypt, and Indonesia (Session 9.7)
   - Democratization of English schools (Session 11.12)
   - Discrimination and affirmative action in Brazil and the United States (Session 14.12)

3. Student and Parent Involvement in Schools
   - Collaborative learning environments for Israeli students (Session 8.9)
   - Career attitudes of Korean middle school students (Session 9.11)
   - Social justice and equity for Pakistani girls in rural schools (Session 9.11)
   - Equity protests of secondary school students in Chile (Session 9.11)
   - Factors affecting parental school involvement in Morocco and the United Arab Emirates (Session 16.13)

4. Leadership Practices
   - Teacher and principal leadership in Mexico and the United States (Session 2.5)
   - Sustainable leadership in Canadian schools (Session 9.4)
   - Challenges confronting superintendents in different countries (Session 10.2)
   - Changing conditions affecting school leaders in Hong Kong and China (Session 14.7)
   - Successful leadership practices in high-poverty Canadian schools (Session 16.7)
   - Career patterns and turnover of school leaders in Scotland and the United States (Session 18.2)
   - Stress for principals on the Mexico–U.S. border (Session 18.13)
   - International perspectives on educational leadership for social justice (Session 20.5)

5. Higher Education
   - International higher education partnerships (Session 9.10)
   - College transition for students in China, Egypt, Tanzania, and the United States (Session 10.5)
   - Amalgamation in Chinese universities (Session 14.8)

6. Leadership Development
   For teachers:
   - ‘Teachers’ engagement in communities of practice in Finland (Session 8.5)
   - Internship experiences in Costa Rica (Session 14.12)
   - Training effects on teachers in Chile (Session 14.8)
   - Doctoral programs in Estonia and United Arab Emirates (Session 18.10)
A Focus on International Programs: CELA

Ross Notman
CELA Director

The Centre for Educational Leadership and Administration (CELA) at the University of Otago in New Zealand was formally established on January 1, 2010. The aim of the centre is to engage in high-quality leadership teaching, research, and community service that will mutually benefit the University of Otago College of Education, students, teachers and the broader educational community in New Zealand and internationally. The CELA offices are located in the Education Centre Building on the University of Otago campus in Dunedin.

CELA will focus on policy development; theoretical and conceptual understandings about educational leadership; the practice of leadership across early-childhood, primary, and secondary education sectors; and research that underpins improved leadership practice and policy development. In particular, the new centre aims to:

• assist the personal and professional growth of current and aspiring leaders in early childhood centres, primary and secondary schools in Otago and the Southland region;
• link the theory and practice of educational leadership through a programme of seminars and workshops provided by leading national and international practitioners and academics, and through master’s and doctoral postgraduate programmes;
• engage in applied research that will address the needs of students, teachers, educational leaders, and school/centre governance; and
• contribute to national policy debate about educational leadership through published research, conference addresses, national forums, and the media.

CELA staff include Dr. Ross Notman, Director; Dr. Darrell Latham, Manager of Professional Services; and Lisa Johnson, Research Assistant. Besides hosting visitors from the United States, Australia, and New Zealand, CELA’s official launch occurred in September 2010 with a regional Leadership Symposium in Dunedin and Invercargill. Principal speakers were Professor Bruce Barnett, The University of Texas–San Antonio; Dr. Jan Robertson, formerly University of Waikato and University of London; Professor Helen May, Dean of College of Education, University of Otago; and Dr. Ross Notman, CELA Director. Planned activities include:

• Phase II of the 14-country International Successful School Principalship Project (ISSPP), which investigates how primary and secondary principals build and sustain success;
• collaboration with the University of Otago Business School Executive Education programme in delivery of a personal leadership course;
• production of an edited book on successful leadership in New Zealand schools and early-childhood centres; and
• coordination of international programmes on behalf of the college.

For more information, contact CELA Director Ross Notman: ross.notman@otago.ac.nz

For principals:
• Impact of international experiences on school leaders (Session 14.12)
• Professional development for Pakistani principals (Session 18.4)
• Challenges and support for new principals in the United Kingdom and Uganda (Session 19.4)

As these sessions reveal, a wealth of knowledge is being generated in countries outside the United States about pressing issues facing schools and their leaders. Many of the same concerns found in America regarding governance, equity, student and parental engagement, leadership preparation, and professional development confront school leaders and those who prepare them in other countries. Because we have much to learn from one another, the growing number of comparative studies of schools and leaders is refreshing. We strongly encourage scholars and practitioners to continue sharing their international experiences to broaden our understanding of critical issues facing educational leaders in the 21st century. Not only is the annual convention a wonderful forum for disseminating international studies and perspectives, but editors of the UCEA journals (Educational Administration Quarterly, Journal of Cases, Journal of Research on Leadership Education) also are encouraging international submissions and special issues. A promising trend, for example, was the substantial increase of international submissions to Education Administration Quarterly in 2010.

To learn more about initiatives being conducted around the world, go to the UCEA website and access the international link: www.ucea.org/international. Suggestions for how to increase UCEA’s support for international research and collaboration can be directed to the UCEA Associate Director of International Affairs, Bruce Barnett (bruce.barnett@utsa.edu) at The University of Texas at San Antonio.

Check out the UCEA Interview Series

The UCEA Interview Series is a new online resource focused on recent research relevant to leadership practice and preparation. Visit www.blogtalkradio.com/UCEA and check out the current offerings, including interviews with Karen Seashore, Ken Leithwood, Terry Orr, Mike Knapp, David Mayrowitz, and Scott McLeod. Listen to interviews live, listen online, or download them to your mp3 player.

www.ucea.org
Book Review: *Organizing Schools for Improvement*

Martin Scanlan  
Marquette University


What are the necessary and sufficient ingredients that lead to substantial improvement in student learning in urban schools? How do they work together? What happens if one of these necessary components is missing? *Organizing Schools for Improvement* (Bryk, Sebring, Allensworth, Luppescu, & Easton, 2009) is an ambitious work that both raises these big questions and addresses them with aplomb. As inequities in educational opportunities persist (Borman & Dowling, 2010), transforming education, particular public urban schooling, remains a vexing and urgent problem. In recent decades public discourse regarding addressing this has swelled, but policies promising transformation have proven ineffectual (Ravitch, 2010a, 2010b). A narrowing focus on rudimentary indicators of student achievement remains a vexing and urgent problem. In recent decades public discourse regarding addressing this has swelled, but policies promising transformation have proven ineffectual (Ravitch, 2010a, 2010b). A narrowing focus on rudimentary indicators of student achievement has constrained public discourse around the underlying purposes of schooling (Rose, 2009). In this context *Organizing Schools* emerges as a masterful work providing salient, compelling evidence regarding how to address this national concern.

Lauded as the most important research in a decade on the topic (Scheurich, Goddard, Skrla, McKenzie, & Youngs, 2010), Bryk and colleagues have crafted a rare work that has emerged as essential reading for practitioners, scholars, and policy makers, particularly in the field of educational leadership. The extraordinary dimension of the study is not that it establishes leadership as playing a central role in orchestrating school improvement. This central finding, though powerful, has been well documented elsewhere (e.g., Wahlstrom, Seashore Louis, Leithwood, & Anderson, 2010). Rather, the power in *Organizing Schools* is unpacking how leadership works to promote school improvement in concert with four other dimensions, and how these five components are both necessary and sufficient to drive substantive school improvement. In this essay review I first describe the primary aims and findings of *Organizing Schools* and then examine concrete implications of this work, specifically attending to leadership preparation and future research in the field of educational leadership.

**Aims and Findings of *Organizing Schools***

*Organizing Schools* is oriented toward praxis: articulating and testing “a theory of action for organizing [urban] schools for improvement” (Bryk et al., 2009, p. 21). The research was conducted through the Consortium on Chicago School Research, which has produced extensive studies of school reform efforts spawned by the Chicago School Reform Act of 1988 (e.g., Bryk, Camburn, & Louis, 1999; Bryk, Sebring, Kerbow, Rollow, & Easton, 1999). The consortium’s work demonstrates how collaborative endeavors among institutes of higher education and elementary and secondary schools can yield powerful results promoting school improvement. Data analyzed in *Organizing Schools* are drawn from a 7-year stretch (1990–1996) during which no other major school reform efforts affected Chicago Public Schools.

**Establishing the framework.** The first two chapters set up the study. In Chapter 1 the authors identify (a) attendance rates and (b) student learning outcomes in reading and math (as measured on Iowa Tests of Basic Skills) as the core outcome indicators of school improvement. For both indicators the authors go to considerable lengths to establish sophisticated measures. They create calculate adjusted attendance trends that “controlled for changes over time in the compositions of students” (Bryk et al., 2009, p. 31) in order to ensure that a school’s improved rates of attendance can in fact be attributed to its organizational improvements (and not to demographic shifts in student population). Regarding student learning outcomes, they create an “academic productivity profile” (p. 34) to capture a school’s contribution to student learning gains over time. This controlled for the changes in the achievement levels of students entering the school (input level) when measuring the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills scores (output level) and allowed the authors to more accurately determine student learning gains over time. Of 390 public elementary schools that comprise the sample, *Organizing Schools* focuses on contrasting the top quartile and bottom quartile on these outcome indicators.

Chapter 2 describes the theory of school organization and improvement underlying the study. The authors strive to provide a theory of practice that will both “afford clinical guidance to practitioners—directing their efforts toward the core aspects of school improvement that merit their attention” (Bryk et al., 2009, p. 44) as well as serve as an analytic tool for scholars to advance research in this area. The heart of this theory is the technical core of instruction, which involves the classroom dynamics (teachers and students engaged in subject matter), the amount of effective learning time for these classroom dynamics, and the effectiveness of supplemental resources supporting these classroom dynamics (pp. 48–49). The level of instructional productivity within the classroom (and school) depends on what happens in this technical core. This productivity further depends upon students’ engagement with instruction, which depends upon an individual’s motivation to learn and regular participation in school (e.g., attendance, discipline, homework completion). Bryk et al. (2009) describe these interacting dynamics as the “classroom black box” (p. 48).

Next, the authors describe four organizational dimensions that directly affect this black box: instructional guidance, professional capacity, learning climate, and parent/community relations. The first two dimensions most directly affect the classroom learning. Instructional guidance signifies the products and processes of curriculum, instruction, and assessment. Professional capacity references the human resources, namely the professional expertise of the educators. The other two dimensions interact with other elements in the classroom black box. By the student-centered learning climate, the authors describe how conducive the culture and atmosphere in the school are to promoting teaching and learning (e.g., academic press from teachers and peers, level of order and safety). The parent/community relations dimension includes the level of parental support for learning, school support for culturally respon-
sive instruction, and community support for supplemental services for students.

After unpacking these four dimensions, the authors identify a fifth essential organizational support—leadership—as the driver of the other four. Leadership involves managing resources and processes in the school effectively and efficiently; providing instructional leadership focusing on improving the technical core of instruction; and facilitating the inclusion of broad, often disparate constituents in a shared vision and path toward improvement. While the principal is the central leader and catalyst, leadership must be distributed, as “no one person can transform a school on his or her own” (Bryk et al., 2009, p. 64). The authors conclude by noting 14 indicators used to measure these five essential supports.

Though the text describing this theoretical framework is lucid, the diagrams and metaphor used to illustrate it are awkward. The authors refer to the five essential supports as the ingredients to baking a cake, inadvertently implying that the process of school improvement has a discrete beginning, middle, and end, and that once the recipe is followed, the end result will consistently emerge. While all metaphors, at some point, break down, baking a cake is a strikingly weak way one to communicate this sophisticated framework. An alternate encapsulation might be to consider the five essential supports as interacting cogs working in conjunction to promote instructional productivity within the classroom black box (see Figure). This metaphor captures the interdependence of each of the five supports in promoting student learning in the classroom and underscores the notion of school improvement as not merely sequential, but an ongoing process.

The authors proceed in Chapter 4 to examine in greater depth the interactions among four of these essential supports (excluding leadership) by presenting a careful analysis of the 14 composite indicators. The findings presented here are actionable for practitioners. By way of example, specific connections between organizational dimensions and outcome indicators are spelled out:

While an unsafe, disorderly climate promotes absenteeism, engaging instruction encourages regular student attendance...schools using a well-paced, aligned curriculum and deploying an applications-oriented pedagogy were much more likely to show significant improvements in attendance. In contrast, schools relying heavily on didactic teaching methods with constant repetition of basic skills worksheets, practice drills, and teacher-directed instruction tended to stagnate. (Bryk et al., 2009, p. 102)

The authors not only provide powerful cautions against negative consequences of “deadening instruction” (p. 104), they also candidly acknowledge the tensions that schools face that drive them toward dysfunctional cycles of weaknesses in a student-centered climate and in the curriculum, instruction, and assessment:

Efforts to “tighten the screws on instruction” in the face of absenteeism...can have negative consequences for students’ engagement. A natural response by teachers is to slow down the curriculum and to reteach lessons with the whole class. This instructional repetition, however, only contributes further to the problem. ...Helping teachers break out of this loop becomes a primary focus for quality professional development. (Bryk et al., 2009, p. 106)

Of particular value is the way the authors unpack how different essential supports interact with “productive reciprocity” (Bryk et al., 2009, p. 117). For example, they describe the curricular alignment (part of the instructional guidance dimension) as highly dependent on the social supports provided in the professional capacity dimension. They conclude the chapter by describing the evidence that leadership drives this interaction. Leadership most directly strengthens parent/community relations and professional capacity and more indirectly affect instructional guidance and the student-centered climate. The longitudinal evidence

![Figure. Dynamic interaction of five essential supports and relational trust.](image-url)
shows that “an average school community with a strong leadership base would have a set of organizational indicators three years later that approached the top quartile of schools in this study” (p. 131), underscoring the role of leadership as driving change.

**Adding nuance.** In the final two chapters, *Organizing Schools* add nuance to the theory of action for urban school improvement. Chapter 5 emphasizes the critical role of relational trust, which is built from social respect, personal regard, role competence, and personal integrity (Bryk & Schneider, 2002), in promoting shared ownership of reform efforts. (In addition, structural dimensions such as small size and stable enrollment are noted to promote successful reform.) Relational trust “conditions the school’s capacity to enhance the functioning of these core organizational subsystems” (Bryk et al., 2009, p. 147). The authors assert, “Trust formation in a school community is a key mechanism in advancing meaningful improvement initiatives” (p. 157). To return to my metaphor of the five essential supports functioning as interconnected cogs, relational trust could be seen as the grease lubricating their movement (see Figure 6).

As Chapter 5 looks inward to the school, Chapter 6 looks outward to the broader context. Here the authors present a textured analysis of the interplay of racial isolation and socioeconomic status on schools in the study, slicing these data to craft seven “racial-SES classifications of school communities” ranging from “truly disadvantaged” (borrowing from Williams, 1987) to racially integrated. Not surprisingly, they find “large and significant differences across the seven categories of schools with respect to trends in academic productivity in both reading and mathematics” (Bryk et al., 2009, p. 164). In truly disadvantaged group, only 15% of schools showed significant improvement. By contrast, within the integrated group, 40% improved in reading and 60% in math. They conclude by examining the levels and types of social capital (bonding, promoting internal cohesion within communities, and bridging, creating linkages to external individuals and organizations) and different community indicators across these seven categories, describing the negative impact of concentrations of social barriers (e.g., high levels of crime, abuse, and neglect and low levels of social cohesion, religious participation, and integration with other neighborhoods). They demonstrate how “differences among communities in their social resources and problems significantly influence the capacity of local schools to improve” (p. 186), suggesting that policies promoting urban school reform must take into account these contextual differences.

**Drawing conclusions.** The concluding chapter of *Organizing Schools* summarizes the core lesson of the study: “meaningful improvement typically entails orchestrated initiatives across multiple domains” (Bryk et al., 2009, p. 197), specifically, the five essential supports. At both the school and system levels, sustained improvement depends on simultaneously attending to each dimension. Here the authors make direct suggestions for educational leadership, asserting that the integrative framework can “guide principals as they reflect on their everyday actions and engage in longer-term strategic planning” (p. 204). First, school principals must promote coherence across the four areas of instructional guidance, professional capacity, the learning climate, and parent/community relations with an unrelenting focus on “improving the technical core of teaching and learning” (p. 204). Second, principals must recognize that “the technical activities of school improvement rest on a social base” (p. 204) and, accordingly, build relational trust within the school community.

**Implications of Organizing Schools**

**Leadership preparation.** Several implications of *Organizing Schools* for leadership preparation—including both preservice leaders and practitioners—emerge from a careful reading of the text. First, this work speaks to how school leaders master standards in the field. These standards emphasize the role of leaders cultivating an effective teaching and learning environment by setting a shared vision, developing a school culture and instructional program, ensuring the management of resources, and collaborating broadly (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2008). Leadership preparation programs frequently emphasize these standards discretely but may find the research presented in Organizing Schools helpful in drawing interconnections among them. Further, these leadership standards have been criticized for failing to foreground issues of educational inequities and the obligation of school leaders to redress these (Cambron-McCabe, 2006). By grounding a theory of essential supports on evidence from schools that predominantly serve students who have been marginalized by poverty and racism, *Organizing Schools* appropriately emphasizes this as a focal point in the field of educational leadership.

Second, this work has implications for preparing leaders to facilitate organizational learning. Literature in educational leadership emphasizes specific foci for organizational learning, such as the instructional capacity of teachers (Spillane & Seashore Louis, 2011). The Brock International Prize in Education recognizes an individual who has made a specific innovation or contribution to the science and art of education, resulting in a significant impact on the practice or understanding of the field of education. It must be a specific innovation or contribution that has the potential to provide long-term benefit to all humanity through change and improvement in education at any level, including new teaching techniques, the discovery of learning processes, the organization of a school or school system, the radical modification of government involvement in education, or other innovations. The prize is not intended to recognize an exemplary career or meritorious teaching, administration, or service with a primarily local impact. The prize itself is awarded each year and consists of $40,000, a certificate, and a bust of Sequoyah.

**10th Annual Brock Symposium**

**The University of Oklahoma**

**April 8, 2011**

2011 Brock International Laureate:

Dr. Linda Darling-Hammond
The authors go to lengths unpacking the manner in which contextual factors delimit opportunities for school improvement. Others have described educational outcomes as closely linked with both social advantages and disadvantages that students experience (e.g., Lee & Burkam, 2002), or teacher empowerment (Marks & Seashore Louis, 1999). Organizational learning involves distributed leadership (Brooks, Jean-Marie, Normore, & Hodgins, 2007; Spillane, Halverson, & Diamond, 2001). Evidence from successful urban schools reflects such organizational learning: Leadership is shared across a range of individuals, from supervisors (i.e., principals) to mentors (i.e., coaches, teacher-leaders), and data analysis consistently guides efforts to improve instruction (Portin et al., 2009). Rather than diverging from this extant literature, Organizing Schools bolsters and synthesizes it by providing a unifying theory of action. The analysis of a unique, longitudinal data set across a system of schools yields novel insights into the specific dimensions working in concert that promote urban school improvement. Preservice coursework (e.g., organizational theory) as well as in-service supports for practitioners should integrate these insights.

Third, this work has implications for how school leaders think about data. One of the striking features of the text is the relentless effort of the authors to describe complex data cogently. For the most part, they succeed in prodding readers to forego indicators that are easily measured for those that have strong analytical purchase. By creating composite, value-added measures of attendance, reading, and mathematic outcome measures, the authors’ claims of school improvement hold sway. By looking beyond the common-place indicators of race and socioeconomic status, they demonstrate a more compelling approach to describing these dimensions of diversity in schools. Leadership preparation programs often seek to scaffold skills at conducting equity audits (Johnson & La Salle, 2010; Skrla, Scheurich, & McKenzie, 2009). In this, they will be well served to draw upon Organizing Schools to demonstrate the potential of creatively approaching data collection and analysis.

Implications for future research. Implications for future research in educational leadership emerge as well. Regarding content, Organizing Schools will likely spawn a cadre of work that tests its theory of action within other sectors (e.g., secondary settings, non-urban settings). In addition, scholars will likely explore in greater depth the interrelations among the five domains. Whereas some of the conclusions that the text draws from these domains are not new, the data that substantiate the claims are. For instance, in Chapter 6 the authors go to lengths unpacking the manner in which contextual factors delimit opportunities for school improvement. Others have described educational outcomes as closely linked with both the political economy (e.g., Kantor & Lowe, 2006) and the social advantages and disadvantages that students experience (e.g., Lee & Burkam, 2002). What is novel in this work is demonstrating the nature of these linkages vis-à-vis specific dimensions of school improvement. Future research will expound these connections.

Organizing Schools has the potential to inspire boundary spanning among researchers and practitioners. Born of collaborative efforts amongst schools and an institute of higher education, this work illustrates that such partnerships have immense potential. The five essential supports explored by this work point toward the need for interdisciplinary research. Most directly, this could provoke partnerships among colleagues within colleges of education studying specific domains (e.g., departments of leadership and administration and departments of curriculum and instruction). The ubiquitous silos that characterize institutes of higher education notwithstanding, Organizing Schools also provides fodder for research endeavors that bring together colleagues across fields (e.g., educators working with colleagues in communications, community development, sociology, and family studies).

Finally, this work has implications for the delivery form that research takes. As a text, Organizing Schools strives to be both accessible and multidimensional. More than once the authors invite “the reader less interested” to skip ahead. Elsewhere, readers hungry for greater detail are urged to explore appendices and online resources. Although not explicitly referenced in the text, a webinar in which the authors present this work is also available (Consortium on Chicago School Research, 2011). Such creative extensions of a static text into more flexible, responsive formats are bound to grow more commonplace as information technology resources continue to burgeon.

Conclusions

Perhaps more than ever, issues at the heart of school reform are widely and hotly contested in the public discourse. Inequities in educational opportunities abound and solutions are elusive. The field of educational leadership, in particular, is positioned at a critical juncture in which its influence on this discourse may either deepen or deteriorate (Shoho, 2010). Organizing Schools provides powerful evidence that strong school leaders can help promote educational equity by advancing curriculum, instruction, and assessment; cultivating professional capacity; fostering student-centered climates; and building parent and community relations. In our roles as scholars, practitioners, and policy makers, we are called upon to promote these necessary and sufficient supports with diligence and ingenuity. In short, we are called upon to organize schools for improvement.
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Increasingly, university educational leadership preparation programs are coming under scrutiny from a range of stakeholders. In particular, state departments of education are demanding that university educational leadership preparation programs show evidence that preparation program faculty are (a) designing preparation programs around state and national standards, (b) embedding these standards within and across courses, and (c) collecting documentation, typically in the form of electronic artifacts of student work products, that demonstrate students’ knowledge of the standards and their ability to carry out each standard’s central tenets. These standards-based scrutiny may compel preparation program faculty to respond in at least two ways. One, faculty may choose an instrumental approach in which they pick specific portions of one or more standards for focus, leaving other standards and accompanying elements at the periphery of their attention. Alternately, faculty may choose to engage in examination of the standards at a deeper level, searching for epistemological roots that can explain further what thinking, values, and beliefs undergird each standard; this explicated information about the standard(s) can then be incorporated into preparation program content, discussion, and experiences. We see these two types of faculty responses as opposite ends of a continuum, and we acknowledge that a variety of responses styles are likely spread along the continuum. As university faculty, we choose the latter, epistemological approach for increasing our understanding how the national and state standards can inform educational leadership preparation programs. We are drawn especially to exploring the concept “vision of learning,” delineated in the first standard of both the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) standards (Council of Chief State School Officers [CCSSO], 2008) and the 2002 Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) standards (National Policy Board for Educational Administration [NPBEA], 2002). This essay serves as our invitation to the educational leadership professoriate to join us in a national conversation about the meaning of a “vision of learning.”

What’s the Problem?

Some members of the professoriate may respond to our invitation by asking, “Why should we have such a conversation? What’s the problem?” In our view, the notion of what constitutes a vision of learning depends upon whom you ask. We believe—and the literature supports—that there is not a unified, agreed-upon definition of the single notion of “vision” much less the more specific phrase “vision of learning.” We believe this lack of a shared understanding of the meaning of the first standard in two national educational leadership standard sets is a problem for the professoriate and for the students whom we serve in at least three ways. First, the absence of an agreed-upon definition of “vision of learning” renders the task of faculty designing preparation programs to include ISLLC and ELCC Standard 1 difficult if not impossible. What would such a program design entail? What would be the foundational knowledge upon which preparation program courses and experiences are based? Second, if we don’t share an understanding of “vision of learning,” then how can we embed its constructs within courses and experiences? Moreover, what criteria would we or external reviewers (e.g., peer and state government staff) use to evaluate whether elements of a vision of learning exist within our preparation courses? What specifically would we teach students about the vision concept; more precisely, how would we guide students to “develop, articulate, implement, and steward” (CCSSO, 2008, p. 14) such a vision among all stakeholders? Finally, without a fully elaborated definition, what would count as evidence—in the form of student work artifacts—that would demonstrate that students understand the concept and are able to include it their practice? We believe these problematic features of “vision of learning” are not only worthy of discussion among the professoriate but critically need to be addressed if the educational leadership professoriate and state departments of education are serious about using meaningful standards to improve instruction. Furthermore, we believe the faculty policy-response continuum from instrumental (e.g., means–ends, technical rationality; Schwandt, 1997) to reflective practice (Schön, 1983) needs to be acknowledged and confronted. In this essay, we explore the concept of vision in the business and educational leadership literature, consider how the concept of vision and the vision literature are represented in the ISLLC and ELCC standards, look at literature and practice that might provide an expanded notion of vision of learning, and suggest areas for further research.

What Does the Literature Say About Vision?

The notion of vision is not new—the concept has old historical roots. The earliest usage, associated mostly with religious and political leadership (Kantabutra, 2008), linked the concept of vision with charisma following the original Greek definition of charisma as a “divinely inspired gift” (Gove & Webster, 1993). This usage implied that such a “gift” could not be learned but was instead an innate ability bestowed by God. Much later, Weber (1947) developed the concept of charisma as a form of influence conferred upon a leader by followers who perceived the leader as having shown exceptional qualities during a time of crisis. For the last several decades, the notion of vision has been linked most frequently to the idea of transformational leadership (Burns, 1978).

Defining vision. Since the 1970s, the notion of vision has garnered increasing interest among business and educational scholars who have theorized about the concept and attempted to test empirically the role of vision in leadership. Despite this increasing interest in vision, a unified, agreed-upon definition of the concept does not exist. Several business scholars (Kantabutra, 2008; Zaccaro, 2001) have synthesized definitions delineated in the literature; these syntheses illustrate that both similar and different conceptualizations of vision have been described. For example, Bennis and Nanus (1985) suggested that vision is a mental image of a possible and desirable future state. Similarly, Kotter (1990) defined vision as a description of something (an organization, a corporate cul-
turing, etc.) in the future. Yet, Kantabutra (2008) noted, others have conceptualized vision as an important business planning strategy; Kaufman, Herman, and Watters (2002) emphasized this latter concept in their advice about educational planning. In fact, Kaufman et al. make their position transparent by including the words “strategic, tactical, and operational” as a subtitle for their work.

As these examples illustrate, vision’s definitional problem is compounded by at least two opposing concepts: vision as mental image and vision as strategic planning mechanism. These two distinctively different concepts—which tend not to be acknowledged or discussed by university educational leadership faculty, practicing educational leaders, or policy makers—contribute to “considerable disagreement…over whether [and how] terms like mission, goals, core values, strategy, and organizational philosophy differ from vision” (Kantabutra, 2008, p. 129; see also Hallinger & Heck, 2002).

Vision and transactional leadership. In the late 1970s, political scientist and social historian James McGregor Burns (1978) brought fresh attention to the twin concepts of charisma and vision by applying Weber’s (1947) ideas to a new leadership approach Burns called “transactional.” Burns (1978) contrasted this new type of leadership with the traditional transactional management style based on contingent rewards and punishment; Burns saw the two as opposing leadership styles. While Burns elaborated on the moral basis of this new leadership paradigm, he did not attempt to sort out types of actions or strategies that transformational leaders might use (Sashkin, 2004). Bass (1985), seeking to compare empirically Burns’s theory of transformational leadership with the older transactional approach, developed an assessment tool he called the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ). From his research findings, Bass argued that transformation and transaction leadership approaches, rather than being opposing styles as Burns suggested, were actually alternate approaches that leaders used depending upon the situation at hand (Zaccaro, 2001).

The 1995 version of the MLQ breaks transactional leadership into four scales and two subscales: idealized influence (formerly charisma) consisting of two subscales, follower attribution and leader behaviors; individualized consideration; intellectual stimulation; and inspirational motivation. Embedded within the scale of inspirational motivation is the idea of “articulating a vision and displaying optimism and confidence that vision will be achieved” (Sashkin, 2004, p. 176). The MLQ also includes additional dimensions of transactional leadership, laissez-faire leadership, and perceived outcomes.

By 1990, Leithwood and Jantzi (1990) had applied the concept of transformational leadership, with its embedded inclusion of vision, to the field of education. Much of the subsequent primary research in education on the concept of transformational leadership has utilized Bass’s (1985) MLQ instrument. Leithwood, Jantzi, and Steinbach (1999) built on and extended Bass’s work into a set of “transformational leadership behaviors,” or TLBs, that could be applied to school contexts. They identified three broad TLB categories: setting directions, helping people, and redesigning the organization. They included a fourth TLB category detailing elements of transactional leadership. In Leithwood et al.’s model, vision is placed at the top of the first TLB category, setting directions.

Several meta-analyses (Leithwood & Jantzi, 2005; Robinson, Lloyd, & Rowe, 2008) have sought to explore the impact of the use of transformational leadership on improved student academic outcomes. Leithwood and Jantzi’s (2005) analysis of 32 empirical studies of transformational leadership found a significant, primarily indirect effect of this form of leadership on student achievement and engagement. However, Robinson et al. (2008) advised caution of promoting transformational leadership based on their meta-analysis of various leadership styles; they concluded that instructional leadership had 3 to 4 times the impact on student outcomes of transformational leadership. Robinson et al. suggested further that in contrast to instructional leadership, transformation leadership was more focused on the relationship between leaders and followers and less focused on improving student outcomes.

Quantifying leadership. As the above brief summary highlights, the notion of vision has evolved from a concept of leadership practice grounded in moral values (Burns, 1978; Kantabutra, 2008) to a set of factors that can be disaggregated and studied individually. For example, recently Leithwood and Day (2007) proposed a framework for “sampling knowledge about principal leadership” (p. 5). This framework consists of five sets of variables: antecedents (e.g., leader dispositions), moderating variables (e.g., family background), independent variables (e.g., leader behaviors), mediating variables (e.g., school culture), and dependent variables (e.g., student outcomes). While Leithwood and Day stressed this model is not “a theory of anything” (p. 5), they suggested that this framework could be used as a tool for testing a theory of leadership.

The majority of the current research on vision in education leadership has followed this quantifying trend. As Robinson et al. (2008) pointed out, a few qualitative case studies of “turn around” schools and districts (see, for example, Edmonds, 1979; Maden, 2001; Scheurich, 1998) have credited school and district leaders with improving instructional effectiveness and student academic outcomes. However, cases providing evidence of sustainability following leadership turnover are difficult to find. More troubling is the tendency to attribute successful school and district turn around to a heroic view of leadership (Hallinger, 2005); such superhuman leadership characterizations underemphasize the complex nature of leadership in difficult times and fail to explore the leader’s negotiation of competing and conflicting stakeholder demands. Similarly, whereas the quantitative research models may usefully show relationships among and between dispositional, contextual, and academic outcome variables, these studies fail to illuminate how leaders actually think and reconcile conflicting demands in schools in ways that appear to positively influence school culture and student academic achievement improvement.

Thus, we conclude that our understanding of visionary leadership in education is still in a nascent stage, despite the prominence of vision language in the current national and state educational leadership standards. We believe these conceptual and empirical limitations severely hamper our attempts in the educational leadership professoriate to guide developing educational leaders to “develop, articulate, implement, and steward” (CCSSO, 2008, p. 14) a vision of learning among all stakeholders.

How Do the ISLLC and ELCC Standards Define “Vision of Learning”? Given the underdeveloped understanding of vision, what guidance do the national ISLLC and ELCC standards provide in regard to Standard 1? Not as much as we would like, as it turns out. The 2008 ISLLC Educational Leadership Standards maintain the central lan-
language of the initial 1996 ISLLC standards (CCSSO, 1996); “facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by all stakeholders” (CCSSO, 2008, p. 14). Whereas the 1996 Standards began with “school administrator” and ended with “the school community,” the 2008 Standards shift to the designation “educational leader” and end with “all stakeholders.” More substantively, the 1996 ISLLC version subdivided the standards into useful distinctions of knowledge, dispositions, and performances; the 2008 ISLLC Standards collapse the standard detail into one category: functions. On first look, this change may seem minor, but closer investigation suggests that this change from 1996 to 2008 has reduced the substance of Standard 1 in several important ways. First, this reduction diverts attention from what is surely a multifaceted leadership role (knowledge, dispositions, performance, etc.) into a single element: functions. This diversion suggests that “promoting...a vision of learning” is a single-minded effort that can be accomplished by “collecting and using data...creating and using plans...promoting continuous improvement...and monitoring and evaluating progress” (CCSSO, 2008, p. 14). Why did we discard consideration of educational leaders’ knowledge and understanding, values and beliefs? Indeed, what happened to the moral underpinnings of Burns’s (1978, 2003) theory of transformational leadership?

Similarly, the 2002 ELCC Standards focused on educational leaders’ knowledge and ability and offered an expanded “vision of learning” built on “relevant knowledge and theories” (NPBEA, 2002, p. 2). But, what knowledge and theories? The 2009 draft ELCC Standards maintain the knowledge and skills language but shift quickly into collecting and using data, creating and implementing goals, promoting continuous and sustainable improvement, and monitoring and evaluating plans (NPBEA, 2009, pp. 4-11).

More troubling, as we reviewed the empirical research base cited as supporting the 2008 ISLLC Standards, a research base previously but no longer available on the CCSSO website, we found only 7 of the 83 references mentioned the concept of vision, and none referenced directly a “vision of learning.” Of the 7, published between 1985 and 2007, 5 used qualitative and 2 used quantitative methodologies. Only one business-oriented article (Lipton, 2003) focused explicitly on vision but did not yield any groundbreaking findings.

From Reflective to Instrumental Leadership Practice?

In our view, the national ISLLC and ELCC educational leadership standards—along with many new state educational leadership standards—have moved away from the idea of vision as a moral enterprise to the idea of vision as strategic planning. We characterize this ideological change as a shift from reflective to instrumental leadership practice. Certainly, we agree, it is easier to define the elements of strategic planning than to try and capture the elusive essentials of what might constitute visionary leadership in general and the specifics of a vision of learning in particular. Still, as we and others (e.g., Hallinger & Heck, 2002; Kantabutra, 2008) believe that insufficient distinction has been made among the concepts of vision, mission, and goal setting, this insufficient distinction has contributed to “conceptual muddiness” (Hallinger & Heck, 2002, p. 32) and impeded efforts to develop adequate methodological measures utilizing quantitative, qualitative, or mixed methodologies.

As we ponder this conceptual muddiness, our thoughts turn to metaphorical descriptions of the distinction between the epistemological and instrumental versions of vision. For instance, we might compare a visionary, transformational educational leader to that of an extraordinary orchestra conductor. Superb conductors—such as Sir Neville Marriner, founder of the English Chamber Orchestra Academy of St. Martin in the Fields—offer excellent illustrations of this metaphor. Sir Marriner led the St. Martin’s orchestra from the middle for a number of years as a performing member of the conductorless group (Stuart, 1999). Eventually, he moved into the official conductor role and led the orchestra to become one of the most recorded chamber orchestras in the world. Sir Mariner’s skill lay in bringing forth the best from all group members in such a way that their collective performance generated synergy that allowed their music to rise substantially above that of other orchestras who might perform the same pieces of music using the same instruments. While these orchestra members’ talents were exceptional in their own right, the beauty of the group’s performance was not defined by individual performances, but by the collective. Extending this analogy to education, the theoretical literature on vision suggests that a comparable educational leader does not stand apart for the faculty and students, but instead stands among them pulling forth from each (including self) the very best efforts at leading, teaching, and learning. According to vision theorists, these efforts, intentionally and collectively, help transform not only the specific educational site, but also the thinking and the work transforms each adult and student participant (Burns, 2003) in such a way that they become different people.

Moving to the opposite end of the conceptual spectrum, we contemplate what metaphor might be appropriate for illustrating the instrumental response to vision codified in such language as strategic planning, goals, directives, and so on. In particular, we wonder, which metaphor could capture the disaggregation of vision into multiple, individual elements that might be studied using quantitative methodologies? We think an apt metaphor might be the Human Genome Project. The Human Genome Project (2010), launched in 1990 and completed in 2003, sought ambitiously to:

- identify all the approximately 20,000-25,000 genes in human DNA;
- determine the sequences of the 3 billion chemical base pairs that make up human DNA;
- store this information in databases;
- improve tools for data analysis;
- transfer related technologies to the private sector; and
- address the ethical, legal, and social issues that may arise from the project.

While mapping alleles on chromosomes may unlock secrets of the body through genetic testing leading to early discovery of disease, the practical effects of this work thus far have been limited. Informal reports from people who have paid significant amounts of money to have analyses conducted suggest that the detailed results did not actually provide any new information beyond what was already known from family history. So, while the long-term benefits from the Genome Project promise to significantly influence how illness and potential illnesses are handled, attendant ethical and social issues also abound.

The Human Genome Project sought to explore the extraordinary complexities of the human body by examining its smallest features. If we use this project as a metaphor for viewing instrumen-
tally the concept of vision, we might consider it as an illustration of breaking the leadership role—particularly, the role vision appears to play—into its component parts. Both endeavors are exceptionally complex and potentially enlightening; however, the practical significance of both is more modest. If we look at leadership effect in terms of antecedents, independent variables, mediating variables, etc., we may develop defensible empirical arguments about causation, direction, and strength of relationships, but transferring these data into what the effect looks like in a school setting is difficult. Likewise, using these findings in our university educational leadership courses may be theoretically and empirically useful, while posing challenges, at the same time, for weaving the disparate elements into a dynamic mosaic of evolving leadership practice.

Moreover, leadership practice most certainly looks different in each setting because, as the empirical research shows, contextual factors such as leader dispositions and student family background are strong influences. Desirable leader traits and dispositions have been characterized as falling into four categories: cognitive, personality, motivation, and social appraisal skills (Leithwood & Day, 2007; Zaccaro, Kemp, & Bader, 2004). We are drawn also to Greenfield’s (1986) idea of leaders exhibiting evidence of moral imagination interwoven with interpersonal competence; Greenfield argued that leadership practice is comprised of an unending set of moral judgments that convey the leader’s “values in action” (p. 12). Moral imagination, Greenfield suggested, is “the inclination of a person to see that…the school and the associated activities of teaching and learning, need not remain as it is—that it is possible for it to be other-wise, and to be better” (p. 14). Building upon Greenfield’s ideas, we explore what a “vision of learning” might look like in practice.

**What Would a “Vision of Learning” Look Like in Practice?**

While educational leadership scholars have become increasingly interested in the concept of vision—particularly in terms of transformational leadership—and have worked hard to test the concept statistically, they have focused little attention on the more specific phrase “vision of learning,” despite its prominence in current national educational leadership standards. However, in our review of the literature, we found promising guidance for our quest in the field of learning theory. This growing literature, conducted mostly by psychologists and curriculum and assessment scholars, provides a valuable perspective and vocabulary that educational leadership scholars can use to formulate the missing “vision of learning.”

Upon reflection, this literature strand may seem an obvious information source in that these scholars are dedicated to developing learning theory and supporting curricular and teaching strategies “that improve education and achievement of all students, especially those who are underserved” (Institute for Learning, 2010). According to the learning theory perspective, education is learner centered and based on principles grouped into four sets of factors: cognitive and metacognitive factors that link learner-construction of knowledge with “thinking about thinking” to the context of learning, motivational and affective factors; developmental and social factors; and individual differences factors that connect learner differences to standards and assessments by using diagnostic, process, and outcome assessment (American Psychological Association, 1997).

For example, the Institute for Learning, established in 1995 as part of the Learning Research and Development Center at the University of Pittsburgh, currently concentrates its work with educators, schools, and districts in three key areas: knowledge about content, pedagogy, and leadership; vibrant learning communities; and tools that teach and support adults in educational settings to do a better job. As founder Lauren Resnick (2010) recently explained, the Institute for Learning has moved from building principles of learning to doing the work and supporting enactment of curriculum and pedagogy. The Institute for Learning scholars translate emerging research from cognitive psychology into practitioner-friendly publications on such topics as content (McConachie & Petrosky, 2009), using practice-based hiring processes (McCarthy, Bickel, & Arzt, 2010), and providing leadership for learning (Resnick & Glennan, 2002).

With the learner at the center, teaching for understanding becomes paramount. From this paradigm, educators focus students on thinking about their thinking, and they teach for understanding (Perkins, 2002). But how do we know when understanding has occurred? Certainly, such assessment cannot be made solely by results of standardized tests. Perkins (2002) suggested that learning for understanding occurs when students engage reflectively with approachable but challenging understanding performances, when such performances are built on previous understanding along with new information, when a variety of learning performances are increasingly challenging, and when students grapple with conflict between prior understandings and new learning. As Sergiovanni and Starratt (2007) explained, in this approach, teaching is not an isolated series of activities or behaviors, rather teaching is an ongoing activity stretching across time, an activity whose beginning may be identified with work of brainstorming a generative topic with students, whose continuation is further focused through…planning…using such tools as graphic organizer[s], and whose partial culmination comes in a dialogic assessment of the culminating performances of the students.

As this deeply textured portrayal of learning underscores, student learning is inextricably connected to what happens in the classroom between teachers and students. We know the strength of this direct connection from scores of quantitative studies (see for example, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, 2010; Darling-Hammond, 2000; Heck, 2009; Seidel & Shavelson, 2007), yet use of such student-centered learning theory in teacher practice remains elusive in far too many educational settings.

**Implications and Needed Research**

What are the implications of the learning theory perspective on university educational leadership faculty and students? In particular, how could this perspective help us unpack the meaning of a “vision of learning”? Our musings led us to identify many more questions that may help shape a national conversation among the educational leadership professoriate:

- How might learning theory contribute to the development of a definition of “vision of learning”?
- Why does the link between university educational leadership departments and departments of curriculum and instruction remain so weak?
- What might inclusion in courses of current theories of learning have on developing educational leaders and their subsequent leadership practice?
• How might such theories, fully explored, enable developing leaders to create their own “vision of learning?”

• What other nontraditional experiences might help developing leaders to “imagine the possibility” (Greenfield, 1986, p. 14) in any given setting?

• What do we know about the experiences of educational leaders who have struggled to enact transformation of schools?

Thus, we end this essay with more questions than answers, and we continue to argue for thoughtful, in-depth conversations about these issues among the educational leadership professoriate. To conclude, we offer suggestions for research that might provide needed insight to some of these thorny questions.

• Provide richly developed case studies—that move beyond the “heroic” leader model—of educational leaders who have attempted to develop and put into action a transforming vision.

• Explore innovative educational leadership course models and formats that intentionally move developing leaders outside their familiar comfort zones in efforts to stimulate creative thinking, reflection, and problem solving.

• More effectively link educational leadership faculty and programs with curriculum and instruction faculty and programs.

• Revisit the concept of clinical supervision to connect more fully current knowledge about theory of learning with the concepts of professional learning communities and school-wide change.
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Twitter is a free service that lets you keep up with UCEA through short (less than 141 characters), frequent updates received by e-mail, text message, RSS feed or on the Twitter website. Join today to start receiving UCEA tweets:

http://twitter.com/UCEA

UCEA Announces
2010 Award Recipients

All of UCEA’s annual awards were presented at the 24th annual convention in New Orleans, LA, October 28-31, 2010.

Edwin M. Bridges Award

Brand new in 2010, the Edwin M. Bridges Award honors original, outstanding work in the area of research or development that contributes to our knowledge and understanding of how best to prepare and support future generations of educational leaders. The premier recipient, Dr. Edwin M. Bridges, Professor Emeritus at Stanford University, has an extensive background in higher education. Prior to joining the Stanford University faculty in 1974, he taught at Washington University in St. Louis, the University of Chicago, and University of California at Santa Barbara. He is internationally known for his work on problem-based learning and has worked with faculty from a variety of disciplines in China and the United States. Professor Bridges has received two lifetime achievement awards for his contributions to the field of educational administration and, during his 35-year career in higher education, has consulted with numerous organizations, including the World Health Organization, the World Bank, and the New York City Public Schools.

Jack A. Culbertson Award: Brendan Maxcy

The Jack A. Culbertson Award was established in 1982 in honor of UCEA’s first full-time Executive Director, who retired in 1981 after serving 22 years in the position. The award is presented annually to an outstanding junior professor of educational administration in recognition of contributions to the field. The 2010 Jack A. Culbertson award recipient, Dr. Brendan Maxcy, is an associate professor of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at Indiana University and serves as co-director of the School of Education’s Urban Principalship Program. Prior to his arrival in Indiana, Dr. Maxcy was an associate professor at the University of Missouri and a science teacher in Texas, Virginia, and Tennessee. His research uses qualitative methods and critical theories to explore educational policies and the responses of school leaders. In addition to studying U.S. schooling, Dr. Maxcy has studied leadership in schools confronting with national educational reforms and intense regional unrest in the border provinces of southern Thailand. Dr. Maxcy’s work is published in Urban Education, Educational Policy, Educational Management, Administration & Leadership, and Educational Administration Quarterly.

Jay D. Scribner Mentoring Award: Martha Ovando

The Jay D. Scribner Mentoring Award honors educational leadership faculty who have made a substantive contribution to the field by mentoring the next generation of students into roles as university research professors, while also recognizing the important roles mentors play in supporting and advising junior faculty. This award is named after Jay D. Scribner, whose prolific career spans over four decades.
and who has mentored a host of doctoral students into the profession while advising and supporting countless junior professors. Dr. Martha Ovando, associate professor of Educational Administration at The University of Texas at Austin, is the 2010 recipient of the Jay D. Scribner Mentoring Award. Her scholarly work has concentrated on the processes related to the supervision of instruction and school personnel; the instructional needs of teachers and their professional development within higher education; processes of instructional supervision, including instructional modules, feedback, instructional assessment, and the evaluation of teachers; and the postobservation processes utilized to improve instruction.

UCEA Master Professor Award: Nancy A. Evers

The UCEA Master Professor Award is given to an individual faculty member who is recognized as being an outstanding teacher, advisor, and mentor of students. The recipient of this award has taken a leadership role in his or her academic unit and has aided in the advancement of students into leadership positions in the K-12 system while promoting and supporting diversity in faculty, students, staff, programs, and curriculum in the field of educational leadership. The 2010 UCEA Master Professor recipient is Dr. Nancy A. Evers, professor of Educational Administration at the University of Cincinnati. Dr. Evers has been a member of the Educational Administration faculty since 1976. Her primary research interests are in the areas of educational leadership, change, women in leadership, and interpersonal relationships. Dr. Evers has served as Dean of the College of Education, Head of the Department of Educational Leadership, and Program Coordinator of Educational Administration. She has provided national leadership as the President of the University Council for Educational Administration, Chairperson of the National Commission on Women in Educational Leadership, and a member of the National Policy Board in Educational Administration.

Paula Silver Case Award: Enrique Alemán, Jr., & Candace Head-Dylla

The Paula Silver Case Award was instituted by UCEA in 1999 to memorialize the life and work of Paula Silver, former UCEA associate director and president-elect, who made significant contributions to our program through excellence in scholarship, advocacy of women, and an inspired understanding of praxis. The Paula Silver Case Award was presented to two recipients this year, Dr. Enrique Alemán, Jr., professor of Educational Administration and Policy Studies at the University of Utah, and Candace Head-Dylla, graduate student at Pennsylvania State University.

Dr. Enrique Alemán, Jr. has an undergraduate degree from St. Mary's University in San Antonio, Texas; received a master's degree from Columbia University's School of International and Public Affairs in New York City; and completed his Ph.D. in Educational Administration from The University of Texas at Austin. While at The University of Texas, Dr. Aleman also completed a doctoral certification in Mexican American Studies. His research agenda includes studying the effects of educational policy on Latina/o and Chicana/o students and communities. In addition to his faculty experience, Dr. Aleman's professional experiences include being employed with the Central Intelligence Agency in Langley, Virginia, the Bronx Borough President's Office in the Bronx, New York, and most recently the Texas Education Agency in Austin.

Candace Head-Dylla is a Ph.D. candidate in Educational Leadership at Pennsylvania State University. Her master's thesis was a quantitative study of the effects of a reading intervention she designed for American Indian middle school students. Ms. Head-Dylla has been employed as the Reading Coach at Bernalillo High School in New Mexico and has trained reading teachers in New Mexico, Louisiana, Maryland, West Virginia, and Puerto Rico.

Roald F. Campbell Lifetime Achievement Award: Rodney Ogawa

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. The 2010 recipient of the Roald F. Campbell Lifetime Achievement Award is Dr. Rodney Ogawa of the University of California, Santa Cruz. A professor of education, Dr. Ogawa specializes in organizational theory, studying the impact of the social environment on school structures, at the classroom, school, and district levels. For more than 20 years, Dr. Ogawa has examined the impacts of educational reform on performance, conducting research on leadership within school organizations that has encompassed principals, superintendents, teachers, parents, and students. Dr. Ogawa came to UCSC from UC Riverside, where he was on the faculty for 10 years, most recently as associate dean in the School of Education. He spent 12 years on the faculty at the University of Utah. Dr. Ogawa earned his BA in history from UCLA, his MA in education from Occidental College, and his Ph.D. in educational administration from Ohio State University, after which he was a postdoctoral trainee in the Organizations Research Training Program at Stanford University.

Looking Ahead

It's not too early to think about honorees for the 2011 convention. The next cycle of UCEA awards begins in late spring with selections completed by the end of summer. Please refer to future announcements in UCEA Review, in UCEA Connections, and on the website. Additionally, each April UCEA announces the recipient of the William J. Davis Award. The Davis Award is given annually to the authors of the most outstanding article published in Educational Administration Quarterly during the preceding volume year. Contributions to the award fund are welcome and should be sent to UCEA, Department of Educational Administration, 1 University Station D5400, Austin, TX 78712-0374.

Nominations for UCEA's 2011 awards competition are due May 30, 2011. Please see www.ucea.org for information on criteria and the nomination process.
UCEA Convention 2011: Call For Proposals
“Forecasting the Future of Leadership Preparation and Practice:
Reclaiming Ground Through Research, Policy, and Politics”

I. General Information
The 25th annual UCEA Convention will be held at the Westin in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. The convention will open at 12:00 p.m. on Thursday afternoon (November 17, 2011) and close at 1:00 p.m. on Sunday (November 20). The purpose of the 2011 UCEA Convention is to engage participants in discussing research, policy, and practice in educational leadership and administration. Members of the Convention 2011 Program Committee are Andrea K. Rorrer (University of Utah), Mónica Byrne-Jiménez (Hofstra University), Gretchen Generett (Duquesne University), and Ann O'Doherty (University of Texas–Austin).

II. Theme
The 25th Annual 2011 UCEA Convention theme, “Forecasting the Future of Leadership Preparation and Practice: Reclaiming Ground Through Research, Policy, and Politics,” recognizes that the field of university-based leadership preparation is contested, while the value of leadership preparation is under assault from multiple directions and by multiple stakeholders. Contested areas include what prerequisites are necessary for leadership practice, who should prepare school and district leaders, what they should learn, where they should be prepared, and what additional experiences are essential to developing effective leaders. Also under scrutiny are what results and outcomes (and for whom) can be attributed to leadership preparation, how we measure outcomes, and how these outcomes are used, as well as what counts as successful school and district leadership and how success should be measured.

The 2011 UCEA Convention further recognizes that our roles as scholars and advocates for children, principals, teachers, and communities have never been more important. Consequently, the convention offers an opportunity for scholars and practitioners to consider these and other contested areas in the field of leadership preparation; critically examine past and current research, policies, and practice; identify relevant and successful practice and research; and build on effective research-based policies and best practice to ensure conditions for schools and districts to be successful in creating equitable access, opportunities, and outcomes for all children, regardless of their race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, nationality, immigration status, ability, or religion.

The 2011 UCEA Convention call for proposals encourages submissions that explore broadly the landscape of quality leadership preparation, including our research and engaged scholarship, our preparation program designs and improvement efforts, our policy work, and the practice of educational leaders. Furthermore, the 2011 convention theme challenges the field to deliberate on the future of educational leadership and how current research and policy engagement efforts and practices are preparing leaders and scholars for the demands of a quickly evolving context. Of special interest is research that provides tools that enable the field to take a proactive role in reframing current policy debates and practice to take leadership development as a more holistic dialogue around school improvement and change.

To address the 2011 UCEA Convention theme, “Forecasting the Future of Leadership Preparation and Practice: Reclaiming Ground Through Research, Policy, and Politics,” we invite members of the UCEA community and other educational leaders to (a) share their research related to leadership preparation and practice; (b) propose innovative ways to utilize research that informs leadership preparation, practice, and policy at national, state, local, and international levels; (c) develop ways in which educational leaders can enhance academic excellence, equity, and social justice in P-20 educational contexts; (d) engage in dialogue, planning, and collaborative scholarship to enhance our efforts to create quality leadership preparation; and (e) demonstrate cross-cultural and/or transnational research and preparation strategies that have implications for current practice and the future of leadership preparation. The following topics are provided to stimulate ideas for the 2011 UCEA Convention. We invite other topics that address the convention theme.

A. Leadership Preparation and Program Development: How do leadership preparation programs reflect the characteristics of high-quality leadership preparation? How do leadership preparation programs evaluate their quality, and how is evaluative evidence used for program improvement?
- Recruitment and selection
- Coherent curriculum
- Active, problem-focused learning
- Cohort membership
- Coaching, mentoring, and other supportive structures
- Partnerships with school communities, district, regional, state, and other stakeholders (e.g., organizations, associations, universities)
- Alumni support
- Job-embedded leadership development
- University partnerships with schools, districts, and states

B. Leadership Preparation Research & Evaluation: How effective are current leadership preparation programs at preparing leaders for the schools, district, and states they will lead? How do preparation programs examine and measure their impact and outcomes of leadership preparation and development?
- Program graduate impact on the school organization, leadership, and teacher practices and school and student performance
- Advances in program relevancy to the problems of leadership practice, particularly issues of equity and social justice
- Classroom and program innovation (e.g., teacher leadership)
- Candidate performance assessment
- Community leadership and partnerships
- Faculty development
- P-20 student voice
- School and district change

C. Politics and Policy: What are the politics of leadership preparation and practice? How do institutions of higher education, and other leadership development programs, actively engage with decisionmakers and influence policies that impact leadership preparation and P-20 environments? How does research and evaluation inform how scholars engage with decision and policy makers?
- Financing public and higher education (e.g., state funding, uni-
D. Knowledge Mobilization: How do scholars and their collaborative partners broaden their scope of influence through research?

- Creation of research-based products
- Dissemination efforts
- Research utilization
- Use of technology
- Blogosphere
- Alternate venues and audiences

III. Session Categories

A. 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 electronic copies of papers. The proposal summary should include a statement of purpose, theoretical framework, findings, and conclusions. For research reports, also describe data sources and methods. A discussion leader will be assigned to facilitate dialogue for the session.

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

C. Conversations/Dialogues. These sessions are intended to stimulate informal, lively discussions using a series of provocative questions or vignettes. Session organizers may organize a panel of participants who facilitate and guide the conversation about critical issues, concerns, and perspectives. Alternatively, these sessions may be organized as a dialogue where the organizers and audience discuss an issue or series of questions in small groups. The proposal summary should describe the purpose of the session, the ways in which participants will engage in conversation/dialogue, and examples of questions or areas to be addressed.

D. Poster Session. These sessions are intended for individualized discussions of one's research and/or development projects. Like a paper session, poster session proposal summaries should include a statement of purpose, rationale, findings, and conclusions. For research reports, also describe data sources and methods.

E. Innovative Sessions. Proposals utilizing innovative presentation/interaction strategies are encouraged, such as web-based projects, films, and the use of technology to increase interaction and participation. The proposal summary should describe the focus and purpose of the session, the innovative format, and how the format will enhance adult learning and discussion.

F. International Community-Building Sessions. These sessions, regardless of format (i.e., paper, symposia, conversation, etc.), require participants to be from two or more different countries. The focus of these sessions must be examinations of critical issues from these multiple international perspectives. The proposal summary should describe the purpose of the session, the format participants will employ, and a list of the national contexts that will be represented.

G. Pre- and Postconvention Work Sessions and Workshops. These sessions, which provide both 2- and 4-hour sessions for scholars of similar interest, are encouraged for (a) groups of scholars who are working on projects related to the core mission of UCEA and (b) scholars who wish to present a workshop for faculty members attending the convention. Proposals should describe the purpose of the session, relevant literature, how the time will be used, the role and expertise of facilitators, outcomes for participants, and plans for disseminating information from the session/workshop to UCEA member institutions and the field.

IV. Criteria for Review of Proposals

All proposals will be subject to blind, peer review by two reviewers, which will occur electronically. The proposal must not include names of session organizers or presenters. Primary authors of submitted proposals agree to serve as a proposal reviewer.

Proposals for papers and posters will be evaluated for:

- relevance of research problem/topic to the convention theme and/or broader discourse in the field regarding leadership preparation;
- thoroughness and clarity of the proposal;
- theoretical framework, methods, analysis and presentation of findings (for empirical research); and
- significance.

All other proposals will be evaluated for:

- relevance of research problem/topic to the convention theme and/or broader discourse in the field,
- thoroughness and clarity of the proposal, and
- alignment between proposed format and purpose of the session.

V. Participation Guidelines and Proposal Deadlines

Those engaged in research, policy, or practice in educational or youth-serving agencies may submit proposals for consideration.

Proposals must be received by Monday, May 9, 2011. All proposals must be submitted electronically at the link to be provided at the UCEA homepage (http://www.ucea.org). This site will open April 1, 2011.

Submission length must not exceed 3 single-spaced pages (approximately 2,000 words or 8,000 characters) using 12-point font New Times Roman. References are required and must not exceed 1 single-spaced page (approximately 400 words or 2,200 characters). The lead author of papers is required to upload an advance copy of the paper into the All Academic System through the UCEA Convention site 3 weeks prior to the convention. By submitting a proposal, the lead author of each proposal also agrees to serve as a reviewer. An author's failure to live up to either of these commitments may lead to the paper being removed from the convention program.

VI. Participation Limits

To promote broad participation in the annual convention, an individual may not appear as first author on more than two proposals. In addition, an individual may not appear on the program more than four times in the role of presenter. The participation limit does not include service as chair or discussant or participation in invited sessions or any session connected with UCEA HQ, committees, or publications.
UCEA Call for Convention 2011 Volunteers

If you are interested in serving as a Proposal Reviewer, a Session Chair, or a Session Discussant for the UCEA Convention 2011 in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, please complete the following form and return it to UCEA. The UCEA Convention Planning Committee will use these forms to identify potential reviewers, chairs, and discussants. Only university faculty may serve in the above capacities. Please print legibly. Return this form to UCEA by mailing or fax:

University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA)
The University of Texas
1 University Station-D5400
Austin, TX 78712
Fax: 512-471-5975

Name: __________________________________________________________________________________

Academic Title: ___________________________________________________________________________

Department/Program: ______________________________________________________________________

Institution: _______________________________________________________________________________

Address: _________________________________________________________________________________

City/State/ZIP: ___________________________________________________________________________

E-mail: __________________________________  Telephone: ______________________________________

I am interested in serving as:

___ Proposal Reviewer for UCEA Convention 2011. Please note all proposals for the Convention will be submitted and reviewed electronically.

___ Session Chair for UCEA Convention 2011.

___ Session Discussant for UCEA Convention 2011.

Have you served UCEA in one of the above capacities in previous years? ___yes ___no

Deadline for consideration as a Proposal Reviewer is May 9, 2011.

Deadline for consideration as a Session Chair or Session Discussant is June 13, 2011.
The UCEA and partner the Wallace Foundation are proud to bring you a free webinar series highlighting research and exemplary practice in leadership preparation. The centrality of leadership to impact school improvement has been well documented. As a result, educational reformers have turned their attention to how leaders are prepared. Policy makers, funders, professional associations such as the UCEA, national commissions, higher education faculty members, and other educational experts strive to identify, and attempt to replicate, programs that effectively prepare future leaders who are able to lead school improvement, resulting in enhanced student achievement. In recent years many educational leadership preparation programs have redesigned their content and delivery to be more influential in graduates’ leadership development and subsequent leadership practice focused on school improvement. Specifically, programs have incorporated features thought to be essential to successful leadership practice. Through this webinar series we will share recent research on the features of effective leadership preparation and the experiences of leadership faculty and college of education in implementing and sustaining such features in their programs.

Register now: www.ucea.org/webinar_2010_2011
Contributing to the UCEA Review

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

General Editors:
Michelle D. Young (UCEA)  michelleyoung@austin.utexas.edu
Gerardo Lopez (UCEA)  lopezg@indiana.edu

Feature Editors:
Samantha M Parades Scribner (IUPUI)  smpscrib@iupui.edu
Andrea Rorrer (University of Utah)  andrea.rorrer@ed.utah.edu

Interview Editors:
Lisa Bass (University of Oklahoma)  dr.bass@ou.edu
Mariela Rodriguez (University of Texas at San Antonio)  Mariela.Rodriguez@utsa.edu

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

Innovative Programs Editor:
Liz Hollingsworth (University of Iowa)  liz-Hollingsworth@uiowa.edu

Managing Editor:
Jennifer E. Cook (UCEA)  jennifercook@mail.utexas.edu

2011 Calendar

February 2011  NPBEA meeting, Washington, DC, Feb. 17
AASA National Conference, Denver, CO, Feb. 17–19

March 2011  UCEA convention planning meeting, Pittsburgh, March 2-3
UCEA EC meeting, Pittsburgh, PA, March 3-6
2011 Excellence in Ed. Leadership Award nominations due, March 7

April 2011  David L. Clark Seminar, New Orleans, April 7–8
Jackson Scholars Workshop, New Orleans, April 8
AERA annual meeting, New Orleans, April 8–12
UCEA Joint Reception, April 10

May 2011  UCEA Convention Proposals due, UCEA HQ, May 9
Applications to be convention Proposal Reviewer due, May 9
Jackson Scholars nominations due, May 20
Award nominations due, May 30

June 2011  ISSPP conference, Boston College, June 8-12
Applications to be convention Session Chair/Discussant due, June 13

July 2011  UCEA transition to the University of Virginia, Charlottesville, June 30-July 31

November 2011  2011 UCEA Convention, Pittsburgh, PA, Nov. 17-20