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Good afternoon everyone and welcome again to the 2012 UCEA Convention, “The Future Is Ours: Leadership Matters,” here in Denver, Colorado. Let me begin with my deepest personal gratitude to a number of people—some of whom are here today and others who are not. First, thank you to the UCEA membership for continuing to demonstrate that leadership remains a central focus of our scholarship and, as Gary Crow (2006) noted in his presidential speech, our work. I am deeply indebted to those along the way whose counsel has been immensely impactful to my professional purpose, including Pedro Reyes, Jay D. Scribner, Catherine Lugg, Ben Levin, Malu Gonzales, Gary Crow, Diana Pounder, and Steve Jacobson. To our UCEA Executive Director Michelle Young, for lifting this organization and the field into the 21st century with her tireless and consistent leadership, vision, and efforts, thank you.

Moreover, thank you to the members of the Executive Committee and UCEA staff and associate directors as well as the support of UCEA’s institutional host—the University of Virginia—for engaging deeply in the work of UCEA. I would be remiss if I didn’t acknowledge the support of the tremendous collaborative team that I work with on a day-to-day basis in the Utah Education Policy Center—two of whom, Cori Groth and Irene Yoon, are here today—and the College of Education former Dean Michael Hardman and Interim Dean John McDonnell at the University of Utah for their enormous support. I also appreciate my colleagues in the ELP Department, students, practitioners, and decision makers who make this work real and necessary.

And thanks to this year’s program committee—then President Elect Cindy Reed, Lisa Kensler, Susan Korach, Cozette Grant-Overton—who have worked diligently since last year to ensure that our meeting is an opportunity for us to share, reflect, learn, plan, and act together. Before I begin in earnest, please join me in giving Dr. Cindy Reed, her program committee, UCEA Executive Director Michelle Young, and the UCEA staff a hand for their tremendous work and contributions for us to join together in this collegial environment to share our scholarship, build our relationships, and enhance our field.

My Journey to Here
I realize that my journey to this address today is pebbled with wonderful and, frankly, fortunate experiences. In the beginning of my career, my desire to be an educator was in response largely to the educational experiences of myself and others around me and a desire to make sure that the education wasn’t a by-product of family wealth or culture. Taught from an early age by my...
In the year preceding my first teaching position, Michael Jackson released his “Bad” album—which celebrates its 25th anniversary next week. This album contained the song “Man in the Mirror.” This song lyricized the quote most often attributed to Mahatma Gandhi—“You must be the change you wish to see in the world.” Mahatma Gandhi’s actual quote, which I will return to later, was more enlightening. Gandhi (1913/1958) reportedly said, “We but mirror the world. All the tendencies present in the outer world are to be found in the world of our body. If we could change ourselves, the tendencies in the world would also change. As a man changes his own nature, so does the attitude of the world change towards him. This is the divine mystery supreme. A wonderful thing it is and the source of our happiness. We need not wait to see what others do.”

In the spirit of our happiness, we need not wait to see what others do. Optimistic that I could make a difference and armed with a license, which supposedly meant I was prepared, I ventured into my first teaching position in 1989 followed by my first administrative position in 1995. I am certain that my preparation programs intended for me to be adequately prepared for practice. In retrospect, I am reminded that certainly “I didn’t know what I didn’t know at the time.” Both as a teacher and as a principal, however, I realized that I was not able to have an impact in isolation. So then, like now, I turned my attention to what I could do collectively with groups of committed people. My professional training, particularly at the University of Virginia with Margaret Grogan, Dan Duke, and Deborah Verstegen, and at the University of Texas with Pedro Reyes, Jay Scribner, Victoria Rodriguez, Lonnie Wagstaff, and Joe Johnson, evoked me to discover my professional voice and perhaps more importantly back it up with evidence and my own practice. I have discovered that seeking and maintaining this voice is a daily task.

We are now a week and half into the wake of the U.S. Presidential election in the United States. As you might imagine, preparing to deliver a Presidential Address in the wake of an actual Presidential election year is a risky move. First, there are the expectations. (Though I have served as UCEA president for the past year, the power differentials are stark. Not to mention that I do not have access to a professional cadre of speech writers or Aaron Sorkin.) Second, there was the potential for having to rewrite parts of the speech based on the outcome of the Presidential election. Fortunately, I stand here today able to say that public education will survive—for now—and that raising standards, ensuring that schools have high-quality teachers and leaders, attention to the modest expansion of early childhood education, and postsecondary education accessibility and affordability remain on the political agenda. There is even momentum to the return of the DREAM Act at the federal policy level.1 So, regardless of your political selections at the polls, now seems to be an appropriate time to reflect and ensure that the future of education, and educational leadership particularly, is imprinted by our collective scholarship.

---

1Texas, California, Illinois, Utah, Nebraska, Kansas, New Mexico, New York, Washington, Wisconsin, and Maryland have now passed state-level DREAM Acts.
Where Is Here?

With a history over a half-century long, UCEA has directed attention to the role of educational administration with an emphasis on quality leadership preparation and development as well as scholarship on individuals, organizations, policies, politics, and practices that hinder and support quality leadership preparation and practice. Although numerous individuals and groups of individuals have worked over UCEA’s history—some of whom are known through the legacy of their scholarship, activism, and leadership, and others who have served as tempered radicals (Alston, 2005; Meyerson, 2001; Meyerson & Seully, 1995)—to integrate issues of equity and social justice with our focus on advancing leadership preparation and practice (e.g., Barbara Jackson, Malu Gonzales, Michelle Young, Khaula Murtadha, Michael Dantley, Judy Alston, Alan Shoho, Colleen Capper, Kathleen Brown, Linda Tillman, Gerardo Lopez, Colleen Larson, and many others, some of whom are noted in this address), the organization has for the past 15 years made this an organizational commitment explicitly and overtly. Throughout our history, there have been many successes organizationally, some near misses, and some omissions along the way. So, given our journey to date, how will UCEA (re)define the future of leadership preparation and practice? My discussion with you today will reflect on

• the reasons we have to be optimistic about UCEA and the field’s future,
• the opportunities we have to deliberately influence our future, and
• the obligation we have as a collective to remain engaged in setting, shaping, and shifting the agenda to ensure that quality leadership preparation and practice serves its role in creating equitable educational systems.

This address is an extension of last year’s conference theme, “Forecasting the Future of Leadership Preparation and Practice: Reclaiming Ground Through Research, Policy, and Politics,” which was planned with three incredibly strong, smart, creative, dedicated, and tenacious scholars—Mónica Byrne-Jíménez, Gretchen Generett, and Ann O’Doherty. Thank you again for last year’s convention planning.

Yet, the foundation for this address extends far into the history of UCEA. At my first UCEA, Malu Gonzalez gave the presidential address, Professors of Educational Administration: Learning and Leading for the Success of ALL Children. I was mesmerized by her speech that talked about “borderlanders”; she provoked thought, affirmed experiences, and challenged me. Since that speech, I have recognized that as individuals, we seek our own ways to contribute to our profession and the experiences of those we work with in our training programs and the field. Indeed, individual faculty in leadership preparation departments are making major contributions in their local arenas as well as more broadly with their scholarship on, for instance, the leadership pipeline, success, and retention; leadership preparation program development, curriculum, and evaluation; leadership influence on school curriculum, teacher practice, school conditions, student learning, and related outcomes; leadership roles in community partnerships, networks of practice, and professional learning; and leadership roles in promoting equity, access, and social justice. This impact is both supported by and benefits UCEA. For the purposes of my address today, I focus primarily, however, on the role of UCEA in our field, including how UCEA’s accomplishments and growth reflect and elevate the continued importance that our departments give to the range of leadership preparation and practice inquiries.

Charles Perrow (1978) noted that leadership can serve a role in “welding the members of the organization into a ‘committed polity,’ with a high sense of identity, purpose, and commitment” (p. 187). Yet, leadership also creates opportunities for individuals and their work to impact the field. As I discuss here, UCEA has afforded the “committed polity” to develop. As Paul Bredeson (1995) in his presidential speech compared incidental and intentional communities, he noted that “intentional communities are ones I define as those purposely chosen by individuals because they represent social groups that embody values, beliefs, ideologies, goals, and understandings they share” (p. 14). UCEA is an intentional community of higher education institutions committed to advancing the preparation and practice of educational leaders for the benefit of schools and children. We do this by

• promoting, sponsoring, and disseminating research on the essential problems of schooling and leadership practice;
• improving the preparation and professional development of educational leaders and professors; and
• positively influencing local, state, and national educational policy.

Embracing Optimism for our Future

It is UCEA’s role as an intentional community that offers me optimism about UCEA and our field’s future. Optimism is defined “as a generalized expectancy that good, as opposed to bad, outcomes will generally occur when confronted with problems across important life domains” (Schneider & Carver, 1985).

Over time, our collective sense of purpose has evolved within UCEA. We were bound initially to the tenets of educational administration as defined by organizational science and behavioral science and amid contested ideological, methodological, theoretical, cultural, and political grounds. There remains contested terrain in our field, and the debates continue over the role of educational leadership as “‘skilled craft,’ an ‘applied science,’ and a developing science anchored in sound theory, research, and patterns of behavior” (La-Magdeleine, Maxey, Pounder, & Reed, 2009, p. 131). While we contend with the questions about whose knowledge, experiences, and expertise shall govern the field, UCEA’s organizational commitment to an inclusive view of the advancement of educational leadership preparation and practice has become more solidified.

Importantly, however, UCEA recognizes that inclusivity of thought, as represented in presentations and publications, is not sufficient and instead has sought ways to increase inclusivity, as evident in our actions. This continued evolution and growth reflect part of the history of UCEA. For instance, in his book Building Bridges: UCEA’s First Two Decades, Jack Culbertson (1995) indicated that the focus of the book was on the “dynamics of change” in UCEA rather than the maintenance. He went on to say, “If the book’s dominant focus had been upon the dynamics of organizational maintenance, its story would have differed from the one told on the pages which follow” (p. iii). In fact, it is the continued story of our dynamics of change that I explore. In particular, I am interested in UCEA’s ability to recognize and embrace change. Our adaptability is necessary for our survival and key to our ability to maintain our core purpose of advancing the preparation and practice of educational leaders for the benefit of schools and children. Therefore, it is our persistence with
a purpose that provides reason for my optimism.

And while similar questions such as that posed by past president Alan Shoho (2010), who led us in a discussion of our “rise or demise?” have reverberated through past president speeches, annual conference proceedings, and our scholarship, optimism also has been present. In preparing for this address, I was struck by how much optimism past UCEA presidents and others have communicated, particularly with regard to how much UCEA has served as a catalyst for change. There have been echoes throughout UCEA’s history of calls to build leadership capacity for learning, relationships, cross borders (i.e., epistemological, axiological, ideological, methodological, professional, political, and geographic), expand networks, and fulfill social justice goals as well as the opportunity for these areas to bridge us to our future.

So, given our persistent focus on advancing the preparation and practice of educational leaders, one must ask, given the increasing attacks on, vulnerabilities of, and accountability for university-based preparation, how UCEA remains steadfast on its purpose while continually evolving? After all, as Culbertson (1995) recounted William Odell’s comments from a November 1957 meeting about the organization’s reason for being, “we need more than something which threatens us.” Here, I turn to the third reason I believe we have to be optimistic about both our organization’s persistence and that of our programs as well: our organizational resilience.

As Luthans (2002) explained, “Resiliency is the positive psychological capacity to rebound, to ‘bounce back’ from adversity, uncertainty, conflict, failure or even positive change, progress and increased sensitivity and resilience in demanding quality leadership preparation also serves another purpose. That is, it serves to create stability for other organizations whose interests might lie in simply producing numbers. The increased attention to educational leadership—both the preparation and practice (e.g., Danley & Tillman, 2005; Farkas, Johnson, Duffett, & Foleno, 2001; Hale & Moorman, 2003; Young et al., 2009)—has included an emphasis on quality, productivity, and outcomes. Researchers continue to focus on the links between leadership preparation and leadership practice and between leadership practice and student outcomes. Moreover, the major lines of research have focused on the influence of leaders on teachers and teaching and on the organization of schools, including factors such as teacher job satisfaction, organizational commitment to purpose and change, improved teaching practices, school learning culture, quality content and instruction, and organizational learning practices and the instructional environment (e.g., Ferman, 2012; Khalifa, 2012; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2008; Leithwood & Richl, 2005; Leithwood, Seashore Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004; Levin, 2008; Robinson, 2011; Robinson, Lloyd, & Rowe, 2008; Scanlan & Lopez, 2012). This research to date has been critical to our understanding and development of quality leadership preparation and development. The educational landscape and the subsequent politics are ever changing. Thus, we have opportunities, even obligations, to influence and stay ahead of such changes in innovative and proactive ways.

Our second opportunity is to remain mindful and diligent to create high-quality leadership preparation programs that reflect the features we know make a difference, though we must be sensitive to not have a misguided confidence that this alone will keep threats away. There are a number of reasons that we can and should be attentive to the threats and demands, including reduction in resources, questions about quality and impact. Despite these potential threats, UCEA has not been (nor should it be) in defensive mode. To be prepared for the imminent demands that lie

Maximizing Our Opportunities Ahead

“You drown not by falling into a river, but by staying submerged in it.” - Paulo Coelho

How can our next 50-plus years build on this tradition of the “dynamics of change” and our organizational resilience? It has been my experience and observation that, while UCEA has been resilient, it has not been resistant to change. Thus, it seems we have unique opportunities at this place in our history to nurture and promote our strongest and unique qualities as an organization. In fact, perhaps one of our greatest differentiators and opportunities to deliberately influence in today’s environment of quick fixes is our steady resolve: to ensure quality leadership preparation and practice so that we help develop leaders who can be leaders for renewal, equity, and excellence.

First, with regard to opportunities for our growth and enhancements and further developing our competence, UCEA continues to be proactive in the support of research to date that has demonstrated that quality school leadership depends in part on quality leadership preparation. Moreover, scholars in our field have generated research on the attributes of quality leadership preparation programs (e.g., Darling-Hammond, Meyerson, LaPointe, & Orr, 2007; Jackson & Kelley, 2002; Young, Crow, Murphy, & Ogawa, 2009). These attributes include well-defined leadership-for-learning focus; coherence; challenging and reflective content; student-centered instructional practices; competent faculty; positive student relationships; a cohort structure; supportive organizational structures; and substantive and lengthy internships (Darling-Hammond et al., 2007; Orr & Pounder, 2010; Young et al., 2009). As a result, we have expanded our attention to the pipeline, admission, placement, and development in practice in leadership studies (Hambrick Hitt, Tucker, & Young, 2012).

The increased attention to educational leadership—both the preparation and practice (e.g., Danley & Tillman, 2005; Farkas, Johnson, Duffett, & Foleno, 2001; Hale & Moorman, 2003; Young et al., 2009)—has included an emphasis on quality, productivity, and outcomes. Researchers continue to focus on the links between leadership preparation and leadership practice and between leadership practice and student outcomes. Moreover, the major lines of research have focused on the influence of leaders on teachers and teaching and on the organization of schools, including factors such as teacher job satisfaction, organizational commitment to purpose and change, improved teaching practices, school learning culture, quality content and instruction, and organizational learning practices and the instructional environment (e.g., Ferman, 2012; Khalifa, 2012; Leithwood & Jantzi, 2008; Leithwood & Richl, 2005; Leithwood, Seashore Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004; Levin, 2008; Robinson, 2011; Robinson, Lloyd, & Rowe, 2008; Scanlan & Lopez, 2012). This research to date has been critical to our understanding and development of quality leadership preparation and development. The educational landscape and the subsequent politics are ever changing. Thus, we have opportunities, even obligations, to influence and stay ahead of such changes in innovative and proactive ways.

Our second opportunity is to remain mindful and diligent to create high-quality leadership preparation programs that reflect the features we know make a difference, though we must be sensitive to not have a misguided confidence that this alone will keep threats away. There are a number of reasons that we can and should be attentive to the threats and demands, including reduction in resources, questions about quality and impact. Despite these potential threats, UCEA has not been (nor should it be) in defensive mode. To be prepared for the imminent demands that lie
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ahead, we can engage with each other and learn from those things that were successful and unsuccessful along the way. For instance, how can we and our own departments learn from the progress and struggles of UCEA in addressing issues of equity and diversity, partnerships, and engaging with the policy community? Collectively, we can learn from and with each other and develop effective, equitable, and innovative programs while maintaining and enhancing our institutional or organizational strength and influencing the field.

Third, we have a unique opportunity to leverage the development of tools, our program centers, and our publications for advancing leadership preparation and practice. For example, UCEA has developed a number of useful tools (e.g., our membership criteria, our Institutional and Program Quality Criteria: Guidance for Master’s and Doctoral Programs in Educational Leadership; Developing Evaluation Evidence: A Formative and Summative Evaluation Planner for Educational Leadership Preparation Programs; our preparation modules for Leaders to Support Diverse Learners research, the suite of School Leadership Preparation and Practice Surveys; the Curriculum Mapping Guide). And UCEA has also helped to establish important program centers (e.g., Center for the Advanced Study of Technology Leadership in Education, Center for Educational Leadership and Social Justice, National Center for the Evaluation of Educational Leadership Preparation and Practice Surveys, the Curriculum Mapping Guide). And UCEA has also supported the creation of many influential and practical publications (e.g., Implications series, Research Utilization Briefs, EAQ, Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership, and the Journal on Leadership in Education). We have ample venues to continue developing these kinds of resources that will help build our collective capacity to better prepare future educational leaders.

As you can see, there are numerous opportunities we have as an organization to impact the field and advance leadership preparation and practice. While I have briefly mentioned specific initiatives that we have in place or are developing, I want to return to the idea of our organization’s resilience and resilience capacity. Again, key in the organizational resilience discussions is the need to be both preventative and adaptive. Consideration of UCEA’s place in the field from a resilience perspective is important. After all, while we cannot control (try as we might) the external demands that we face, we can mitigate them in ways that allow us to maintain our focus on advancing leadership preparation and practice by further developing our organization’s resilience. In doing so, we allow UCEA
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to increase its agility and reliability. Moreover, developing our organizational resilience further permits us to deliberately approach our future. Lengnick-Hall and Beck (2005) explained, “Resilience capacity enables firms to move beyond survival and actually prosper in complicated, uncertain, and threatening environments” (p. 753). They added that building resilience capacity requires attention to “information flow, initiative doubleloop learning, and elaborating on our action repertoire” (Lengnick-Hall & Beck, 2005, p. 750).

As Lengnick-Hall and Beck (2005) further explained, there are three components of resilience capacity—cognitive resilience (i.e., constructive sensemaking and strong ideology), behavioral resilience (i.e., complex and varied action inventory and functional habits), and contextual resilience (deep social capital and broad resource network). Let’s consider briefly the ways in which we have opportunities to further cultivate our resilience capacity. These strategies are somewhat evident in UCEA’s strategic goals, objectives, and action items.

UCEA continues to promote resiliency practices by engaging in and engaging with scholars in developing tools to better understand our programs, their quality, and their outcomes. We also have provided a means for improvement in these areas by establishing the attributes for high-quality programs. Of late, we have anchored our work in the integrated purpose of advancing leadership preparation and practice with leadership for equity and social justice. As we continue on this journey, our program centers are growing, our available tools and resources for program development and improvement have expanded, and our partnerships and alliances (e.g., CCSSO, National Policy Board for Educational Administration with the ISSLC and ELCC standards, NCATE, and the Wallace Foundation) have developed as a means to promote our agenda and influence the national agenda for leadership preparation and practice.

Mallack (1998), in his article, “Putting Organizational Resilience to Work,” indicated that there are seven strategies for how to use organizational resilience to enhance our organizational work (see Table). Taken together with the tenets of organizational resilience capacity building, these strategies provide further opportunities for us to refine our initiatives and efforts to create the future of educational leadership preparation and practice. To meet the opportunities that are ahead, UCEA has to continue to evaluate how the demands and problems that we face are shared, similar and different, and consistent with (or not) our mission. Then, based on this analysis, we must evaluate our potential responses in both a short-term and long-term manner to shift the agenda for our field. Whether the demands placed on us are internal or external, we have an obligation to engage and act. I now turn my attention to this obligation.

Meeting our Obligation While Moving Forward

With regard to our discussion of our obligation, I am drawn the relevance of Sweet’s (1997) scholarship on the new sciences and the description of our ability to “co-influence and co-create behavior and events.” Sweet indicated, “This nonlinear view dispels the attribution of unidirectional impact of environment on organization or organization on environment inherent in the notion of linear causality” (p. 331). Thus, while society has had an impact on schools, teaching, and leadership, this relationship is not, as Sweet noted, unidirectional. As such, we must consider the ways in which leaders of schools, leadership preparation programs, and scholars whose work addresses issues central to leadership preparation and practice may influence the future. In this respect, we have much to leave us optimistic. Moreover, we also have the obligation to stand up to forces that attempt to tell us that “what is-is what must be” (Kochan, 2004) and attempt to revoke or extinguish our place in the leadership preparation and practice domain.

Let me briefly tell you a quick story with regard to the importance of our scholarship and work with each other, practitioners, and policy/decision makers. During a discussion on campus last year about earthquake preparedness, which is relatively important given that we are on a fault line, a few colleagues in a university-wide meeting expressed concern about an earthquake drill’s disruption to their daily routine. A colleague in military science addressed the concerns by relaying a military saying: “You hope that folks will rise to the occasion, but in the end you can expect them to drop to their level of training.” Though I am fascinated—and frankly a little scared—by the thought of a major earthquake in Salt Lake,

Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mallack’s (1998) Strategies for Using Organizational Resilience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principle</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceive experiences constructively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perform positive adaptive behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure adequate external resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand decision-making boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice bricolage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop tolerance for uncertainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build virtual role systems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

this raised the question about what we do in our work—individually and collectively—to prepare and support educational leaders and advance leadership preparation and practice. In response to this question and review of UCEA’s work, I have the following obligations for us to consider.

First, although Culbertson (1995) indicated that UCEA during its first two decades had considered the issues of “confronting human inequities” central to its work, our organizational history has demonstrated how we have struggled and made progress to authentically integrate this commitment into its mission and work around leadership preparation and practice. UCEA as an organization has selected to pursue these goals in tandem. In our programs and in our organization, the deliberate attention to issues of diversity, equity, and social justice have come as an affirmation for the lived experiences of many, the consternation of some others, and an opportunity for still others to understand. However, our point in deliberately integrating issues of diversity, equity, and social justice in our programs is not just about understanding, it’s about action and transformation both in our field and in the lives of children. Recently, Michael Dantley (2012) reiterated the question, “How will we move deliberately to a pluralistic agenda?” (p. 9).

Pedro Reyes (1994) in his presidential address and many others have consistently brought this question to the forefront. Pedro referred to this as reaching a “social ethic” and one that reflects a “social obligation.”

And so, I return to why it is our obligation to really know, understand, and be able to advance leadership preparation and moreover integrate leadership preparation and practice with leadership for social justice. Because, without concerted attention to the knowledge, skills, and our fundamental beliefs about children, adults, communities, and social justice, our schools will continue to be bastions of inequity in access and opportunity for all. With concerted attention and action, however, we can influence the context, environment, and world that schools are situated in.

In this obligation, it will be imperative for educational scholars and leaders to transcend the boundaries of traditional educational leadership labels and categories (see Kochan, 2004). We can, then, exercise a social justice frame of leadership in our efforts to scale action from an individual level to an organizational level while also addressing imperative roles around curriculum, instructional improvement, teaching and learning, and outcomes (see, for example, Brown, 2004; Capper, 1993; Dantley, 2002; Dillard, 1995; Foster, 1989; Gooden, 2012; Marshall, 1995; Parker & Shapiro, 1993; Skrla & Scheurich, 2001; Strachan, 1999; Young & Laible, 2000).

As explored in this address, UCEA continues to advance educational leadership, focus and unify attention and beliefs, and cultivate collective responsibility in order to transform educational leadership and disrupt inequity. And so, I believe our second obligation rests in, as Greenfield and Ribbin (1993) asserted, both individual and collective agency, particularly our collective consciousness. Specifically, these scholars concluded, “To understand organizations requires that we understand how intention becomes action and how one person’s intention and action triggers intention and action in others” (p. 104).

Collective consciousness, according to organizational researcher Gustavason (2001), “can be defined in terms of a mental unity between people, either by content, by being, or both” (p. 359). This affirms the existence of “a false dichotomy between organization and individual” (Greenfield & Ribbin, 1993, p. 104), where instead “organizations and individuals are inextricably intertwined” (p. 1). Again, Pedro Reyes (1994) called attention to our “fundamental interdependence that exists among us” (p. 1) as a means to progress as a field. As you know, UCEA continues to seek ways to bring scholars, departments, and partners together and thus serves as a powerful catalyst for affirming and leveraging our interdependence and interrelatedness. In turn, this interrelatedness and interdependence among us can contribute to the development of a collective consciousness (Gustavason, 2001).

Certainly, studies about collective consciousness have been most prevalent in the political science and sociological arena (Miller, Gurin, Gurin, & Malanchuk, 1981), particularly in studies that focus on the influence of race and class (Bloom & Erlandson, 2003; Leggett, 1963). Again, scholars whose work contributes to the construction of collective consciousness do not disregard the fact that collectives are comprised of individuals. However, the consideration for individuals in these cases is how their existence and action shape how the collective will function, similar to Sweet’s (1997) view of the role of organizations. As Morgeson and Hoffman (1999) reported, “It is the individuals who determine the collective construct and, through their actions, influence the behavior of others in the collective” (p. 253). The collective construct facilitates an inquiry into how the collective is capable of acting in ways that result in a sum that is larger than the individual parts simply added together (Bandura, 2000).

However, creating a common understanding and collective work does not occur organically. Instead, when it occurs, it is intentional. Gustavason (2001) further explained: This intentionality requires that “the specific content in the consciousness of two or more persons has to be somehow negotiated to mean the same thing to all persons, or at least develop a similar inter-subjective understanding” (p. 359). Getting to know itself is a primary feature of the organization that is raising collective consciousness. Here, even our similar intersubjective understanding must continue to be developed, refined, and renegotiated between and among us. However, our engagement in reflective practices, stories, and self-study at the organizational and program level are among our strategies to attain a collective consciousness about how to move forward and in what direction (Gustavason, 2001; Weick & Roberts, 1993).

And herein lies one of our obligations. How do we organizationally and in our practice create spaces consistent with the tenets of quality leadership preparation and devoid of the reproduction of race, class, gender, sexuality, citizenship, language, and ability struggles?

Next, we have an obligation, as Past Presidents Malu Gonzales, Steve Jacobson, and others for instance have reminded us, to seek relationships and understanding while reaching beyond ourselves. We must recognize our privilege to do the work that we do from the positions we have and use this to work alongside practitioners and community leaders for change. In his 2009 presidential address, Jim Koshoreck (2010) explained this obligation as we venture forth in our work:

Becoming an effective activist, then, involves no small amount of humility. We need to listen rather than speak. We need to bring the activist projects the fullness of our skills as analysis and share our resources with folks who are working to bring about social change. We need to get messy in our interrogations of the dichotomy between thinking and doing. And we need to stop talking only to ourselves and start building relationships with other activists. (p. 4)
Given the increasing demands and high-stakes environment that educational leadership faculty, practitioners, and university-based preparation programs face, we have to ensure that the tenets of quality leadership preparation survive. Thus, here lies another obligation—to increase the utility of our work. Our outlook on this obligation is indeed optimistic, as Levin (2011) concluded from the work on knowledge mobilization:

There are strong grounds for optimism about the potential role of research in policy and practice in education. The increasing effort and growing research capacity and understanding offer much promise for yielding improvements in education in ways that benefit students and are satisfying to professional educators. (p. 24)

As scholars in the field, we are accustomed to the notion that research and evidence are necessary. But it is not sufficient in shifting the agenda. Knowledge mobilization and research utilization have long been a focus in UCEA. How we go about this work, however, has changed (and continues to change). While our production of scholarship in traditional forms that are most often rewarded by retention, promotion, and tenure committees must continue to receive attention, our efforts to disseminate and mobilize our findings are equally, if not more, important (Cooper, Levin, & Campbell, 2009; Levin, 2011; Young & Rorrer, 2012). Arguably, UCEA, as an intermediary (Young & Rorrer, 2012), can serve a unique role as we move forward. Importantly, this means that efforts such as the UCEA Review, UCEA’s Research Utilization Briefs, Interview Series, and Implications publication are among those ways that UCEA bridges the work of scholars in our field to a broader audience. Cooper et al. (2009) noted, “Most people, including professionals, get their knowledge of research not from reading the original studies, but through various mediating process” (p. 162). We, individually and collectively, are positioned to have an impact on decision makers in multiple arenas (e.g., local, state, national, and international). Despite the challenges to doing so, we are obligated to ensure that our scholarship reaches beyond the publications, publicly available websites, and conference proceedings we engage. In doing so, we not only will further our resilience capacity, we also will situate our scholarship and work together to “co-influence” the field as well as society.

Finally, for us to fulfill any of our obligations, we must all participate. Whether that participation is to “think globally and act locally” or to “think and act globally and locally,” the key is we must engage. As noted earlier, this can occur through our own acceptance of our social obligation and our embracing both our individual and collective responsibility. Again, UCEA’s history—both the commonly recounted version and the other stories behind the story (Lopez, 2003)—is filled with individuals who engaged in the leadership, governance, initiatives, and efforts of UCEA. Thus, another way of fulfilling our obligation to the future of UCEA and the field is to add your name, time, and scholarship to our endeavor.

Conclusion

“Life is a series of collisions with the future; it is not the sum of what we have been, but what we yearn to be.” – Jose Ortega y Gasset

UCEA has remained persistent in its purpose. In doing so, it is arguably among the most dependable professional organizations promoting quality leadership preparation and practice. I understand that this statement can (and will be) contested. However, UCEA’s consistency of mission, alignment of organizational actions, integration of scholarship and practice, and development of networks and resources aimed at impacting our departments, our scholarship, and the field have influenced who we are and what we do. Over time, with strong leadership, followed by a succession of efforts to refine the mission, address membership criteria, and change attitudes and actions, UCEA has helped others see leadership preparation and practice as an important domain in education.

For each of us, being part of UCEA has its own unique story. For some, this story is filled with acceptance of self and scholarship. And for others, this story is filled with experiences of one’s own research being marginalized or dismissed while more mainstream, traditional research takes center stage. Over time, UCEA has become more inclusive for many. In part, this is attributed to a number of structural changes (e.g., programs, policies). However, in large part, it is the underlying assumption that although we have as an organization made progress, we still have much of our professional journey ahead of us. What will this journey look like remains to be determined by those of us here, our colleagues, our students, practitioners, and policy makers. While we have grown professionally in our organization, there are cues about how we could, and possibly should, make progress in the coming years. In this address I propose a symbiotic view of the optimism, opportunities, and obligations we have as a field to ensure that our future is secure (see Figure).

![Hope for UCEA's Future](image)

Of late, I have been considering “hope theory” as means to enact the symbiotic nature of this optimism, opportunities, and obligations. Snyder, Irving, and Anderson (1991) explained that hope actually has two defining attributes in positive psychology. As Snyder et al. explained, hope is “a positive motivational state that is based on an interactively derived sense of successful (a) agency (goal-directed energy), and (b) pathways (plans to meet goals)” (p. 287). According to Snyder (2002), “These pathways and agency are

---

2As Steve Jacobson (2009) in his speech referenced Townsend’s note to the Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration and Management, perhaps we should consider it “thinking and acting both locally and globally” (p. 2).
iterative as well as additive over a given goal pursuit sequence” (p. 252). UCEA has helped guide us to the goals for advancing leadership preparation and practice. Moreover, UCEA and its members have codified the pathways for these goals to be attained, including enhancing the skills, expertise, and beliefs of those who will lead and the policies that affect teaching and learning for all children.

I am here now to share with you that in fact, as it turns out, “hope is a strategy.” And though the future of UCEA and our field will require assuredly bold and decisive moves, our organization’s ability to thrive and influence the field will be dependent on our consistent, unwavering commitments to quality leadership preparation and practice reflective of our commitments to eliminating struggles around race, class, gender, sexuality, citizenship, language, and ability and our ability to act on these commitments. In pursuing this effort, I am reminded of Bandura’s (1986) assessment of people working towards social change:

Many people devote their lives to social and political activism by their unwavering conviction that by collective effort they will eventually bring about fundamental changes in society. While such convictions often go unrealized, they sustain reform efforts that achieve lesser but nonetheless important social changes. In the effort for social change, success is better measured by gains than by victories. (p. 226)

So, I leave you, hopeful about what lies ahead, with these thoughts regarding our future in UCEA and our field:

• When others suggest the demise of our field, stand for our conviction in the need to advance quality leadership preparation and practice individually and collectively.
• When others point to the inconsequential nature of our work, stand and be prepared to demonstrate its worth and relevance.
• When others seek to eliminate access and opportunity in schools, stand together in opposition and with resilience and hope.
• When given the choice between critique and action, stand up, engage, and transform the direction.
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Engaging the UCEA Presidential Address

Over the course of UCEA’s history, the UCEA Presidential Address has become a key fixture within the Winter issue of the UCEA Review. It is considered an important resource by many scholars of educational leadership because of its focus on the state of the UCEA consortium or on issues or problems of educational administration and leadership as they relate to UCEA. The address in the past was delivered to the UCEA Plenary Session members during their annual governance meeting. In 2001, however, the UCEA Executive Committee sought to increase the visibility of these historically and institutionally significant addresses and, for the first time, opened the Presidential Address to the entire UCEA Convention.

Last year, UCEA developed another new practice of asking a group of UCEA Executive Committee members and UCEA past presidents to offer responses to the Presidential Address. Within the next few pages you will find responses from Past President Stephen Jacobson and Executive Director Michelle Young. We hope the ideas and issues provoked by the Presidential Address and the two responses serve as a springboard for thoughtful reflection and meaningful conversation among the UCEA membership and colleagues in the broader field.

Hope as a Strategy: Seconding Andrea Rorrer’s 2012 UCEA Presidential Address

Stephen Jacobson
University at Buffalo

I’m one of those folks addicted to watching the ongoing soap opera that we call American politics, and my drug of choice is MSNBC, which tips my hand as to my political persuasion (although I admit to occasionally sampling the alternative universe of Fox News to get a view from inside that “bubble”). The reason I mention this is that within days of the reelection of President Obama I heard two commentaries that I felt were especially enlightening as we collectively address our nation’s future. The first was by Rachel Maddow, who ran through a litany of things that were NOT going to happen as a result of the election:

- We are not going to overturn Roe v. Wade.
- We are not going to repeal health reform.
- We are not going to amend the Constitution to stop gay people from getting married.
- We are not eliminating the Department of Energy, the Department of Education, or Housing.
- We are not scaling back on student loans.
- We are not vetoing the DREAM Act.
- We are not letting Detroit go bankrupt.

She ended by saying that we had the choice to do those things, but we said NO!

I loved that commentary. It was simple, clear and reaffirming, because it enumerated so many awful things that might have happened so many of us not voted as we did. I had a similar response to Andrea Rorrer’s 2012 UCEA Presidential Address, which came just a week later. For me, her argument that the confluence of optimism, opportunity, and obligation, a strategy of hope, represents the most proactive and positive approach for addressing the future of UCEA and our chosen field rings true. Her address makes the point quite clearly that we have to continue to seize opportunities to influence and shape our collective future, and, for the sake of our nation’s children, we are obligated to remain committed to ensuring high-quality preparation for school leaders and helping these leaders create more equitable school systems. She rightly notes that UCEA has a long history of serving as a catalyst for change and that its “persistence with a purpose provides reason for optimism.”

I second Andrea’s observation about, and strategies for, UCEA’s role and responsibility as a leader in educational innovation and as a standard bearer for quality preparation, especially in light of the intense competitive pressures caused by those institutions, “whose interests might lie in simply producing numbers of graduates or increasing profits rather than developing high-quality leaders.”

There is probably not a single UCEA institution that doesn’t have to compete with a “cash cow” certification mill somewhere in its neighborhood. Programs staffed almost entirely by retired administrators armed with war stories and bags of tricks. Programs for whom the criterion for candidate selection is essentially, “Any body is better than No body.” One of my colleagues at University at Buffalo recently told me about a conversation he had with a faculty member at one such nearby program who was surprised to learn that at University at Buffalo we actually reject candidates for admission and occasional fail students who are in the program.

Having served on the UCEA Executive Committee for many years, I can attest to how seriously we consider institutions seeking UCEA membership. We have been diligent in determining whether these preparation programs reflect the features we know make a difference, and if they don’t, we help them develop those features if they really want to become members.

No less important than membership criteria are the collective efforts undertaken by UCEA to improve practice across the board, especially in service to the creation of equitable and just school systems. Andrea notes several ongoing UCEA initiatives such as the Program Centers, Research Utilization Briefs, Interview Series, and Implications publication, but the one I’d like to stress as symbolic of a strategy of hope is the development of the modules for Leaders to Support Diverse Learners (LSDL) research.

Teams of colleagues at UCEA institutions across the nation have done a fantastic job of creating six modules, each containing a series of powerful learning experiences, intended to develop school leaders’ ability to address and improve students’ achievement at low-performing schools. These modules represent some of the most practical and insightful curricular material for leadership preparation I’ve seen in some time, and they’re yours to use for free! I strongly encourage you to visit the LSDL link for more details:

www.ucea.org/lsdl-preparation-modules-new/

The LSDL modules are an exemplar of UCEA’s efforts to bring scholars, departments, and partners together to enhance our collective consciousness. And, as Rorrer notes, it can serve as a powerful catalyst for affirming and leveraging our interdependence and interrelatedness and thus bridging our scholarly work
to a broader audience in our field.

I began my doctoral studies in educational administration in 1982, and the very next year A Nation at Risk was released. So for my entire academic career, public education has been under attack for one reason or another. It seems that every year, I hear educators worry aloud that “the sky is falling,” as they long nostalgically for the “good old days.” I have come to realize that these ARE the good old days; it’s just that many of us need a few more years before we realize it.

Andrea’s Presidential Address suggests that she gets it NOW. Her clear call that it is our obligation to seek opportunities that build relationships and understanding, reaching beyond ourselves in order to increase the utility of our work is a cause for optimism and hope. And to this we should say YES!

Response to the 2012 UCEA Presidential Address

Michelle D. Young
UCEA Executive Director

I enjoy history lessons, particularly when they involve organizations, communities, people, or movements to which I am somehow connected. For me, the new information strengthens the bond. This is part of the reason why I look forward to the annual UCEA Presidential Address. Since joining UCEA as executive director in 2000, I have had the distinct pleasure of working with 14 UCEA presidents:

• Mary Erina Driscoll,
• Maria Luisa Gonzalez,
• Gail Furman,
• Fran Kochan,
• Margaret Grogan,
• Gary Crow,
• Michael Dantley,
• Fenwick English,
• Steve Jacobson,
• James Koschoreck,
• Alan Shoho,
• Autumn Tooms,
• Andrea Rorrer, and
• Cindy Reed.

Each of these presidents, and others whom I have had the opportunity to hear give their address, focused their remarks on some aspect of UCEA’s work, history, or context. In doing so, they have provided me with new information and unique perspectives that have expanded my understanding of UCEA, its work, and what it means to different people. Andrea Rorrer’s 2012 Presidential Address was no exception.

Because organizations like UCEA have meaning beyond their mission (e.g., a place to share research, a network of scholars, a group of high-quality institutions), it can be very helpful to reflect on the organization’s mission from time to time. This shifts the focus from utility and surface-level descriptions to the taproots of the organization: Why is it here? What purposes does it serve? What mission drives its work? Rorrer’s address answered these questions, leading the audience to the organization’s core mission: the improvement of professional preparation of administrative personnel in the field of education. This mission has steadfastly anchored the organization over its 60-year history, providing support and focus to UCEA member organizations committed to the improvement of educational leadership preparation, practice, research, and policy.

The achievements charted by Rorrer’s address are impressive. They chart the efforts of many scholars over many years, building on past efforts in some cases and forging new waters in others. For those who haven’t had the opportunity to read a chapter or two of Jack Culbertson’s (1995) book, Building Bridges, I highly recommend it. There is much to learn and admire about UCEA’s first 20 years. The Monroe City Simulation project and Case Study Series are particularly impressive contributions to the preparation of leaders in education. During the decade following, the Knowledge Base project brought together scholars in an effort to think deeply about the intellectual roots and empirically base of research upon which preparation, practice, and policy might be anchored. This project spurred further research, critique, and dialogue around the fundamental ideas informing educational leadership. More recent achievements are the key focus of Rorrer’s address, including research on preparation, development and research initiatives around preparation program evaluation, curriculum-development initiatives focused on leaders of diverse learners, and the dissemination and utilization of research and research-based resources.

UCEA has, without question, consistently contributed to the improvement of leader preparation and practice.

Just as one can argue that UCEA members have much to be proud of, however, one could also argue that we have much to do. Quality leadership matters. We know this. Our current and former students practice this. Our community of scholars has researched this, and we as an educational leadership community have a strong body of knowledge documenting this empirically. Yet, we continue to experience broad disparities in schools. Indeed, not all children are equally benefiting from quality leadership.

The reasons why students inequitably benefit from quality leadership are complicated. There are individual, institutional, governmental, societal, economic, and civilization factors at play. Countless research projects, journal articles, and conversations have identified and interrogated the factors involved. Countless hours and resources have been dedicated to understanding and overcoming this situation. Just as the factors contributing to this condition are complex, it is likely that any strategies we undertake in addressing this situation will be complex as well.

In 2002, George Petersen, Paula Short, and I wrote a piece for EAQ on the complexity of substantive reform. In closing, I’d like to reiterate one critical point we made in that article that continues to be relevant. Part of our field’s failure to gain traction on significant problems of practice, we argued, was the lack of collaboration. No single educational stakeholder group can solve the problems we face in our field alone. No single policy mechanism, no single dedication of resources, no single strategy will change the balance of equity in schools. The conditions leaders, teachers, and communities face will require the commitment and collaboration of multiple stakeholder groups.

Given our current climate, these efforts are truly important. Furthermore, it is our collective responsibility. No
other collective of professionals knows more about school leadership training than we do, and no other group, in our perception, cares as much about the development and delivery of quality school leadership preparation for the benefit of all children. At this juncture, then, we need to move beyond individual and group interests to consider issues in which we are mutually invested, and we must create and implement an organized and collective agenda for the improvement of educational leadership preparation. (Young, Petersen & Short, 2002, p. 171)

Honoring the Memory of Barbara L. Jackson

On Friday, November 16, 2012, UCEA Celebrated the life and mourned the loss of a great leader, mentor, humanitarian, scholar, and friend: Dr. Barbara L. Jackson.

Dr. Jackson, who passed away November 15, 2012, contributed dedicated service to the field of educational administration for over 50 years. She served the field in a broad spectrum of roles including teacher, professor, scholar, center director, executive committee member, department chair, associate dean, and dean. She was considered by many to be a trailblazer who opened up avenues of research and practice that have made a significant impact on the lives of others, on the operations and structures of institutions and organizations, and on the field of educational administration. She contributed to the knowledge base on leadership, diversity, and urban education not only through scholarly publications but also by engaging in applied research activities. The scope of her contributions is extraordinary.

Dr. Jackson was a leader. While serving as dean of Morgan State University, Dr. Jackson initiated its first doctoral program in educational administration. She later served as director of a new doctoral program in educational administration at Atlanta University. Her initiatives at these two historically Black institutions were indicative of the type of career she carved out for herself—a career marked with proactive endeavors to open up opportunities for others, particularly people of color and women, and to make the field of educational administration responsive to the needs of society. Furthermore, her capabilities, dedication, and contributions made her widely sought after for her wisdom and leadership. She served on multiple boards, including the Board of Trustees of Hampton University, Virginia; the Institute for Responsive Education’s board; the Board of Directors of the New York City Parent Resource Center; the Boys Choir of Harlem Academy; and the Board of Trustees of Wellesley College. She also served on the Board of Directors for UCEA.

Dr. Jackson was a builder. In addition to the doctoral programs she developed and enhanced, she served as director of evaluation for the National Urban League. Dr. Jackson developed evaluation plans for street academies, where she was instrumental in implementing the Boston Model City Program, discovering and teaching her colleagues how to create a community within a city and how to build connections between and among the home, school, and community. Within this context she developed, implemented, and researched programs for single mothers, established avenues for dealing with issues of race, power, and shared governance within schools and communities; and established a knowledge base on how to create changes in power structures in schools by empowering parents and community members.

Dr. Jackson was a mentor. In addition, she consistently reached out to other young researchers to help them build their careers and mentored them and guided them in their paths. In recognition of her work in this area UCEA named the Barbara L. Jackson Scholars Program, a program focused on developing and mentoring scholars of color into the educational leadership professoriate, in her honor.

Clearly, Barbara L. Jackson established herself as a national leader in the field of educational administration, making our field more responsive to the needs of children, adults, institutions, and communities. UCEA and the educational leadership field are fortunate to have had such a gifted leader grace our community. She will be dearly missed.

Sincerely,

The UCEA Community
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Commencement Address to Stanford University
School of Education, June 17, 2012
Edwin M. Bridges

It is an honor and a privilege to be your commencement speaker. After accepting the invitation from Dean Steele, I consulted my oldest and one of my dearest friends. Since he had served as the president of four Canadian universities and the Chairman of the Board for a fifth university, I knew that he had listened to many commencement speeches and delivered a few as well. Over a Guinness one afternoon, I said, “George, what advice could you give me?” He paused, leaned over, and spoke softly and slowly. Here is what he said: “A commencement speaker is like a body at an Irish wake; the organizers need you for the party and don’t expect you to say much.”

I intend to follow my friend’s advice and talk briefly about how my life was changed following a taxi cab ride I took more than 40 years ago. However, before recounting this story, let me preface my remarks with a few details that don’t appear in my bio or curriculum vitae. They provide a context for the important lesson I learned during my taxi cab ride.

Elliott Eisner speaks of career planning as an oxymoron. Others refer to professional careers as a happenstance or just plain luck. They are right as far as I am concerned. To these cogent observations, I would add the words spoken nearly four decades ago by one of my three sons, then 6. At the dinner table one evening, my son said, “Dad, when I grow up, I want to be a baseball player. What do you want to be when you grow down?” How prophetic that question was. Since retiring, my height has shrunk 2 inches, and I am still trying to figure out what I want to do next.

My professional career certainly had a life of its own. As a 16-year-old, I walked across the stage at Hannibal High School in Hannibal, Missouri, to receive my high school diploma. Having received first place in the state for a news story I had written for the school newspaper, which I edited, I planned to enter the School of Journalism at the University of Missouri and become a reporter. To offset my expenses, I worked one summer in a shoe factory and another summer as a Gandy Dancer, an occupation immortalized in a song titled, “The Gandy Dancers Ball.” Believe me, it was no ball. During the day we laid railroad tracks in the hot Missouri sun, drove spikes, shoveled gravel, and set railroad ties. At night we slept in box cars on a railroad siding. The closest I came to journalism school was to marry one of its graduates, Marjorie Anne Pollock, who became the reporter in the family. Next month we celebrate our 58th wedding anniversary and a wonderful life together.

Now let me turn briefly to that fateful taxi cab ride and the lesson I learned that had a profound effect on my life. The lesson I learned concerns choices.

Every choice involves a sacrifice, for oneself and for others. That statement is hardly profound; however, its consequences are. Often, we are so blinded by our wants and desires that we ignore the sacrifices inherent in the choices we make. My work in the shoe factory and later as a Gandy Dancer led me to appreciate that everyone, regardless of their station in life, has wisdom to share if you bother to listen. Many years ago I flagged a cab in Chicago and began a conversation with the cabby. Here is what he said that influenced my life:

“I wanted a nice home for my family in the city, a summer home on Lake Michigan, and a car for my wife and each of my two children. To afford these, I needed to work two full-time jobs. We had the nice home, the summer home on Lake Michigan and cars for everyone in the family. My wife divorced me, and my children would have nothing to do with me. By working two jobs, I got what I wanted, but I lost what I had. What I had was more important to me than what I wanted.”

This cabby, fine man that he was, was so blinded by his desires that he failed to consider the sacrifices for his family and for himself. Sadly in my experience, this is an all too common mistake.

Equally sad, if I had been riding with the same cabby today, I probably would not have learned this valuable lesson. Instead of listening to him, I would have been talking on my cell phone, surfing the Internet with my smart phone, texting, or tweeting.

In light of this cabby’s story, let me ask each of you in the audience and on stage two questions:
1. What are the three or four most important things in your life?
2. What sacrifices are you unwilling to make no matter what the choice or opportunity is?

These are tougher questions to answer than you might think and even more difficult to act upon. I know from my own experience.

Not too long after the cabby told me his story, I created a mental list of the things in life that meant the most to me. This list exerted a major influence over my choices for the rest of my professional career:
1. my family;
2. my students, including teaching and advising; and
3. my research and writing on practical problems, no matter how controversial they were or whether they were valued by members of the academy.

With the benefit of hindsight, I should have added a fourth—my own personal health. With all due respect for my former deans, annual reports and faculty meetings did not make my list.

Thanks to that cabby, I can enter the checkout line when my time comes with few regrets. I am not estranged from my four children. My wife and I like, as well as love, each other. I have students who continue to care about me as I continue to care about them. I have several really close friends, the kind who feel comfortable sharing their innermost thoughts and feelings with each other. Strangely, the more I paid attention to the sacrifices and set aside my desire for professional recognition, the more recognition I received.

At every Irish wake, it is customary to offer a toast to the body. Instead, let me offer a toast to this year’s graduates. May you experience success, enjoy your journey, and end your life with few regrets because you did not let your desires blind you to the important sacrifices inherent in your choices.
Educational programs for aspiring and sitting educational leaders come in all shapes and sizes. They vary in length from an hour to several years. The formats include formal classes, workshops, seminars, internships, retreats. Leadership development programs are offered by districts, consultants, businesses, and universities. More often than not, they are designed and offered for a specific purpose (e.g., to assist leaders in responding to specific problems of practice, to prepare leaders for a position or a work opportunity). An example from higher education would be the Special Education Administration program offered by the University of Texas at Austin. The program was designed to provide district-level special education directors and their staff members with the requisite skills and knowledge to provide leadership and expertise for the district’s special education programs. According to Schulman (2010), such a program represents a professional approach to education: “Doctoral education is thought to be all about theoretical and conceptual learning to enhance scholarship and understanding. In contrast, professional education is all about preparing people to practice in fields that serve society in important areas” (p. B9).

Clearly, different scholars have different beliefs about the purpose of doctoral level education, even within the specific field of educational leadership. Indeed, the debates on this topic within the UCEA Review over the last decade have delineated significantly different perspectives on the purpose, content, learning experiences, etc. of the doctorate in educational leadership, particularly the EdD. The current issue is one example.

Since the early 2000s, UCEA faculty have engaged with the Carnegie Foundation sponsored initiative, the Carnegie Project on Educational Leadership (CPED), to rethink the EdD in educational leadership (see Shulman, 2004). The key issue driving the conversation within UCEA circles has been the fit between programming and program purpose.

Table 1
A Side-by-Side Comparison of the EdD and the PhD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>EdD</th>
<th>PhD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary career intention</td>
<td>Administrative leadership in educational institutions or related organizations (e.g., superintendent, assistant superintendent, staff developer, curriculum director)</td>
<td>Scholarly practice, research, and/or teaching at university, college, institute, or educational agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree objective</td>
<td>Prepare professional leaders competent in identifying and solving complex problems in education. Emphasis is on developing thoughtful and reflective practitioners.</td>
<td>Prepare professional researchers, scholars, or scholar practitioners. Develop competence in conducting scholarship and research that focuses on acquiring new knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge base</td>
<td>Develops and applies knowledge for practice. Research-based content themes and theory are integrated with practice with emphasis on application of knowledge base.</td>
<td>Fosters theoretical and conceptual knowledge. Content is investigative in nature with an emphasis on understanding the relationships to leadership practice and policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship</td>
<td>A field internship or experience appropriate for intended professional career. Students demonstrate proficiency in program evaluation as part of the experience.</td>
<td>Practical experiences required in both college teaching and research. Expectations that students will present at a professional conference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive knowledge assessment</td>
<td>Written and oral assessments are used (e.g., comprehensive exams). Knowledge and practice portfolios provide evidence of ability to improve practice based on theory and research as well as demonstration of competencies.</td>
<td>Written and oral assessments are used to evaluate an understanding of the theoretical and conceptual knowledge in the field, as well as its relevance to practice and to evaluate competence in conducting research to acquire new knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research methods</td>
<td>Develops an overview and understanding of research including data collection skills for action research, program measurement, and program evaluation. Could include work in management statistics and analysis.</td>
<td>Courses are comparable to doctoral courses in related disciplines. Courses develop an understanding of inquiry and of qualitative and quantitative research. Developing competencies in research design, analysis, synthesis, and writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capstone/dissertation/treatise</td>
<td>Well-designed applied research of value for informing educational practice. Reflects theory or knowledge for addressing decision-oriented problems in applied settings.</td>
<td>Original dissertation research illustrating a mastery of competing theories with the clear goal of informing disciplinary knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capstone/dissertation/treatise committee</td>
<td>Committee, including at least one practicing professional in an area of relevance to candidate’s program and possibly faculty from other institutions, evaluate candidate’s applied research.</td>
<td>Composed primarily of active researchers in areas relevant to students’ areas of interest. Should include at least one faculty member from a related discipline or from another institution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What should an individual expect to gain from attaining graduate education in educational leadership? What should we expect to find in such degree programs? Who should be teaching in these programs? What knowledge base should they draw upon? What kinds of research methods should be emphasized? What practical experiences should be built into these programs, and what should the capstone experience involve? (Young, 2006, p. 6)

Table 2

Fictitious Program Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example: The EdD in Educational Leadership</th>
<th>Example: The PhD in Educational Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Although programs differ, depending upon their focus (e.g., urban leadership), EdD programs typically require a minimum of 50 hours of required coursework. The coursework is often divided into four curricular blocks: a Concentration, Internship, Applied Research, and Capstone Block.</td>
<td>Although programs differ depending upon their focus, PhD programs typically require a minimum of 63 credit hours of required coursework. PhD students are often supported through grants, fellowships, and research/graduate assistantships, allowing them to enroll full time. The coursework is often divided into five curricular blocks: a Core, Concentration, Research, Cognate, and Dissertation Block.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Core</td>
<td>PhD Core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The concentration is designed for K-12 teachers and administrators who aspire to key leadership positions in districts, departments of education, and other educational organizations. The courses in the leadership core are delivered in a sequential manner, focusing on issues of leadership, accountability, diversity and student learning as well as the skills and knowledge needed to lead successfully at a district and state level. Courses might include Educational Leadership; Accountability in Educational Leadership; Diversity and Cultural Issues in Educational Leadership; Learning and Curriculum; Policy, Laws, and Politics in Education; Public School Finance; Management of Human Resources; School Leadership and Instructional Improvement; and Leading Organizational Change.</td>
<td>The core courses for PhD programs in educational leadership usually consist of five or six classes and serve as the foundation for the PhD program. The core often represents a program's focus and incorporates different levels of analysis in the formulation and consideration of educational issues and problems. For example the following courses might be found in a PhD program with a leadership focus: Theoretical and Ethical Foundations of Education; Societal Factors in Education; Diversity, Accountability, and Student Learning; Economics of Education; Organizational and Behavioral Theories; Educational Change and Reform; and Politics of Education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship</td>
<td>Concentration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through collaborative partnerships and by building on the strengths and assets of local school communities, students examine and participate in processes related to leading, learning and teaching across a broad spectrum of K-12 settings. The internship extends across two semesters, and internship experiences are tied to coursework throughout the program.</td>
<td>The Concentration Course Block is linked to a student's concentrated area of study, in this case leadership, and typically consists five or six courses. Some programs may schedule students from PhD and EdD programs to take these courses together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Core</td>
<td>Cognate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The purpose of the EdD research core is to develop an overview and understanding of research, including data collection skills for action and qualitative research, program measurement, and program evaluation. For some students it may include work in management statistics. The following courses are typical: Inquiry Methods I, Inquiry Methods II, and Critique of Research.</td>
<td>The Cognate consists of four or more courses and reflects an interdisciplinary perspective on educational issues. The Cognate may include courses inside or outside Colleges of Education. The specific courses are chosen in advisement with the faculty advisor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capstone</td>
<td>Practice Experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A capstone (sometimes a dissertation or treatise) course is often provided to EdD students to prepare them for their culminating research and sense-making capstone project. Advisement continues through the writing and final defense of the project. The EdD capstone typically consists of a well-designed applied research project, focused on a problem of practice. It reflects theory or knowledge for addressing problems of practice.</td>
<td>Students engaged in PhD programs are often provided opportunities, if not required, to participate in research apprenticeships and teaching assistantships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation Core</td>
<td>Research Core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The dissertation core involves a set of experiences (and some cases a dissertation seminar) designed to prepare students for their dissertation research and continues through the writing and defense of the dissertation. This block also includes dissertation work and advisement.</td>
<td>The research core typically consists of five or more courses and provides students with the tools to pursue systematic, programmatic and empirical investigation. It should include an introduction to systems of human inquiry and experience with both qualitative and quantitative methods. The following list is typical of required courses: Systems of Human Inquiry and Research Design; Qualitative Research I; Statistics; Advanced Qualitative Research; and Advanced Qualitative Analysis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In thinking through these issues, Table 1 may prove helpful. Table 1 identifies key program areas for the doctorate in education and how they differ by program purpose. According to Table 1, an individual who is interested in a faculty position in higher education would be offered a doctoral program that is distinctly different from that provided to an individual seeking a district-level leadership position. For example, in an EdD program the curriculum would be more likely to provide opportunities for students to develop and apply...
knowledge for practice. In contrast, in a PhD program the curriculum would foster theoretical and conceptual knowledge. Important differences would also be evident in the internship, research methods courses, and final capstone experiences.

UCEA headquarters reviews educational leadership programs on an ongoing basis for both initial and continuing membership. Over the past 10 years, more and more UCEA programs have revised their EdD programs to more clearly reflect the professional needs of district and state-level leaders. They have also become more explicit about the intentions of their programs. The Innovative Programs section of the UCEA Review has highlighted a number of such revised programs. Table 2 provides a side-by-side example of the differences one might expect to see in a program of study designed to develop leaders and one designed to develop researchers.

It is important to note that the final capstone project for EdD students is the subject of much debate. The most common practice involves a research study of some kind, though a growing number of faculty members “have misgivings about training someone to do research who is not going into professional research, such misgivings have not translated into organized efforts at change” (Archbald, 2008, p. 705). Most of the faculty members and practicing leaders I have talked to about the EdD expressed a strong desire for a program of study that builds “scholar practitioners,” individuals whose preparation experiences enable them to understand and use research to enhance the organizations and practices within their sphere of influence. Given such an aspiration, how do EdD programs measure up?

I hope that the conversations, ideas, and program changes that are generated as a result of UCEA efforts, such as the pieces included in this issue of the UCEA Review, do indeed move leadership preparation, practice, and research in a positive direction. If you have comments, suggestions, or questions about the ideas contained within this essay or how UCEA might facilitate conversations and work around this issue, please email me at mdy8n@virginia.edu. I welcome your comments and ideas.
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Differentiating Doctoral Preparation in Educational Leadership: A Common Foundation With Separate Culminations

Perry A. Zirkel
Lehigh University

This article is a follow-up to a review of the literature concerning doctoral programs in educational leadership, including research evidence of the core commonality and culminating differences between superintendents and educational leadership professors. Providing personal reflection and formulation in light of the findings from the previous literature review, the author presents a guiding framework for distinctive doctoral degrees that prepare these two respective leading roles in educational leadership. The framework consists of a two-stage template that successively recognizes commonality then differences. The first stage is based on the common core of the Educational Leadership Constituent Council (ELCC) competencies with at least equal emphasis on the practical as the academic dimension. The second stage provides for clearly separate doctoral degrees that provide different balancing of the academic and practical dimensions. Integral to the efficacy of the framework is rigor both in terms of the systematic scope and selective level of applying these two dimensions at the entry and exit points of each of these two successive stages.

At first glance, the current quality standards for preparation of educational leaders (e.g., Young, 2011) make sense for the superintendency, as the chief educational leader at the local level, but they stand in stark contrast to the enduring conception of the PhD as “the monarch of the academic community” (Shulman, 2008, p. x) and as “the academy’s own means of reproduction” (p. xi). For example, the common elements of intensive internships and cohort structures are obviously intended for practitioners, whereas for professors the missing components are subject specializations and sophisticated research skills.

Yet, a unifying vision provides a way of harmonizing the commonalities and the differences between the practitioners, as led by the superintendents, and the professoriate, as marked by academia’s doctoral degree, in education leadership. This vision, or guiding framework, emanates from three principal sources, or pillars, which are canvassed in a recent literature review (Zirkel, 2012).

First, the evolving ELCC standards, subsumed herein under the generic concept of “competencies,” provide—with an adjusted application of the internship category—the useful foundation for a common core for doctoral programs in educational leadership that prepare superintendents or professors. The criticism of these standards in terms of either uniformity (e.g., English, 2006) or currency (e.g., Leithwood & Steinbach, 2003) should not stand in the way of progress toward a more defensible and unifying vision. Murphy (2005) cogently observed, “the standards were left deliberately broad” (p. 173), purposely providing the basis for evolution and customization.

Second, the review of the criticism of, including the various proposals for, the terminal degree(s) in educational leadership and the other evidence in the available literature reveals a repeating pattern of commonality yet differences between the leading practitioners and their counterparts in academia. For example, superintendents’ and educational leadership professors’ publication preferences reveal a shared value in the broadly based professional periodicals Educational Leadership and Phi Delta Kappan but divided loyalties for practitioner magazines (e.g., School Administrator) and refereed journals (e.g., Educational Administration Quarterly), respectively (Zirkel, 2007).

Finally, although the foregoing literature review concerning criticism, competencies, and the catchall category of “other evidence” provides the grist for this framework (Zirkel, 2012), this blueprint for the mill itself is subjective. More specifically, I offer the particular perspective of a so-called content specialist—the specific field being education law—who has negligible experience in K-12 leadership and has taught for more than 30 years at the graduate level, including serving on the doctoral dissertation committees of several superintendents. My values tend strongly to the classic academic conception of rigor—with research, writing, and teaching based on studious scholarship that contributes to informed practice. As an incidental matter, the reemergence of the trait theory of leadership (e.g., Antonakis, Ciocciolo, & Sternberg, 2004; Zaccaro, Kemp, & Bader, 2004) provides ancillary reinforcement of my personal view.

Upon reflection on my professional experience, my primary pertinent perception is that doctoral students in educational leadership tend to fit into two categories, with precious few having a forte in both. One group, who has performed with distinction in my education law courses and at the dissertation stage, has the distinctive capacity and orientation for intellectual pursuits, as marked by classic indicators such as high GRE or MAT scores and impressive academic records. In trait theory, their primary characteristic is in terms of cognitive abilities, which Zaccaro et al. (2004) classified among the “distal attributes” (p. 122) in relation to leadership success. The other group evidences the distinctive capacity and orientation to get along well with others and succeed in the career ladder of school leadership culminating in the superintendency. In trait theory, the hallmark characteristics are social appraisal skills, or “social intelligence” (p. 115) along with “emotional intelligence” (p. 116), and “tacit knowledge” (p. 117), which Zaccaro et al. correspondingly classified as “proximal attributes” (p. 122).

The doctoral students who are what I metaphorically call “bilingual and bicultural,” because they exhibit clear competency in both domains, are the exception rather than the rule. Indeed for many students, the relationship tends to be inverse at the extremes. Our doctoral program is an EdD but is skewed toward the traditional doctoral values. Those who excel in its relatively rigorous intellectually skewed selection and dissertation process do not necessarily succeed as school administrators, whereas too many of the most successful administrators, including leading superintendents, either do not gain admission or do not achieve graduation. For the many competing programs in the region that are far easier, false positives dominate instead of false negatives. The result is a general mismatched lack of distinctiveness and distinction.
In response, based on these three foregoing sources, the accompanying Figure presents a guiding framework for doctoral programs in educational leadership. The template provides for a two-stage program, starting with a common core and then moving to two distinct tracks at the second stage.

Selection at the initial stage would be based on not only cognitive abilities but also, at least equally, practical (e.g., social and emotional) intelligence. Brilliance, or—in the bilingual analogy—advanced fluency, is not necessary for either or both at this entry level; however, selectivity merits careful and comprehensive attention to minimize both false negatives and false positives on both dimensions. The common core for the first stage consists of the evolving competencies represented by the ELCC standards. This content corresponds to principal certification in most states, which is typically at the master's degree level or, if extending beyond it, would not equate to the doctoral level in this guiding framework. The core competencies provide not only a foundation for the subsequent separate degrees but also the facilitation of conversation, interaction, and cross-fertilization between education leadership practitioners and professors at the leading levels of superintendents and doctorates within and across institutions.

The candidates for the next stage would have to demonstrate a predetermined entry level, represented by the ETS exam and—more importantly—a portfolio of performance-based evidence for each of the standards. In accordance with the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, “every standard must be addressed by performance assessment—evidence that students can use theory in practice” (Glassman, Cibulka, & Ashby, 2002, p. 269). Moreover, this stage is for the unifying experience that the advocates for a nondifferentiated doctorate would make exclusive for the entire model.

The next, higher stage would be doctoral study in one of two distinct program types, thus clearly recognizing and responding to differences beyond the unifying core and designed for advanced “fluency” for either academic or administrative excellence. For aspiring superintendents and others advancing on the practitioner track, the candidacy standards would be skewed more heavily and highly to practical abilities, knowledge, and skills, including but not limited to a revisitation and expansion of the core competencies but at a more advanced level. Part of this second stage would be a second or extended internship at this more advanced level. Other program features such as a cohort model, district–university partnership courses, and an applied group project all fit well in this track. Like the terminal degrees in law and medicine, a dissertation is not, but research knowledge and skills are, a sine qua non. As Kowsalski (2006) observed, “Emphasis on data-driven decision making … has contributed to renewed interests in superintendents functioning [in one of their several relevant roles] as applied social scientists” (p. 46). Unlike business leadership, where the MBA is the accepted professional degree, it is unlikely that the proposals for a Master of Educational Administration or Master of Educational Leadership would suffice, given (a) the perception—at least for superintendents—that a doctorate is the appropriate credential, and (b) the vision—in this framework—of a two-stage process clearly extending beyond the master’s level. Thus, the degree designation could be EdD or any of the proposed variants, including PPD, but not—in any event—PhD.

Conversely, for those pursuing a career in the education leadership professoriate, the candidacy standards would put the priority on a high level of academic (i.e., cognitive and intellectual) abilities, although not emphasizing “formal knowledge” (Richardson, 2006, p. 260) to the exclusion of “practical knowledge” (p. 265). Thus, the coursework would include advanced levels of academic writing, quantitative and qualitative research, a substantive cognate area (e.g., law, economics, or organizational theory), an internship in university teaching, and a traditional dissertation akin to those in the arts and sciences. The degree designation would exclusively be PhD.

Under this conception, each university would have to choose one track, the other, or—in the instances of full institutional capacity and clearly distinctive tracks beyond the common core—both. At a minimum level, those institutions that do not demonstrate sufficient faculty capacity, other university resource commitment, and program coherence to fulfill this overall model should be eliminated. The framework is sufficiently flexible to allow for innovation and evolution, including systematic definition and valid measurement of the various constructs within the practical as well as academic dimensions.

Figure. Guiding framework of differential doctorates in educational leadership based on common core.
However, the ultimate key for advancing the profession to the levels reserved for law and medicine is rigor. Rigor—like standards—in this context has two overlapping but separable meanings—one being horizontal and the other vertical. Horizontally, the relevant rigor concerns the need to define and measure more precisely the major subsets—for example, “social intelligence,” “emotional intelligence,” and “tacit knowledge” (Zaccaro et al., 2004, pp. 115-117)—that en toto amount to Sergiovanni’s (1989) and others’ aforementioned reference to “practical intelligence.” To a lesser extent due to the traditional predominance or bias in the indistinct mixing of EdD and PhD programs, the measures of cognitive ability need fine-tuning due to not only cultural bias in standardized tests but also grade inflation at the graduate level. Vertically, rigor means applying a consistently high standard upon selection and at the subsequent “series of milestones” (Walker, Golde, Jones, Conklin-Bueschel, & Hutchings, 2008, p. 10) for the education doctorate.

For the two-stage process of this Figure, rigorous selection is both at the entry for the core and at a higher level with a differential mix at the entry for the clearly separate tracks. Moreover, the culminating milestone for the practitioner side warrants direct alignment with leadership effectiveness, including student learning, whereas that for the scholar side warrants direct alignment with research, teaching, and service productivity in the context of graduate education.

As Young, Petersen, and Short (2002) noted, achieving such rigorous reform is a complex challenge, requiring unusual commitment and collaboration. Unless and until we transcend the usual obstacles—including the immediate demands of the marketplace, the inertia to preserve the status quo, and the endless debate within in academia—superintendents will continue to need consistently “first-class temperaments,” but most doctoral programs in educational leadership will continue to be clearly second class both practically and intellectually.
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Innovative Programs

The Project ALL Simulation at VCU:
Increasing Authenticity, Immersion, and Interaction in Principal Preparation

Hans W. Klar
Clemson University

Project ALL

Project ALL was funded by a grant from the U.S. Department of Education and developed through a collaborative effort among researchers at VCU’s School of Education, Interactive, Inc., and Richmond Public Schools. The purpose of the initiative was to develop an innovative approach to preparing educational leaders in a manner that bridged the gap between traditional, classroom-based programs and practice. The simulation, currently in its beta version, is aligned to each of the 12 learning modules that comprise the leadership certification program at VCU.

Grounded in problem-based learning, the simulation allows participants to experience a year in the life as the principal at the fictional Charles Thompson Middle School. Experienced school administrators and VCU faculty selected and developed the simulation content to provide participants with authentic and interactive experiences in accord with the new Virginia state principal performance standards. The school entails a range of challenges and opportunities typical of a chronically low-performing school, as determined by the developers’ experiences and research on urban school improvement. In the future, data from an actual urban school district will be used to provide background information and allow for a more authentic decision-making process. The additional data will include information about the Charles Thompson student information system, class schedules, physical plant, student body, information technology, and curriculum.

Simulation content is presented in one of three modes: full-motion video vignettes of chains of problems, choices, and consequences; singular, self-contained decision points; and events that provide context. The video is filmed in an actual school with a point-of-view camera perspective. This technique, combined with actors speaking directly toward the camera lens (i.e., the user’s point of view), provides participants with the feeling of being fully immersed in this virtual school. The vignettes are focused on issues such as instructional leadership, student discipline, school safety and communication. Decision points, which appear as on-screen graphics interspersed with the vignettes, require participants to address particular bounded concerns. The 400+ elements requiring the user’s attention cover instructional leadership, teacher supervision, professional development, and student assessment. Other areas that received significant attention include planning, safety, and budgetary issues. Events are randomly occurring items that pop up while the participant is engaged in other activities. They are intended to replicate the kind of world-of-practice distractions that comprise the daily life of a principal, such as receiving e-mails.

The Simulation Experience

In general, simulations as educative tools are not new. Digital simulations have been used for many years to prepare members of the armed forces and the health care professions, among others. However, Project ALL represents a major advance in the use of web-based simulations to support project-based learning in that the vignette and decision points require participants to make decisions that have both immediate and long-term consequences. The video input-choice-consequence sequences are made possible by computer algorithms that evaluate participants’ decisions and provide them with immediate feedback. Thus, rather than a series of static videos, the simulation allows participants to solve various problems, and their choices lead them through preset sequences of vignettes. Depending on the selection made, the subsequent screen may show an appreciative parent or a disapproving staff member.

In addition to participants receiving immediate feedback on the decisions made, their decisions are scored and evaluated according to their likelihood of advancing or impeding school improvement. Upon completion of the approximately 8-hour simulation, participants are presented with an individualized profile based on the specific choices they made. The scores in the profile are grouped by the following state and national leadership domains and standards: instructional leadership, teacher supervision, planning, student performance assessment, professional development, safety, budgeting and business management, communications and community relations, and professionalism.

The data captured by the simulation can be used to assess individual competence within and across program sites. By tracking other features, such as the amount of time and number of button clicks it takes to complete certain activities, the developers are also able to determine aspects of the user’s administrative, managerial, or leadership behaviors. The developers have also used this feature to make improvements to initial iterations of the simulation.

Another key feature of the simulation is that its interactive nature enhances participants’ engagement with the content. This
provides participants a relatively authentic, yet low-stakes and private, opportunity to develop competence and even to determine whether they wish to pursue a career as a school administrator.

**Incorporating Project ALL in a Leadership Preparation Program**

Participants complete various aspects of the simulation as they progress through the principal certification program at VCU. In addition to completing coursework, they work with mentors during their internships and use additional paper materials and offline activities to enhance simulation activities. In addition to being intricately linked to the program modules, the profile developed during the simulation can be used to tailor the participants’ experiences during their field placement, providing enhanced opportunities to strengthen areas in which relatively less competence was exhibited during the simulation.

**Participants’ Reactions**

The alpha and beta versions of the simulation have been trialed with sitting principals in the Richmond metropolitan area; aspiring administrators from Richmond Public Schools; and students from Bank Street College, VCU, and leadership academies in central Virginia. Participants have indicated that they found the simulation both engaging and convenient to access. Some participants expressed discomfort with the lack of continuous feedback and the scoring rubric, whereas others raised concerns about the limitations of the choices available. Although users may find any range of choices somewhat limiting, developers of the simulation emphasize that incorporating discussions about the available choices for each scenario and the research basis underpinning them into class activities is a fruitful way to discuss the complexities of school leadership.

The developers of Project ALL acknowledge the significant costs and effort required to develop the initial version of the simulation. In the conventional delivery mode, professional development is relatively inexpensive to develop (PowerPoints and three-ring notebooks), yet expensive to deliver (repetitive salary costs, time away from schools, etc.). Simulations are more expensive to develop but virtually cost free to deliver and can be completed anywhere, anytime. Additionally, once developed, the ongoing maintenance required of simulations is minimal, and those costs become further minimized as the scale of use increases.

The developers also point out that simulations not only add convenience to the learning process but also enhance the implementation of the problem-based learning approach. They also suggest that, while the ultimate measure of Project ALL’s success is a clear indication of enhanced learning and leadership practices, they also consider participants’ authentic engagement with the content as evidence of its effectiveness. Though the innovative Project ALL simulation is still being trialed and refined, its developers have clearly provided the field a glimpse of the potential of web-based technologies to enhance leadership preparation through immersive and interactive problem-based digital learning experiences.

**More Information**

More information about Project ALL can be obtained from by contacting Dr. Charol Shakeshaft or accessing the references below. The Project ALL website is [www.projectall.vcu.edu](http://www.projectall.vcu.edu).

Dr. Charol Shakeshaft
Principal Investigator, Project ALL
Professor, Department of Educational Leadership
cshakeshaft@vcu.edu
(804) 828-9892
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Point/Counterpoint:
The Context(s) of Leading and Learning

Mónica Byrne-Jiménez, Hofstra University

Curriculum has often been the focus of discussion and improvement in education leadership programs, particularly in the ongoing debate of PhD “versus” EdD, as if to imply that what one group of students “needs to know” is different or better than what another group of students “needs to know.” And yet, what students “learn,” where they learn, and our role in that learning process are often footnotes in that debate. A closer look at the assumptions we make about the relationship between learning—which may or may not include curriculum and which may or may not take place in a classroom—and leadership is necessary. Rather than participate in the PhD/EdD debate, this Point/Counterpoint looks at multiple ways of fostering learning at both the classroom level and the program level.

To help us explore these issues, we invited Dr. Kensler, Assistant Professor at Auburn University, and her student, Lauren Parker, as well as Dr. Dantley, Professor and Chair of Educational Leadership at Miami University of Ohio, to share their perspectives on the definitions of learning in leadership programs. Dr. Kensler and Ms. Parker share the purpose and impact of a “Challenge Course” (think “ropes course”) in the development of educational leaders. In addition, they propose that leadership development and learning can happen outside the classroom context. Dr. Dantley focuses on the “learning” divide between EdD and PhD programs. The “divide” exists, not in terms of student understanding, but in terms of how faculty conceptualize their programs. Both contributions encourage us to think critically about what we mean by learning, how we provide opportunities to deepen learning, and what we, as faculty, learn in the process.

The Challenge Course: A Trigger Experience for Developing Healthy Cohort Dynamics and Leadership

Lisa Kensler, Auburn University
Lauren Parker, Smiths Station Freshman Center

Our educational leadership preparation programs aim to develop the leadership capacity of our students so that they then act as effective leaders in K-12 school settings. Elements of effective leadership preparation programs include knowledgeable faculty, driving theory, coherent curriculum, active learning, individual reflection, quality internships, social and professional support, and standards-based assessments (Orr & Orphanos, 2011). Faculties of high-quality programs strive to incorporate these features, evaluate their effectiveness, and continuously improve. In this article we (a faculty member and a current doctoral student) will explore one element of our program at Auburn University, the “Challenge Course.” The Challenge Course serves as an active learning experience that sparks individual reflection and leadership development, as well as cohort unity and camaraderie.

Challenge Course, Leadership Development, and Cohorts

Leadership development occurs in an organizational context; for educational leadership programs, the program is the organizational context and exists for the purpose of developing school leaders. The cohort model is recognized as an organizational structure that may facilitate student learning, social support, program completion, and postgraduation networking (Barnett, Basom, Yerkes, & Norris, 2000). However, the structure alone is not enough; the social conditions within the cohort need to be cultivated for healthy interpersonal dynamics and continuous individual and collective learning (Scribner & Donaldson, 2001). Since 2010, we have included a Challenge Course experience in the first semester of both our MEd and PhD educational leadership programs to trigger individual leadership development and promote healthy cohort dynamics.

Others have reported on the importance of trigger experiences in concert with individual readiness and a safe, nurturing organizational context for providing the full set of conditions in which leadership can develop more readily (Avolio & Hannah, 2008; Avolio & Luthans, 2006).

High impact leader development experiences create a point of disequilibrium and heightened self-awareness that can lead the individual to challenge his or her basic beliefs and assumptions. We contend that this sort of disequilibrium can occur from both positive and negative trigger events and that each can facilitate growth, provided that the leader is otherwise developmentally ready. This is because disequilibrium prompts or compels an individual to revise his or her self-construct in light of the new experience. (Avolio & Hannah, 2008, p. 335)

Trigger events may occur in a short or long time period. Regardless of duration, a trigger event sparks personal reflection, ideas, emotions, reactions, and behaviors; meaningful reflection has the power to lead to personal changes in behavior that persist into the future (Avolio & Luthans, 2006). The Challenge Course provides an opportunity for students to experience trigger events that spark reflection and personal transformation.

The Challenge Course that we use includes both low (see Picture 1) and high elements (see Picture 2). The low elements provide the opportunity for the cohort members to engage in group activities that build trust, cohesion, and interpersonal understanding. The high elements invite the same while also maximizing individual opportunities for challenge and growth. Although relatively little research exists on the effectiveness of challenge course experiences, Gillis and Speelman (2008) reported in their meta-analysis that the highest effect sizes existed for adults and group effectiveness. Thus, empirical evidence exists that suggests Challenge Course experiences may be an appropriate tool for educational leadership preparation programs for facilitating individual reflection, leadership development, and cohort cohesiveness.
One Student’s Perspective

Like other cohort members, I completed the university’s requirements to be accepted into the instructional leadership master’s program: entrance interview, portfolio, writing sample. We even had to attend a “Meet and Greet” to become acquainted with other students in various stages of their educational leadership studies. I was prepared for and comfortable with most of these research-inspired activities. However, in my second course of the program’s first semester, my 12 cohort members were introduced to the syllabus for our new Leadership for the Learning Organization class, which included half of a Saturday for a Challenge and Ropes Course. Needless to say, we were all a bit nervous but were assured that this would be a fun day packed with learning. I suppose our professor forgot to mention the forthcoming form on which we would sign our lives away. I signed the form and participated in the experience over a year ago. Lessons from that day still resonate with me.

The cohort arrived that day dressed for a day of outdoor activities, complete with coolers, camp chairs, and comfortable shoes. We had no idea what to expect. The staff introduced us to various team-building activities one by one, and each had its own lessons to be learned. One was a low-impact activity where all 12 cohort members had to stand on and balance a platform that sat atop a fulcrum. The catch: after we finally got it balanced, we had to keep it that way through three rounds of “Row, Row, Row Your Boat,” sung all together. A high-impact activity was something like a pendulum swing where a cohort member is harnessed and attached to a cable that is pulled up by the team until the harnessed cohort member is parallel to the ground and approximately 30 feet in the air. When ready, a release cord is pulled and the participant swings! It is a scary and exhilarating experience, not unlike a zipline.

Perhaps the most challenging activity for my group was the giant puzzle, one of the low course activities. We were split into two teams, and each team was given a set of puzzle pieces (one set was orange and one set was blue). Teams were given the task of putting their puzzle together but without any talking or noises. There was no time limit, and, although we weren’t told it was a competition to finish first, my team’s tacit agreement was that we were going to win! The minutes ticked by as we failed time and time again. The puzzle was impossible. It couldn’t be done. Frustrations were peaking when a cohort member in the other team walked over to our puzzle with a wordlessly communicated idea—let’s put the puzzles together to see if they had the pieces we needed. It worked, and then it was time to debrief and reflect on what we’d learned.

Individual reflection. Two thoughts about my own learning during this experience are salient to me: (a) The experiential nature of the Challenge Course solidified some strengths and weaknesses of mine, and (b) the experience gave me another “window” through which I can see my world in a leadership and team member capacity. The giant puzzle activity was powerful in showing me my tendency to allow my frustration to separate from the group and, therefore, from the goal. After failing to make the puzzle work attempt after attempt, I simply walked away from the group in order to process the activity on my own. I later realized that my physical separation from my team was an outward display of my inner struggles. This created an unsettling situation that required deep reflection to ascertain why I responded in this manner and what strategies might work better in this type of situation in the future.

Second, if we imagine our lives to be represented by a house, consider each powerful experience as a different window that opens in our “house.” These windows symbolize a different perspective through which we can view our world. My experiences at the Challenge Course with my cohort and with myself gave me another window to view my world. Effective school leaders are charged with the challenging task of seeing any situation from each person’s perspective—the student’s, the teacher’s, the parent’s, the board member’s—and adding windows to one’s “house” allows the leader to view situations from varying perspectives. In this way, the leader can make a decision that considers multiple viewpoints.

Group impact. The Challenge Course affected the cohort in many ways, mostly in our understanding of indi-
individuval members’ interactions with the group. This became clear to us in the lengthy and painstaking preparation for our capstone project. We spent hours and hours in group meetings hashing out the details of the presentation that was to be the culminating project. When we became discouraged, confused, or uncommunicative, we reminded each other of the powerful lessons we learned about each other during the Challenge Course, and these lessons helped us move forward and complete an outstanding project. The members who had typically been reticent when the more outspoken members were dominating the group work became facilitators of the goal rather than whose idea was the best. We had a common experience that we could use to remind each other of our strengths. We remembered the lessons from the Challenge Course that the goal required all team members and that we each had something valuable and, in fact, necessary to contribute to that goal.

A Faculty Member’s Perspective

Thus far, I have taken three MEd cohorts and three PhD cohorts through the Challenge Course. For all but one MEd cohort, the Challenge Course occurred about midway through their first semester of the program. When a graduating MEd cohort heard that the entering cohort was going to have a Challenge Course experience, they insisted that they get to have an experience as well. On the course, they were a cohesive team and moved quickly and with confidence through their set of challenges. (The two cohorts were on the Challenge Course at the same time, but they had a completely different set of challenges led by their own course facilitator. I “floated” between the two groups.) The contrast between the two groups’ capacity to face team and individual challenges was striking. Lauren (student perspective above) was a member of the entering cohort, and her group definitely struggled. This confirmed my assumption that the real value of the Challenge Course experience exists during the first semester. However, many students mentioned that they were glad we did not begin the first semester with this experience, as they appreciate knowing their cohort members just well enough to let their vulnerabilities show during the day. Too early in the semester and the stress of the day could very well be too much for many individuals or the group as a whole.

The Challenge Course, when facilitated thoughtfully and intentionally, serves as one element in our program for developing healthy cohort dynamics and individual leadership. As Lauren described above, students face individual and collective frustrations, doubts, and fears in a safe environment. These are the trigger events that seem to spark deep reflection, self-awareness, and in some cases personal transformation.
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Terminating the Terminal Degree Debate: Reconciling the EdD/PhD Divide

Michael E. Dantley, Miami University of Ohio

When I was asked to be one of the contributors to this Point/Counterpoint discussion on the PhD/EdD divide, I was, at first, genuinely excited about having the opportunity to lend my voice and perspectives to this ongoing discourse. However, the longer I thought about what some might consider to be the dichotomous nature of the two terminal degrees, I became more and more convinced of their similitude as opposed to their differences. Allow me to preface this discussion with the upfront admission that I do see inherent differences in the purposes, pedagogical delivery, and culminating activity between the two and will discuss those later. Nonetheless, I believe that in many other ways, in curriculum and even to some degree the intentions germane to both, there are significant items that both degrees hold in common. At the offset, it is also important to share that I have taught in both degree programs and found in some technical and logistical ways differences between the two, while in substance there were none.

For the purposes of coherence and to refrain from engaging in a professorial stream of consciousness diatribe on this subject, I will divide this discussion in the following segments. First, I will discuss what I concur with others to be the overarching purposes of a terminal degree. Second, the curriculum and focus of a doctoral degree in educational leadership will be delineated. Third and finally, I will articulate the distinctions I believe both the EdD and PhD possess. (As a side note, I find it interesting that Microsoft Word has already made a decision about the salience of one degree over the other because every time I type EdD it underlines the degree in red signifying that it does not recognize this degree, while absolutely nothing happens when I type PhD. How interesting is that?)

There are significant purposes either terminal degree in educational leadership holds. The arduous process of pursuing these degrees includes not only the exposure to the salient theories, philosophies, and historical and cultural topography that have shaped the field but also welcomes the lens of critique and inquiry that demystifies and deconstructs the very foundations of the field to extend knowledge and to create perspectives that the boundaries of time and space could not allow. It is through the engagement with texts, professors, other students, and practitioners in the field that a broadened knowledge base becomes established and new
understandings of the work get proposed. So with almost every paper that is written, every dissertation, every problem-based project that is completed, and every residency and internship, the field of practice gets rescrutinized and ultimately redefined.

The pursuit of the doctorate requires what Bingham (2005) in his article, “The Hermeneutics of Educational Questioning,” calls the true question, that is, the kind of inquiry that does not lead to resolution or the one right answer but rather spawns additional questions and calls for continued discoveries as the field becomes “opened up,” as he refers to this process of critical interrogation. In this way, the work required to gain the doctorate compels the learning community to become open to embracing a three-chord focus of the field. Our work accepts the amalgamation of, first, the historicity of the field aligned, second, with the extant or contemporary realities that finally become, because of critical interrogation, a part of a prophetic future of the field of educational leadership practice. The constant research, the incessant questioning and musings situate the terminal degree to fulfill what Richardson (2006) outlines as the purposes of the PhD. Richardson writes,

The PhD program should be designed to prepare scholars who can provide normative as well as epistemic theory, research, and analysis in ways that place discussions about the enterprise in frameworks that are both analytical and morally defensible. The PhD degree, then, should denote a steward who is responsible for both the field of educational study and the education enterprise. (p. 252)

She further provides a phenomenal outline of what she calls the crucial elements of scholarly inquiry and student learning. These elements include

- having a substantive knowledge of the field, thinking theoretically and critically, framing fruitful research problems, seeing research as being socially situated, designing research, that is joining researchable problems to appropriate methods of inquiry, collecting and analyzing data, and communicating with various audiences about research. (Richardson, 2006, p. 261)

While Richardson specifically outlines this purpose for the PhD, I am hard pressed to conclude why these same descriptors cannot be ascribed to the EdD as well.

In like manner, the Carnegie Project on the Education Doctorate (CPED) lists six actions such a degree should undertake. These working principles include a program being framed around questions of equity, ethics, and social justice that are aimed to provide solutions to the myriad, complex problems of practice in schools and will prepare leaders to construct as well as to apply knowledge. The goal here, according to the CPED initiative, is to make a positive contribution to the lives of individuals, families, organizations, and communities. Additionally, this degree should provide opportunities for students to communicate and to work collaboratively with diverse communities and to analyze problems of practice while also suggesting multiple ways to bring about meaningful solutions. The EdD will be grounded in professional knowledge that is a blend of both practical and research knowledge, a combination of theory and practice. Finally, CPED calls for the generation and transformation of knowledge and practice. As in the case of Richardson’s (2006) definition of the PhD, I am perplexed why these descriptors of the EdD ought not pertain to the PhD as well.

The curriculum for both degrees should include grounding in leadership and organizational theory but also must include a focus on social and cultural foundations, axiological and ethical studies, data-driven decision making, curriculum, change, social justice, community engagement, and critical self-reflection. This last component leads to the spiritual and nonrational aspects of educational leadership that are often left untouched in both traditional doctoral programs. A critical theoretical grounding that unmasks the racist, sexist, classist, and homophobic underpinnings of the theoretical hegemony that supports traditional notions of educational leadership must be intimately interwoven in every course of the doctoral program.

In a number of ways, an air of elitism accompanies this EdD/PhD discourse, as the EdD is commonly referred to as the professional terminal degree. That is, the EdD degree prepares the recipient to return to or remain in the K-12 context, utilizing the practical skills taught while pursuing this degree. The PhD, on the other hand, denotes the degree that prepares one to do teaching, scholarship, and service in a college or university. Most often, the PhD is thought to be more theoretically based, whereas the EdD is deemed to be more practical.

Several issues strike me about this divide. First, a number of us in the professoriate hold the EdD and have gone successfully through the rigors of promotion and tenure and have reached other markers of success in higher education. So that artificial distinction needs to be seriously reevaluated. Second, theory and practice mutually inform one another. Therefore, this constant bickering between the two is nonsensical and actually makes the argument groundless and a waste of time. Finally, the doctoral degree in educational leadership, whether PhD or EdD, must be about transforming educational institutions in such a way that students, at every level of education, are presented with learning opportunities that will result, in what Grant (2012) calls the flourishing lives of students. Grant argues that the following six aims or goals of education, as espoused by some of the early philosophers of our work, must include “personal autonomy; critical and analytical thinking, ethical judgment, learning how to function as a diverse society, learning to forge relationships across difference, and to respect one another’s perspectives, experiences and world views” (p. 911). The focus must be on what gets delivered to students in educational settings, K-12 schools or colleges and universities.

If the divide is to remain, and I believe that it will, then a department of educational leadership that offers both degrees should have a common set of core courses that students pursuing either degree are required to take. The richness of the discussion, through the multiplicity of perspectives and voices, is a tremendous by-product of this joint study of core courses. Research courses should be the same, especially those that introduce the fundamentals of research, and then the EdD students should focus on action or field-based research. The delivery of the courses for the scholar-practitioner should also take an alternative route. The intellectual rigor must be maintained even while and especially while the delivery of instruction may include hybrid or blended models of pedagogical practice. The culminating project for the EdD should be a study that has direct impact on the school, school district, or the institution with which the candidate is associated.
Call for Nominees

2013 Excellence in Educational Leadership Award

Deadline: March 1, 2013

The Award

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

The Procedure

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

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

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

Nominations due March 1, 2013

Questions? Call UCEA Headquarters at (434) 243-1041
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Interview With Joan Buttram

Lisa Bass
North Carolina State University

Joan Buttram is affiliated with the University of Delaware and UCEA. She is director of the Delaware Education Research and Development Center and coordinator of EdD programs in the School of Education, College of Education and Human Development. She is a member of the UCEA/LTEL SIG Taskforce on Evaluating Leadership Preparation Programs

LB. Describe the role/purpose of the UCEA taskforce you are in?

JB. The UCEA/LTEL SIG Taskforce on Evaluating Leadership Preparation Programs has several subcommittees. I am the chair of the Doctoral Program Evaluation Subcommittee. Our charge is to identify options for evaluating doctoral EdD programs.

LB. Who instituted the taskforce?

JB. I am not sure who instituted the taskforce.

LB. What is your role on the taskforce?

JB. I am chair of one of the subcommittees. There are about 25 members all divided into subgroups.

LB. How long has the taskforce been intact or meeting?

JB. I am not sure how long the taskforce has been intact. My subcommittee has been meeting for about 4 years and I’ve been part of the group for 3 years.

LB. In your opinion, has the taskforce been successful to this point? If so, what have been the major accomplishments of the taskforce?

JB. Yes. Before trying to think about evaluation options, we decided that it would be helpful to gather descriptive data about both EdD and PhD programs. Our thoughts were that having descriptive data would help us identify critical issues and select variables of interest for evaluation purposes. We have developed a survey, distributed it to 258 EdD and PhD programs in the United States, and analyzed responses from 103 programs (39.9%). We have made two presentations to UCEA members about the results. The findings have stimulated several great discussions and suggested additional follow-ups. We are in the process of negotiating with a journal for publication of the results; once this is completed, we will begin to move forward on our evaluation agenda.

LB. Does your taskforce work with or collaborate with any other agencies or with universities?

JB. The subcommittee has members from multiple universities including Auburn University, Bank Street College, Hofstra University, Rowan University, San Diego State University, University of Cincinnati, University of New Mexico, University of Utah, and University of Virginia. The subcommittee has both members and nonmembers of UCEA.

LB. What do you perceive to be the differences between the PhD and the EdD? What is the role of the EdD? The PhD?

JB. Although traditionally the PhD degree was seen as a research degree and the EdD as a professional degree, the survey results show that the expectations and preparations for the two degrees are more alike than different. Our survey results do not allow us to fully explore why this is the case, so this is clearly an issue that merits more investigation.

The task force was surprised at the number of similarities between EdD and PhD programs. Although the purposes of the two degrees are different, we prepare students similarly. The other surprise is the large number of EdD programs that have been redesigned in the past 5 years. The extent of the changes varied per university, but the programs still prepared students pretty much the same—even after going through redesign. Essentially, when we looked across programs after redesign, the majority of EdD programs still closely resembled PhD programs.

LB. Ok. Thank you! What type student should apply for each?

JB. Our data do not directly address this question.

LB. What do you believe to be the role of leadership preparation programs in promoting these differences?

JB. My sense is that programs articulate different purposes and probably recruit different students for the two programs. In spite of this, the two programs have many of the same requirements in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Redesign of EdD and PhD Programs: In Spite of Redesign, Most Programs Continued to Require a Traditional Dissertation as a Capstone Project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dissertation/capstone project</th>
<th>EdD program (N = 76)</th>
<th>PhD program (N = 21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional research dissertation</td>
<td>41       53.9</td>
<td>8        38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modified dissertation</td>
<td>21       27.6</td>
<td>0        0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culminating individual project</td>
<td>5        6.6</td>
<td>0        0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culminating group project</td>
<td>7        9.2</td>
<td>0        0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3        3.9</td>
<td>0        0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
terms of courses, dissertation expectations, etc. Our data suggest that the alignment between purpose, requirements, and expectations is somewhat limited. More investigation is clearly needed to understand the factors at play here.

Nevertheless, if we’re going to take seriously the different purposes of the two programs, then the programs should be more aligned with what graduates are expected to do. I would like to see these expectations reflected in the way each degree prepares students for either academic- or practitioner-oriented positions. The skills necessary for someone who is headed towards an academic career are very different than for someone who is going to be a district or school leader. We ought to prepare students differently—but the data don’t demonstrate that this is the case.

LB. Is there anything else you would like to add regarding the PhD and the EdD?

JB. I think we have covered it between our conversation and the handouts I’m sending [see Tables 1-3]. I’m sure there is much more to talk about.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
<th>Partnerships and Practitioners: Purpose of Partnerships Varies Between EdD and PhD Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>EdD program (N = 76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership development for district personnel</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferential admission decisions</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District as context for applied coursework &amp; research</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locations for offering graduate courses</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship sites for doctoral students</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3</th>
<th>Nature of Student Assessments: Both EdD and PhD Programs Continue to Use Traditional Assessments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>EdD program (N = 76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course grades</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of student portfolio</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common assessments that all students complete</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National examination</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance in school/district site</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2013 UCEA Graduate Student Summit: Call for Proposals

Theme: “Rising above the challenges in educational leadership: From understanding to action”

The 2013 UCEA Graduate Student Summit will be held at the Hyatt Regency Hotel in Indianapolis, Indiana. The summit will commence Wednesday, November 6, 2013, at 12:00 noon and will conclude Thursday, November 7, 2013, at noon. The purpose of the 2013 UCEA Graduate Student Summit is to provide a space for graduate students to engage in authentic dialogue about their scholarly work. This summit will offer opportunities to meet and network with graduate students and faculty, to participate in presentations, and to receive feedback on your research.

• Paper sessions allow you to share your research and receive constructive feedback.
• Workshop sessions will give you direct feedback on a paper that you would like to publish, a proposal, or your dissertation research plan.
• Networking sessions will give you the chance to network with students from other UCEA institutions interested in similar research topics and talk with UCEA Executive Committee members and Plenum representatives.

To access the full Call for Proposals, please visit the following link: http://ucea.org/graduate-student-summit-2013/

We will begin accepting proposals April 1, 2013.

ucea.org/graduate-student-summit-2013
This document is the last in a trilogy of conversations focused on the role and process of advocacy for educational leaders—practitioners, researchers, and policy makers. We first explored personal ontologies as foundational for the purpose of nurturing the political imagination for educational leaders. The second conversation focused on how historical and present-day contexts provide a guiding framework to organize our experiences and ecologies of knowledge. This third conversation focuses on specific advocacy examples that move the political imagination from theory to action.

These stories and the framing of an emerging political imagination have been vetted with students, coresearchers, community, and our partners in the engaged higher education where we work. The reception and impact of its utility have been positive. The political imagination has been effective as a framework for making sense of educational leaders’ stories and experiences; it gives students a process that takes complicated and nuanced lived experiences and organizes them into manageable frames to be examined while also assigning value and meaning to them. In this multilayered process we simultaneously attempt to understand our present and historical positions at work, both in practice and theory. This examination scaffolds the development process for educational leaders to systematically develop an operational and relevant philosophical position for our emerging leadership work and advocacy.

As we articulate the work of the political imagination, we rethink the structures and processes for engaging in this new thinking and acting—essentially a higher education process. To write this document as a single author, for example, would violate the spirit and process of this brand of political imagination. Moreover, it is important that the ideas, methods, and processes we employ be congruent in our research, teaching, and advocacy. In response to this methodological issue, we use the concept of circle to facilitate the conversation and employ the previously framed ecologies of knowing, self, organization, and community as an organizing framework; we integrate the frames for analysis of history, biology, culture, and politics to provide a deeper aspect of issues we face in our daily work. These frames are useful, though certainly not exhaustive, and in the spirit of coconstruction, we invite the readers to develop their own political imagination and to employ other frames congruent with their context, ontology, and epistemologies to assess their own work. This conceptual framework is dynamic and intuitive—essentializing it would disrupt the invitation to imagine. The stories below present samples of the way each of us practices our political imagination in our daily lives. Our partners reflect on the application of their political imagination, on how their work looks like, and what informs their work. Through the circle format, everyone takes a turn at telling stories of action, and of the political imagination.

Self

Miguel: Understanding the politics of learning was part of our home life. It looked radically different from school, but no less valuable. This learning environment, along with lessons learned on the playground, helped us transfer private learning into public action. We learned this process from our parents. Creating healthy spaces to learn, share, and advocate is an important part of my public self as an educator and political actor! We learned the spirit of giving from my parents who gave of their time, their resources, and their ideas, as advocates for the public good.

Creating spaces where deep hospitality is practiced as a virtue invites students, community partners, and me to create transformative learning environments; this has become a significant part of my advocacy work. These exchanges take place in my classroom, at the local coffee shops, local public school classrooms, and communities; these spaces have become the spaces where we convene class. At the core of this learning environment is the congruence of culture and social rules for engagement between the institution/university and us (students, teacher, and community). When successful, this congruence leads to a process where trust is strong and questions abound. The learning space is focused on building a foundation where we understand our genealogy, culture, and political selves as a critical foundation in order to push our learning toward practice. This advocacy work originates with the skills our parents have mastered, particularly building strong relationships. By extension, the practice guides the policy and the institutional narrative we work purposefully to build. The process of pedagogy as policy and policy as practice is reciprocal and symbiotic. It is not a normal construct in the literature or in practice; this is why we must allow our imagination to guide our advocacy.

The process of relationship building requires the consistent negotiation of power and position. This process is dynamic and open between person and person, people and institutions, and institutions and communities. The relational process and setting give way to a dynamic learning exchange and an opportunity to (re) imagine. This is a practice that graduate students, my colleagues, and I construct in our brand of engaged scholarship. This engagement affords us the opportunity to reimagine higher education, a reimagining fueled by a collective and coconstructed political imagination. As we are prepare capable academics, we also prepare

Part 3: Reframing the Political Imagination: Stories of Advocacy From Educational Leaders

Miguel Guajardo, Texas State University–San Marcos
Francisco Guajardo, University of Texas Pan American
John Oliver, Texas State University–San Marcos
Mónica M. Valadez, Texas State University–San Marcos
Lia O’Neill Keawe, University of Hawai‘i–Ma‘noa
Karon Henderson, Texas State University–San Marcos
Patricia Rocha, Texas State University–San Marcos

This is the last part of a trilogy focused on the political imagination for educational leaders.
powerful citizens with a new appreciation and understanding of what is possible, when we imagine the political world as it can be.

Karon: Until recently, my teaching career in multicultural contexts has been mired in day-to-day classroom practices consisting of lessons, activities, and drills. I did little to develop my students into critical thinkers with a vision of the world as a place there they could make a difference. I lacked a political imagination and did not consider myself to be political at all. Sadly, I was becoming a drone to the accountability schemes and policy initiatives, never questioning or challenging policy mandates that directly affected the culturally and linguistically diverse students I taught.

Having the opportunity to participate as a cohort member of the PhD in School Improvement program at Texas State University has had a profound effect on developing my political identity as an educator. Engagement in critical conversations with the many diverse thinkers in my cohort group, I found myself in a safe place to develop a critical conscience. As my core values were challenged and I engaged in critical self-reflection about my role in carrying out educational policy that might have a hand in further marginalizing the culturally and linguistically diverse students I taught, I began to understand how my beliefs and values have informed my practice.

Years of accepting the status quo and operating through a techno-rational and mechanistic paradigm have come to a screeching halt. I take the lessons I have learned from my experiences in engaging in critical conversations to promote deep reflection with teacher leaders as we work to inform our collective practice and shape our political identities. Creating spaces to examine policy mandates that directly affect the culturally and linguistically diverse students we teach provides a forum to engage in critical reflection and an exploration of our ever-changing self-concept and political imagination.

Patricia: I made the decision to leave the position of elementary school principal and accept a job as a school facilitator so that I could have the opportunity to further pursue my studies in a doctoral program in school improvement. I have spent the last couple of months engaged in an ongoing reflection on my leadership as a principal and now as a school facilitator, as I explore my political autobiography and the emergence of my political framework. Informed by an ongoing awareness of the self, I have reflected on my tenure as a principal with a new set of lenses. The new lenses give me an understanding of the rhythm and beat for equity that resonates in my soul. I am aware that this is the same rhythm that motivated me to stand up against being treated unfairly as a female. Recognizing this political action of color she interviewed felt as though the parent–teacher conferences held for her child consisted of nothing more than a series of boxes of information needing to be checked off by the classroom teacher. We engaged in a critical conversation about reimagining what a parent–teacher conference could be. Shifting the focus from information giving to information gathering—the power of information that could be gathered from a simple conversation that consisted of asking questions about students from the people who know them best, instead of utilizing the time to “inform” parents of their child’s “deficits.”

Growing up in my childhood community bred a cultural dissonance between school and home, and I never felt as though my lived experiences were assets that could have been used in school to inform teaching and curriculum. I now use my political imagination to engage my students in critical conversations to reimage what school can be for both students and teachers.

John: During the summer of 2010, a close friend congratulated me on my new position as Assistant Professor of Educational Leadership. Instantly, my face brightened and I flashed a cheesy smile. But, it didn’t last very long. Next, somewhat jokingly, he asked, “So, how does it feel to be the Jackie Robinson of your department?” The gravity of the question slowly turned my smile upside down. Instantly, I understood his question. I thought, “Jackie Robinson was the first African American to play major league baseball. He integrated the sport in 1947 when he signed with the Brooklyn Dodgers. My smile persisted, Wow! I’m the first African American man hired to a tenure-track position in my college. My smile began to fade as I continued reflecting on the same. At that moment, I fully realized the magnitude of the challenges and opportunities associated with being “The First.” I understood the historical, biological, and political significance of my accomplishment. More importantly, I understood the responsibility to assure that my work contributed to developing an environment conducive for others to follow.

I offer this story as a call to leaders in public schools, higher education and community-based organizations to celebrate the accomplishments of “The First” and work to be engines for social equity by creating successful pathways of opportunity for all—
particularly people of color and immigrant, indigenous, and low-income communities. Creating environments for thriving relationships, conversations, and story while encouraging curiosity is at the core of knowing, learning and growing. These mediating processes of engagement create a political imagination that develops the advocacy of educational leaders and moves the political imagination from theory to action.

Lia: I am but one member of a critical mass of Kanaka Maoli faculty and staff who have reclaimed our cultural identity. As a consequence of this collective experience, we have become scholar activists on the University of Hawai‘i at Manoa campus for the community of people we represent. Our efforts to reauthor Kanaka Maoli have led to strong political awareness that has affected the politics of institution building at University of Hawai‘i.

The Hawai‘inuiaka School of Hawaiian Knowledge serves as an outcome of political imagination and was established on May 16, 2007, by the Board of Regents of the University of Hawai‘i. “It is the first new school or college established on the Manoa campus in twenty-five years, and it is the only college of indigenous knowledge in a research 1 institution in the United States” (Hawai‘inuiaka School of Hawaiian Knowledge, 2011, para. 1). Political imagination is alive and well in Hawai‘inuiaka. Equally, it is where advocacy continues to thrive through education in the development of next generation leaders for Kanaka Maoli.

Advocacy has also affected the current University System Strategic Plan (University of Hawai‘i, 2010) that now includes policy to support, honor, and preserve the host culture. Such an initiative toward Kanaka Maoli educational attainment aims to increase the number of Kanaka Maoli student enrollment, retention, and completion of degrees (University of Hawai‘i System, 2011). At University of Hawai‘i, the chancellor has committed the campus to implementing an action plan whereby Manoa will truly be a Hawaiian place of learning (University of Hawai‘i, 2012). To do this, a representative task force of Kanaka Maoli scholars and educators collectively developed a report that recognizes programs that perpetuates Hawaiian language and culture; identifies strengths, gaps and challenges in current programming; and recommends actions and resources needed to support the strategic directive of (Kanaka Maoli) Native Hawaiian advancement.

Community

Paco, Papi, and Mami: My mother has always nurtured the family stories in ways that are respectful and appropriate. Though she never attended any school, she has always supported every aspect of her children’s schooling, and even the education of my father, whose educational practice is manifest through his early morning pláticas at the local coffee shops. His routine is to engage other local men on the importance of talking to their children, their grandchildren, and other family members about the importance of college. “Que se preparen para el colegio” is a common line my father uses with others at the coffee shop. If my mother accompanies him, she gestures in agreement, picking her time to offer nurturing insight specific to how the family will be stronger if they send their kids to college.

My parents help me bridge the generation gap. I gave a commencement address at a local high school recently and invited my father to copresent with me. My father spoke about his own political imagination, as a Mexican immigrant who attended only elementary school in rural Mexico and as a father, grandfather, and community member who is an unapologetic pusher of education. He spoke of the importance of conversations, relationships, and staying committed to the right things. “When you and your brothers went to college,” my father told me while I interviewed him for an oral history recently, “is when the life of the family changed most dramatically.” My father is intent on reproducing that same drama, as he pushes the conversations in the coffee shops, at family get-togethers, and through commencement addresses. I’m con-

---

Figure. “Political Imagination,” by Mónica Valadez, 2012.
vinced my father has impacted our local community narrative. He’s helped many Mexicano men talk more easily about their kids going to college. I believe that is the product of my father’s political imagination.

Monica: Mis papás never communicated to my siblings and me that we were to tend to our education in order to obtain a good job with benefits and retirement packages. To the contrary, an education was to open up the possibilities of viewing and understanding the communities and worlds in which we lived and the possibilities of exploring new ones never even imagined. The latter view was the one that many of my colleagues and I embraced as we sought new ways of challenging our bilingual students and families to reimagine possibilities. But, all too quickly, the frameworks that we attempted to establish gave way to the standardization of knowledge and the acquisition, at all cost, of the dominant language. There was no need to understand the system as a whole, let alone express or act upon any political imagination. Learning only needed to be understood from the perspective of the rung we occupied on the ladder.

A colleague and I recently accepted an opportunity to work in a small group setting with bilingual educators that find themselves constrained by the same system that they at once try to appease, ever attempting to understand and tirelessly work on the rung that they have been assigned. It has been a personally and professionally trying experience. We have doubted our own capacity to create a space to explore and nurture the group’s political imagination and begin to acknowledge and envision new frameworks for making sense of our roles within educational settings. Still, the understanding of education that mis papás made reference to throughout my childhood and adolescence permeates my every thought and action, and relying upon the politics of engagement that illustrate the importance of knowledge of self, community, and world, and nurturing trust and facilitating difficult dialogues we continue to make sense of our learning and our capacity to reimagine possibilities.

Debrief the Circle

Advocacy is a deliberate act. Many educators do the right things daily, but as educational leaders our role is to inform, set the conditions, and navigate the advocacy issues necessary for building the public good. As our stories are anchored in relational processes—the foundation of our political imagination—we invite our colleagues to build learning environments predicated on trusting relationships. As such we challenge ourselves and others to rehabilitate our institutions to respond to students. We advocate a shift from deficit thinking to assets building, to the development of a critical consciousness, to building the power to reauthor and reclaim what is our birthright. The work is intergenerational, so we must respect the wisdom of our elders, as we listen to the voices of our youth. These behaviors have been vetted, filtered, and framed through a systematic process that responds to the dignity of people; it is both congruent with the local culture of participants, and with the people who give shape to institutions. The advocacy we share is with people, organizations, and community. It is not sufficient to develop the skills of leaders, if we do not reframe the cultures of institutions and the awareness of communities.

Next Steps

We do not propose a grandiose mandate or a master plan for this closing; rather, we invite you to imagine with us. We propose to nurture our own curiosity, and others’, as we frame the following questions for reflection.

- What is your political story?
- Who are the important people in your life?
- Who do you need to be in conversations with?
- What are you personal, organization, and community assets?
- Where is your power source?
- Where are the safe spaces for learning?
- Where and how can you practice your political imagination?
- Why is this important?
- How do we share these stories of advocacy with other communities?
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Using Publications From EAQ, JCEL, or JRLE in Your Courses?

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

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

www.ucea.org/publications
Notes for Doctoral Students, Professors Early in Their Academic Careers, and Their Colleagues

Joseph Murphy
Vanderbilt University

Over my career, I have had the privilege to work with a number of students, both as individuals and in groups, who were preparing for positions in the professoriate. Based on those experiences and lessons learned through my own work, I have formed some insights that may assist colleagues to enhance their effectiveness during their graduate school careers and the early years on the job. Since I believe that most of these insights require explicit instruction, colleagues who also prepare scholars for the professoriate may find the article of interest as well.

Let me begin with a caveat. There are three hallmark ingredients for excellent preparation for the professoriate: (a) deep and cutting-edge content knowledge in one or more areas of scholarship (e.g., the superintendency); (b) an exceptionally well-stocked toolbox of methodological skills, skills that allow one to design and carry out sophisticated studies on the edge of the known scholarly universe in question; and (c) a robust capacity to think and to write well. This article is not about these cardinal elements of preparation. Rather, the spotlight is directed to issues that can boost success across these areas. Eleven suggestions are clustered into three groups: notes on networking, notes on planning work, and notes on working.

Notes on Networking

An often-neglected dimension of early career development is the forging of networks of colleagues; think of forming webs of “professional friends.” These linkages do not happen by accident, at least not on a reliable basis. They need to be forged one scholar at a time. Here are some linkage-forming strategies that I have seen be productive over the years.

1. Join American Educational Research Association (AERA) Special Interest Groups (SIGs) in your areas of interest. Attend SIG meetings at the AERA convention. These groups are usually manageable in size, are constantly seeking new energy, and are generally comfortable environments for participation. Connections can be formed easily in the SIGs. Opportunities for leadership are often found in these organizations as well.

2. Volunteer when opportunities materialize. Become an officer in a SIG. Perform the role of chair or discussant at conferences. Volunteer for editorial boards. If you are too shy to do it yourself, ask a professor or student colleague to nominate you for opportunities that will create threads in your web of connections. And strike this language from your head: “I couldn’t do that; I’m only a student [or a 2nd-year professor].” It is your career. Other people can help, but you need to be proactive on the linkage front.

3. Use professional conferences to network. You should become skilled at using professional conferences to create denser webs of professional linkages. Building webs through your work (i.e., articles) is the key here. But in the best of worlds, this is a slow-developing strategy. More proactiveness here is advisable. Before each conference, identify two or three people who do really good work in your area. Include both junior and senior colleagues. E-mail them. Introduce yourself and your work. Tell them what it is about their work that you appreciate. Ask if they have time for a cup of coffee at the convention. Follow up. Keep your eyes open for opportunities for shared work with these colleagues and others with whom they work. Get yourself in their web of professional linkages.

4. Take advantage of institutionally sponsored opportunities. There are three types of opportunities here: (a) those that are available to everyone (e.g., to present a paper at UCEA), (b) those that are available to everyone but that give a leg up to “junior” colleagues (e.g., SIG business meetings), and (c) those that target doctoral students (e.g., UCEA graduate student seminar). Work all three avenues, but keep a sharp eye out for opportunities in the last two categories.

5. Get your work on the street. Unpacking the intricacies of publishing is a topic for another essay (e.g., how to weigh different publication venues). Here, we just acknowledge a central reality of the process. It takes a good deal of time to get your work published. You need to “jump” the process whenever you can. One good method to do this is to identify 10–15 people whose work in your area of interest you admire. Send them hard copies of your related piece to be of interest. A different list is likely to be needed for each paper. If you have something useful to say, there is a decent chance your work will begin to be referenced long before it appears in final form in a journal. New strands of the web will form.

Notes on Planning Work

6. Set targets. Everyone is busy. But some folks get a lot of their work out and others do not. Some not-insignificant part of the production algorithm features goals and targets. Here are three questions for which you want to form concrete answers:

1. How much time each week will you devote to research work? Set a target that includes only reading, data analysis,
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1 There are two immediate antecedents for the article: A PhD seminar in the spring of 2012 for 14 students from three departments at Vanderbilt and an attempt to develop ideas of use for Clark Scholars, also in the spring of 2012. I want to thank all the students for the exchanges around the ideas in the article.

2 Institutional efforts of UCEA are an especially bright spot in this area. Initiatives such as the Jackson Scholars, the Clark Seminar, and the New Graduate Student Seminar at UCEA beginning in 2013 are powerful methods to assist students in spinning webs of relationships. But the central message is this: a core responsibility of each young scholar is to use these and a host of other strategies to form his or her web of connections.
and writing. Be aggressive. Remember, you do not go to dinner or read the paper Sunday morning till you hit your goal. All the other “stuff” will get done. You need your chips on research time.

2. How many conference presentations will you make each year, presentations based on papers?

3. How many refereed articles will you publish each year? Use a 3-year rolling average as the test here. And yes, I mean as a doctoral student. Two is not a bad goal, by the way.

7. Develop and update lists of work “needing doing” on a yearly basis. Select a consistent time each year to develop (update) two agendas: long-term and yearly scholarly plans. The entire system is predicated on memos that you write yourself and throw into a folder or a dedicated drawer in your desk. These memos should flow from everything you read. For example, if you are reading something on principal-agent theory, you might create a memo like this: “I wonder if this critically important construct has ever been applied to teachers and children?” Or if you are reading an article on troubled district finances forcing the closing of schools, one memo you might generate is this: “It would be great if we could look at the theories of loss from different areas (e.g., sociology, diversity, psychology) to see how closing a school is felt in a community.” These are memos of puzzlement, insights about missing work, disagreements with authors, and so forth.

When you sit down every year to update your plans, these memos will be of enormous help. For example, the recent work on homeless children that Kerri Tobin and I have been doing came out of the “long-term plan,” where it had been for about 15 years. The “loss” project has been in the long-term folder (with a couple dozen other possible projects) for even longer. About half of my scholarly production this year was the direct result of memos thrown in the “short-term” folder last year. The system forces both daily and long-term proactiveness into your work, an especially wise piece of scaffolding early in one’s career.

8. Learn to “spin down” academic publications for the other three players in the game—developers, policy makers, and practitioners. Referred journal articles are the coin of the realm in the professoriate. This is good. You want your work to shape scholarship in important ways. But the truth of the matter is that you are more likely to get hit by lightning than you are to shape the other three domains of education through your journal articles. You want to get in the habit of spinning down your academic work for practitioners, developers, and policy makers, assuming you want to leave fingerprints in these domains. Each of these areas is represented by sometimes overlapping groups (e.g., Learning Forward, National Association of Secondary School Principals), each of which has its own publication outlet(s) (e.g., Journal of Staff Development, NASSP Bulletin).

The formula for spin downs is simple. You get five pages to say something to superintendents (or state legislators). Take the essence of your 35-page paper and put it into those five pages. Hold the references; jettison academic lingo; “talk” to the audience in question in writing. And yes, you can do multiple spin downs for multiple audiences.

9. Avoid the silo. Many colleagues, you will discover, live in scholarly silos. The gravity in the profession will pull you in this direction. Having a lot to say about nothing will not help you, however. Nor will it do much for the rest of us either. Your goal, while specializing, is always to have one eyeball on the full landscape of the education profession. You want to be knowledgeable about all the major sectors of the enterprise and who is doing great work in those sectors. More importantly, you want to develop the habit of identifying the implications of that work for school leadership. For example, certainly part of the impetus for the new publications dedicated to the topic of preparing school leaders came from those with one eye focused on what was afoot in the field of preparing teachers. Remember also that almost every bit of theoretical scaffolding in educational leadership has been brought to us by scholars with one eye focused in other areas (e.g., the pervasive line of new work on “trust”).

Having eyes focused on different directions is not natural. You will need to cultivate the habit. One way to do this is to read extensively and to read outside the field. You will know you are successful here if you regularly stumble upon journals that you did not even know existed. A second is to devote a significant portion of your time at AERA tracking down and attending sessions outside Divisions A and L. Spending a weekend actually reading the AERA catalog from cover to cover may be the most productive “landscape” learning you can undertake.

10. Be a first mover. You will find that a good deal of attention has been devoted to most of the topics that are of interest to you. The scholarship on many already fills entire wings of the library. This is often, but certainly not always, good for the profession. But it makes your job more difficult. In order to study one of these “deeply explored” domains—and add to the body of extant knowledge—you will need to read and understand everything that is already available. It is also tougher to make a mark (i.e., leave scholarly fingerprints) in these areas.

For these reasons, it is wise to search for domains in your broad area of interest that are less trodden over than are other domains. For example, let us say that you are interested in the essential dynamic in play that is transforming the education industry from a public monopoly to client-oriented enterprise. Here one choice, a non-first-mover choice, would be to study charter schools. If so, you will need to spend considerable amounts of time exploring the 94 floors of that building that have already been constructed. Rest assured also that your piece of the 95th floor is going to be a fairly small section of the overall building. If you took your interest in this broad area of scholarship (e.g., privatization) and applied the same amount of intellectual investment to, say, homeschooling or virtual schools (topics of at least equal importance as charters), the outcome will be different. To begin with, you will find yourself working on creating the architectural designs and pouring the foundations of the building. Your contribution to and imprint on the field of privatization is also likely to be greater. Develop the intellectual habit of identifying and moving into important areas of work that are underdeveloped.

11. Determine if you are undertaking single-room or entire-house work. At the risk of some oversimplification, scholarly work falls into two categories: (a) work that is constrained,
that is, you can go into the house (e.g., democratic community) and capture almost all of what you need in one room, and (b) work that requires you to go from room to room to gather insights to answer the question(s) at hand. An example here will help. Let us say that the house of interest is “school improvement.” And let us say the question is, how does instruction vary among students from different social classes in the same classroom (i.e., with the same teacher)? In this case, I can garner almost everything I need in one room, the one labeled tracking and ability grouping. It is a big room for sure, but it is still one room. On the other hand, if I want to uncover the actions of principals in promoting student success in communities with very high levels of poverty, I will need to collect information from a lot of rooms and then cobble it together. I will need to spend time in the room on school change, in the curricular implementation rooms, in the room on successful special programs, and so on.

The salient point here is that “entire-house” work takes a great deal more time, it is often harder, and the scholarly outcomes of the efforts tend to be more distal. If time is constrained or you have not done much scholarly work in the past, then focusing on single-room work makes a good deal of sense.

Conclusion
The main storyline in preparing colleagues for work in the university is well formed. It is about developing robust content, knowledge, strong methodological tools, a good head, and a powerful quill. But there is a good bit of background narrative that is less visible as the preparation play unfolds. In this article, I tried to pull some of this material onto center stage. My observation is that there is a good deal of unnecessary stumbling about because we are less than explicit in helping young colleagues see and learn important insights about how to be successful as students and as early-career academics. My hope is that the lessons presented herein may assist in helping overcome that deficiency.

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

www.ucea.org/graduate-student-column/
www.ucea.org/graduate-student-blog/
Researchers suggest that mentoring is associated with a range of positive outcomes for mentors, mentees, and the organizations in which they serve (e.g., Bickmore & Bickmore, 2010; Ehrich, Hansford, & Tennent, 2004; Fletcher & Mullen, 2012; Lechuga, 2011; Lumpkin, 2009). These outcomes include greater rates of teacher retention (e.g., Smith & Ingersoll, 2004), and tenure and promotion among higher education faculty (e.g., Hackmann 2003; Schrodt, Cawyer, & Sanders, 2003). Mentors (formal and informal) can assist faculty members to develop and demonstrate their competence in research, teaching, and service with the goal of tenure and promotion in mind. Furthermore, mentors can provide advice to mentees on how to balance personal and professional responsibilities (Lumpkin, 2009). Schrodt et al. (2003) found that faculty members who participated in a mentoring relationship were more satisfied with the socialization process than nonmentored newcomers. Bell and Treleaven (2011) found that new faculty members in mentoring relationships had a significantly stronger sense of ownership of their departments, a greater sense of connectiveness, and clearer information about work expectations than nonmentored faculty. Program evaluation data from a formal academic mentoring program indicated the importance of personal connections and facilitation of the selection process. Finding a suitable mentor is crucial to the success of mentoring relationships (Bell & Treleaven, 2011).

However, researchers also suggest that mentoring without forethought or evaluation can potentially do more harm than good (Ehrich et al., 2004). Program evaluation serves as a valuable means of assessing program effectiveness and improving future delivery (Guskey, 2002). This brief article summarizes the results of an annual survey administered to participants (mentors and mentees) of the 2012 William L. Boyd National Educational Politics Workshop. The survey sought to gauge participants’ perceptions of the event and to seek guidance on how to improve its future delivery.

In April 2008, the Politics of Education Association (2008) hosted the National Educational Politics Workshop in New York City. The workshop, held in conjunction with the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (AERA), provided an opportunity for emerging scholars to interact with leading politics of education scholars. Politics of Education Association members chose to make the workshop an annual event and renamed it in honor of the late Dr. William Lowe Boyd of Pennsylvania State University, a luminary in the field of educational policy, politics, and administration. The Boyd Workshop gained the valuable cosponsorship of UCEA, an organization with a long history of commitment to mentoring through programs such as the Barbara L. Jackson Scholars and the David L. Clark National Graduate Student Research Seminar. These programs and the Boyd Workshop are a means of supporting UCEA’s goals, which include the following:

- Promoting, sponsoring, and disseminating research;
- Improving the preparation and professional development of educational leaders and professors; and
- Positively influencing educational policy. (UCEA, n.d., para. 1)

Most recently, the annual meeting of the AERA in Vancouver, British Columbia, played host to the Boyd Workshop in April 2012. The schedule of events included a keynote speech by Dr. Gary Crow, Professor in the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at Indiana University—Bloomington. Crow, a past president of UCEA who has published widely on the work socialization of educational leaders (e.g., Crow, 2012a), shared his thoughts and experiences on the importance of mentoring in academia. He advised that a transformative mentor should ask insightful questions that sometimes make the mentee uncomfortable, but these questions will awaken new roles and ideas. A transformative mentor does not necessarily give the mentee answers, but leads the mentee to deeper reflection and the development of his or her own answers. A transformative mentor tells good stories—not about how great the mentor is, but about the hard lessons learned along the way (Crow, 2012b).

Crow’s keynote speech was followed by two breakout sessions. The first breakout session matched mentors and emerging scholars on the basis of research interests. The second provided an opportunity for mentors and emerging scholars to discuss specific topics. These included developing a research focus; managing the work–life balance, transitioning from graduate student to junior professor, teaching courses in educational policy and politics, and incorporating issues of social justice in research on educational politics.

In addition to soliciting participation and matching mentors with emerging scholars, coordination of the Boyd Workshop involved the creation of an evaluation survey. The online program evaluation instrument (available upon request) consisted of 13 items, including both open- and closed-ended questions. The survey was forwarded to all 2012 workshop participants. In comparing 2011 responses to those of 2012, the response rate to the program evaluation survey increased (24% in 2011; 42% in 2012). Of the emerging scholars, 29 of 71 (41%) responded to the survey. Of mentors, 19 of 42 responded, yielding a response rate of 45% (see Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Participant n</th>
<th>Survey respondent n</th>
<th>Response rate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emerging scholars</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentors</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Descriptive analysis suggests that respondents were positive about their experiences at the 2012 Boyd Workshop (see Table 2). A majority of participants—98%—reported Session 1 as being very productive or somewhat productive. This is an increase compared to 2011 respondents, of whom 87% reported Session 1 as very productive or somewhat productive. As to the quality of the mentor–mentee match, nearly 48% of respondents reported an excellent match between mentors and emerging scholars. Only 2% reported a poor match in 2012. This is a decrease from 2011, when 9% of respondents reported a weak match for Session 1. These improvements may be explained by revised online application forms that utilized a series of short response items that narrowed topics by methodology and keywords. The same online application forms were utilized for the upcoming 2013 Boyd Workshop.

Feedback on Session 2 was generally positive—79% of participants reported that the second session was either very productive or somewhat productive. Approximately one fifth of respondents indicated that the productivity for Session 2 was somewhat unproductive. Likewise, the quality of the matching for Session 2 was not as strong as that of Session 1. This might be explained by the fact that when mentors volunteered to participate, they were asked to mark all of the breakout sessions they felt comfortable in discussing (developing a research focus, teaching courses in education politics and policy, jobs beyond the professoriate, managing the work–life balance, transitioning from graduate student to junior professor, and incorporating issues of social justice in research on educational politics). Responding mentors often marked numerous topics. The program coordinators used this greater flexibility in an effort to keep the mentor–mentee ratio as low as possible. Some program revisions were considered that might improve participant satisfaction with Session 2. These included constraining mentor options, such that they choose no more than three topics from the list. However, less flexibility and the potential for higher mentor–mentee ratios would likely be an issue in this course of action. A positive finding from this survey was that an overwhelming majority of participants reported that their overall experience was excellent or very good and that the length of the workshop was “just right.”

In addition to Likert-scale items, participants were also asked open-ended questions: “How could Session 1 be improved?” “How could Session 2 be improved?” and “Overall comments/suggestions for future Boyd Workshops.” Open-ended responses were analyzed and coded as positive, mixed, or critical (see Table 3 for examples). Critical comments made up 49.4% of the open-ended responses. Suggestions ranged from requesting more time, decreasing the noise level, increasing time with mentors, and decreasing the mentor–mentee ratio.

In summary, the 2012 Boyd Workshop Feedback Survey yielded valuable results to improve upon the delivery of future events. Some critical comments have already been acted upon (e.g., increased time with mentors). Others (e.g., larger or more individual meeting rooms) are difficult to accommodate due to logistics and limited financial resources. Increasing the quality of the match between mentor and emerging scholar was identified as an area in need of improvement after the 2011 Boyd Workshop. This remains no easy task and takes time, but the criticisms of matches decreased after the 2012 Boyd Workshop.

For 2013, we made the decision to cap emerging scholar registration by setting a registration deadline (February 11, 2013), or when we reached maximum capacity (85 emerging scholars). Matching and confirming attendance is vitally important to ensure that mentors and emerging scholars actually have the opportunity to meet and develop these relationships. For 2013, we will reiterate the importance of mentors and emerging scholars contacting each other well in advance of meeting personally. Two-way communication is integral to maximizing the experience.

Table 2
Descriptive Analysis of Closed-Ended Survey Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey item</th>
<th>Response options (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very productive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 1</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 2</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of mentor–emerging scholar match</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 1</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 2</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop length</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Just right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Looking Ahead to April 27, 2013…

Registration for the Boyd Workshop quickly reached full capacity before the end of November. While late applicants did not find room, reaching capacity quickly provided an opportunity to work on making quality matches. The William L. Boyd National Educational Politics Workshop for 2013 will be held Saturday, April 27, from 2:30 to 5:00 pm. The Boyd Workshop will continue to feature two breakout sessions, but these will be longer in 2013. After brief introductions and laying the ground rules, mentors and emerging scholars will move quickly to meetings. In the meantime, if you have any questions, please contact Dr. Kyle Ingle at wingle@bgsu.edu or Dr. Tamara Young at tamara_young@ncsu.edu.
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Table 3
Sample Open-Ended Item Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response type</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Sample comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>“The workshop was the exact session I was looking for. It (1) made me feel connected again; (2) aligned me with compassionate scholars; and (3) gave me the opportunity to share and receive ideas about the research process. Thank you!!” – Emerging scholar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“I enjoyed the opportunity to meet young/rising scholars. The fit was excellent with my research interests. Feel free to keep me on your database to serve as a mentor for young scholars with research interests related to —— ——.” – Faculty mentor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>“Have a bigger room to allow for more intimate conversations. My mentor and I were at a table with two other groups and it was hard to hear at times. My pairing was excellent and I very much enjoyed interacting with my mentor.” – Emerging scholar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“I enjoyed the mingle time and the refreshments as well as the sessions—sometimes those informal times are even more valuable than formal sessions in terms of renewing acquaintances or forging new connections—might think about building in a little more informal time if not between sessions at opening and closing of seminar—overall, very well done!!” – Faculty mentor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>“I encourage searching for a greater diversity of scholars of color to act as mentors.” – Emerging scholar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Ask students to write a one-page research interest summary and send it to mentors ahead of time.” – Faculty mentor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ICSEI: A Model for International Research and Development

Similar to UCEA, a host of professional organizations provide opportunities for scholars and practitioners to conduct research, shape policy, and influence the practices of teachers and school leaders. As UCEA strives to increase its international presence, a professional association that embodies an international perspective is the International Congress for School Effectiveness and Improvement (ICSEI). Their inaugural meeting in 1988 in London was attended by researchers, school district personnel, policy makers, and practitioners from Australia, the United Kingdom, Europe, Israel, Norway, Scotland, Scandinavia, South Africa, and North America. Reflecting the international character of the organization, subsequent conferences have been held around the world, including Israel, Wales, The Netherlands, Belarus, Hong Kong, Spain, Slovenia, Kuala Lumpur, North America, and Cyprus. The organization is overseen by a 10-member board of directors, consisting of representatives from at least five different countries. The board executives include a president, president elect, past president, and treasurer.

Purpose and Goals

ICSEI is intended to serve the professional interests of all those concerned with enhancing quality and equality of education, including policy makers, practitioners, and scholars around the world. The major dissemination strategies include the Annual Congress, relationships with journal publishers, website, and ICSEI networks. Their efforts reflect a concern for school effectiveness, school improvement, educational innovation and transformation, excellence in education, quality in education, equity in education, educational policy, school differences, and school effects.

ICSEI Networks

Among the most prominent development and dissemination strategies are ICSEI networks, which strengthen and facilitate the sharing of thoughts, experiences, and challenges as well as building professional learning communities between researchers, practitioners, and policy makers. All networks are provided website communication facilities and real-life meeting opportunities at the yearly conferences. All of the networks have an online forum where ICSEI members can contribute, initiate, or read current topics. All members of ICSEI can submit proposals to establish a new network, which are approved by the ICSEI Board. Currently, there are five networks, which are briefly described below.

The Early Childhood Education Network focuses on a variety of themes:
- evaluation and assessment practices;
- sustainable improvement, paradoxes, and dilemmas;
- policy development and implementation;
- interdisciplinary work across sectors;
- collaboration with parents;
- children’s perspectives in research and practices;
- children’s right to education;
- language, math, and literacy fluency;
- gender issues;
- cognitive skills and brain research; and
- relation between play and learning.

The Data Use Network gathers researchers from around the world who are conducting research on the strategies and challenges of using data within schools and educational systems. By sharing knowledge of data use, this network aims to increase effective data-use practices in all schools. Members examine how school leaders and teachers include data in their decision-making processes, factors that enable and hinder the use of data, interventions that support schools in the use of data, and effects of data use on student achievement. Particular attention is devoted to comparisons across countries to help researchers, practitioners, and politicians reflect more critically on what is happening in their own school systems.

The Educational Leadership Network provides a forum for leaders at all levels of the educational system to share and advance the creation of knowledge in leadership. The Educational Leadership Network was initiated in 2006 at the ICSEI Conference and has been developing in capacity and provision. For instance, during the 2012 ICSEI Conference in Malmo, Sweden, the first preconference was held in conjunction with the Data Use Network, and a special Educational Leadership symposium was organized.

The Methods of Researching Educational Effectiveness Network began in 2006 in Barcelona and has steadily increased in membership. This network seeks to
- present and interpret results of empirical studies in educational effectiveness;
- exchange ideas for research in effectiveness and evaluation of improvement programs;
- develop research proposals for studies in educational effectiveness, especially international comparative studies;
- discuss problems encountered in educational effectiveness research and identify possible solutions;
- identify new research methods for issues unique to educational effectiveness; and
- contribute to the establishment of a data bank of research instruments used in educational effectiveness studies.

The 3P Network provides a forum for exchanging professional practice and research between policy makers, politicians, and practitioners. Members examine the competences, knowledge, skills and behaviors these groups need in the following:
New Zealand, and the United States. Highlights of the day included research collaboratives, and identify critical issues for future international sessions to allow participants to share diverse perspectives on leadership. Tom Alsbury, Meredith Mountford, and Bruce Barnett) developed the inaugural International Summit was held at the Morgridge College of Education on the University of Denver campus. The planning committee (Michelle Young, Cindy Reed, Susan Korach, Tom Alsbury, Meredith Mountford, and Bruce Barnett) developed sessions to allow participants to share diverse perspectives on leadership preparation and development, examine existing international research collaboratives, and identify critical issues for future international research. Participants attended from many regions of the world, including Africa (Kenya), Australia, Central America (Costa Rica), Europe (Finland, Sweden), the Middle East (Saudi Arabia), New Zealand, and the United States. Highlights of the day included the following:

• Mika Riska, assistant director of the Institute of Educational Leadership at the University of Jyvaskyla (Finland), gave the keynote address, “USA–Finland and the Almost Trans-Atlantic Connection in Education.” The presentation was simulcast to University of Jyvaskyla, allowing for interaction between participants in Denver and Finland. Mika compared the ways in which Finland and the United States deal with PISA results, equity, the mission of education, education and society, evaluation, and school culture.

• Roundtable discussions were conducted by colleagues involved in three international research projects (International Successful School Principal Project, International Study of the Preparation of Principals, and International School Leadership Development Network). They shared their experiences managing and sustaining international research projects, understanding different cultural contexts and concepts, designing studies to obtain comparable data, and examining the realities of leadership in high-need schools.

• Meredith Mountford and Tom Alsbury facilitated a discussion about sustaining international research projects. They shared their views and solicited reactions on how international research can alter our perspectives, the importance of accommodating the needs of different team members.

• Meredith Mountford and Tom Alsbury facilitated a discussion about how international research projects, no matter what the topic, require patience, cooperation, flexibility, and synthesis.

• “International research should become a common way of researching.”

• “The benefit of international research is the richness of differences in cultures and practices which continues to challenge our beliefs and practices.”

• “International research is hard, difficult, negotiated work.”

• “International research rewards those who participate in it and stimulates new ways of thinking, being, and acting that can enrich researchers for life.”

• “International research projects, no matter what the topic, require patience, cooperation, flexibility, and synthesis.”

And they have kept coming back and attracting others because, like many networks, the issues of concern require something bigger than any individual can create. (ICSEI website, p. 1)

UCEA and its members not only can learn from the international networks ICSEI has developed but also should realize the shared interest in educational leadership, data use, policy development, and school effectiveness. Discussions have begun between UCEA and ICSEI leaders to determine ways in which our two organizations can collaborate in the future. Any ideas and suggestions for such a collaboration can be directed to Bruce Barnett, UCEA Associate Director of International Affairs (bruce.barnett@utsa.edu). For more information about ICSEI, visit their website: www.icsei.net

Inaugural UCEA International Summit at the 2012 Convention

On Sunday, November 18, 2012, following the 2012 UCEA Convention, the inaugural International Summit was held at the Morgridge College of Education on the University of Denver campus. The planning committee (Michelle Young, Cindy Reed, Susan Korach, Tom Alsbury, Meredith Mountford, and Bruce Barnett) developed sessions to allow participants to share diverse perspectives on leadership preparation and development, examine existing international research collaboratives, and identify critical issues for future international research. Participants attended from many regions of the world, including Africa (Kenya), Australia, Central America (Costa Rica), Europe (Finland, Sweden), the Middle East (Saudi Arabia), New Zealand, and the United States. Highlights of the day included the following:

• Mika Riska, assistant director of the Institute of Educational Leadership at the University of Jyvaskyla (Finland), gave the keynote address, “USA–Finland and the Almost Trans-Atlantic Connection in Education.” The presentation was simulcast to University of Jyvaskyla, allowing for interaction between participants in Denver and Finland. Mika compared the ways in which Finland and the United States deal with PISA results, equity, the mission of education, education and society, evaluation, and school culture.

• Roundtable discussions were conducted by colleagues involved in three international research projects (International Successful School Principal Project, International Study of the Preparation of Principals, and International School Leadership Development Network). They shared their experiences managing and sustaining international research projects, understanding different cultural contexts and concepts, designing studies to obtain comparable data, and examining the realities of leadership in high-need schools.

• Meredith Mountford and Tom Alsbury facilitated a discussion about sustaining international research projects. They shared their views and solicited reactions on how international research can alter our perspectives, the importance of funding, and the importance of accommodating the needs of different team members.

• Participants acknowledged important insights they gained about the complexities of engaging in international research and development projects. In particular, they mentioned the importance of understanding the assumptions, vocabulary, structures, and polices of countries involved in international research; the need for funding to support multinational research; and the value of having common goals, activities, and distributed leadership across the team. Comments from participants illustrate these insights:

• “International research should become a common way of researching.”

• “The benefit of international research is the richness of differences in cultures and practices which continues to challenge our beliefs and practices.”

• “International research is hard, difficult, negotiated work.”

• “International research rewards those who participate in it and stimulates new ways of thinking, being, and acting that can enrich researchers for life.”

• “International research projects, no matter what the topic, require patience, cooperation, flexibility, and synthesis.”

Based on the success of this initial experience, participants enthusiastically endorsed holding another International Summit following the 2013 UCEA Convention in Indianapolis. President Cindy Reed and Executive Director Michelle Young have agreed that the next International Summit will be Sunday, November 10, 2013. More information about this event will be distributed as the details are known. If you have questions or suggestions for the summit, please contact Bruce Barnett, UCEA Associate Director of International Affairs (bruce.barnett@utsa.edu), at the University of Texas at San Antonio.

2013 International Summit:
Sunday, November 10
Trends in International Research and Development
From the 2012 UCEA Convention

As UCEA continues to support and publicize international research and development projects, our annual convention has become an excellent resource for colleagues around the world to learn about and share ideas. During the 2012 UCEA Convention, presentations examined leadership issues in many countries outside the United States, with particular focus on what is occurring in these regions of the world:

- Africa (Egypt, Kenya, Mali, Somalia),
- Asia (Hong Kong, Philippines),
- Australia and New Zealand,
- Europe (Italy, Turkey),
- the Middle East (Israel, Kuwait),
- North America (Bermuda, Canada, Costa Rica, Mexico),
- Scandinavia (Finland, Norway, Sweden), and
- the 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 these major areas:

- women and leadership,
- leadership preparation and standards,
- leadership influence at the school and district levels,
- ethical and globally minded leaders,
- school governance, and
- leadership approaches (e.g., democratic, social justice, culturally relevant, entrepreneurial).

As these topics 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 facing American school leaders, such as governance, equity, 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 in Educational Leadership, Journal of Research on Leadership Education) also are encouraging international submissions and special issues.

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

http://ucea.org/international

At a Crossroads: The Educational Leadership Professoriate in the 21st Century
by Donald G. Hackmann & Martha M. McCarthy

This volume represents the results of a comprehensive study of educational leadership faculty and the departments and programs in which they work. It reports the characteristics, activities, and attitudes of educational leadership faculty involved in university-based educational leadership preparation programs in 2008 and provides longitudinal comparisons with data from studies conducted since 1972. Findings are compared by type of institution and with respondents grouped by sex, race, administrative experience, type of appointment (tenure-line or clinical), length of time in the professoriate, and affiliation with UCEA and the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration. While the number of university-based leadership preparation programs continues to grow, the average faculty size has declined. Among major trends are an increase in female faculty (from 2% in 1972 to 45% in 2008) and the reduction in gender differences in attitudes and activities since the mid-1980s. Also, over the past few decades, there has been a significant increase in faculty occupying non-tenure-line positions, having administrative experience, and focusing on leadership in general, in contrast to a content specialization. These and other developments have significant implications for leadership preparation programs and for knowledge production in our field.
The UCEA 2012 Convention in Denver included an inaugural UCEA Film Festival that featured eight short films produced by educational leadership faculty and candidates. A panel of five reviewers selected these films for screening based upon content and production scoring criteria. (You can see these films on the UCEA website: http://www.ucea.org/ucea-2012-film-festival/). These two UCEA Film Festival programs inspired rich dialogue related to the diverse ways that video production may be used in leadership preparation programs. This article shares three big ideas based upon this dialogue to inform innovations in utilizing video to prepare educational leaders, and concludes with tips for filmmakers who would like to submit 5-minute videos for the UCEA 2013 Convention’s Film Festival in Indianapolis.

1. Video Production to Support Learning in Educational Leadership Programs

Advances in video production technology have made filmmaking more accessible as an active learning tool for faculty members and candidates in educational leadership programs. With minimal training or tutorials, videos can be filmed and edited using an iPad or a digital camera and laptop computer. Digital storytelling is one application of video that encourages “deep reflection, self-discovery, and the construction of personal story” (Guajardo et al., 2011, p. 145). At the UCEA Film Festival we saw two examples of digital storytelling from North Carolina State University, one from Tonya Little titled “Awakened” (see the video at http://vimeo.com/46239871) and one from Yolanda Wiggins, Melissa Harris-Richardson, and Shelley Williams titled, “Halifax, North Carolina” (see the video at http://vimeo.com/46240440).

Video simulations and video portfolios are additional ways that candidates can experience active learning through media. Virginia Commonwealth University filmed 15 video scenarios in K-12 schools that required candidates to make leadership decisions. Candidates received individual feedback based on a scoring rubric associated with consequences of their decisions (Mann, Reardon, Becker, Shakeshaft, & Bacon, 2011). At the University of Missouri–Kansas City, candidates in a Media and Public Relations class created video portfolios that included a formal address to a group of stakeholders and a simulated television news interview pertaining to a crisis situation in a school. Candidates reviewed their portfolios in collaborative groups at the end of the semester and felt better prepared to engage with the media (Friend, Adams, & Curry, 2011).

Whether produced by faculty members or leadership candidates, the possibilities for using video in support of learning are limitless.

2. Video and Documentary Film as a Research Tool

The use of video in research is not new; what has changed is that videotaped interviews or classroom footage are no longer relegated to a locked filing cabinet in the researcher’s office. Although some Institutional Review Boards may see documentary filmmaking or video production more as entertainment than as a legitimate form of research, methodologies employed by faculty members to produce educational documentary films have closer ties to scholarship than to Hollywood. There are many “choice points” in filmmaking that parallel decisions in qualitative research methodology: (a) where to point the camera (site selection); (b) individuals who will be videotaped (participant selection); (c) data collection protocol such as equipment used for recording video and audio, when to begin and end video recording, and what to say to direct or prompt your video participants; (d) data analysis to select video clips during editing, the order in which you will present these clips, and other video elements (such as music, motion graphics, recorded narration, title cards, etc.); and (e) sharing the results with an audience.

Two short documentary films, “What Kids Love and Hate About School” (Friend, 2006) and “What Teens Love and Hate About School” (Friend & Riggs, 2011) were created using qualitative research methods: (a) consent forms from student participants and their parents, (b) transcriptions of the videotaped interviews, (c) pattern coding to identify frequencies of common themes, and (d) video editing to represent these findings. Presenting your video research findings is easily accomplished by posting short video clips on the internet (YouTube channel, Vimeo, your institution’s website), incorporating the video in a lesson with students in higher education classrooms, using the video as part of a professional development session with educators and leaders in preK-12 settings, sending an e-mail link to legislators and policy makers, or hosting community screenings with panel discussions. Video research is also becoming more visible at educational research conferences, as evidenced by the UCEA and American Educational Research Association Film Festivals in 2012 and 2013. As we expand the use of video research methods, we must keep in mind Goldman’s (2007) considerations that “media tools can privilege certain mainstream perspectives,” and therefore it is important to engage marginalized individuals as “creators of knowledge” and not just as video subjects or “end-users of products” (p. 34).

3. Video Created in Service to the Program and the Educational Leadership Profession

Video can also be used to share innovative program features or to promote programs. At the UCEA Film Festival we saw four examples of innovative programs. Dr. Patrick Schuermann shared a video related to Vanderbilt University’s Leadership Capacity Building Program in Abu Dhabi (see the video at http://vimeo.com/47025282). Dr. April Peters-Hawkins from the University of Georgia College of Education shared a video about an Early Career Principal Residency Program (see the video at http://vimeo.com/54708512). Dr. Matthew Militello presented a video on social justice training from North Carolina State University’s leadership program (see the video at http://vimeo.com/46236223). Dr. Thomas J. Halverson from the University of Washington shared a video about the Master of Education program in Education Policy
(see the video at [http://vimeo.com/46706256](http://vimeo.com/46706256)). In addition to producing videos that share program innovations, leadership faculty and candidates can partner with local school districts and other organizations to create videos that share innovative and effective leadership practices in preK-12 schools.

**Recommendations for Filmmakers**

Several recommendations for emerging filmmakers were discussed during the Film Festival programs. Educational leadership candidates and faculty members who are interested in creating a 5-minute film for submission to the 2013 UCEA Convention Film Festival may want to partner with students in high school or university film programs to create videos. These partnerships provide valuable experience for the film students and lead to higher production value at no cost to leadership programs. A small budget can enable you to hire a professional crew, such as Vanderbilt University’s video, which cost $5,000 to produce. It is essential to have good audio, and therefore an external microphone (not a microphone built into the video camera) is recommended. Lavaliers or “lapel” microphones are best for capturing interview audio, and a “shotgun” microphone mounted on a boom pole is better for capturing audio in a group setting. When filming in a classroom, for example, a filmmaker could use two video cameras recording at the same time (one following the facilitators, and one following the participants) and could consider having the facilitators wear lavaliere microphones while the room audio is captured using the shotgun microphone.

It is important to pay attention to ethical considerations when planning your project to avoid objectification, voyeurism, or commodification of participants’ voices. Legal considerations are also a critical component of filmmaking. Release forms for adults and for minors and their parents must be obtained before any video or audio recording takes place (see sample media release form). When filming in a public setting, display notices at the entry points and videotape these posted notices as a record that the public was made aware that filming is taking place (see sample public notice; full size versions available at the UCEA website). Copyright laws are another element to follow when using music, images, and narrative that are not created by the filmmakers. Thank you to the many participants who engaged in the UCEA 2012 Film Festival sessions and contributed to the dialogue. Watch for the new call for video submissions on the UCEA website, and we’ll see you next year at the UCEA 2013 Convention Film Festival in Indianapolis!

**References**


---

**Sample Release Forms**

**Authorization and Permission to Use Photographs, Videotape, and Soundtape**

For valuable consideration, I hereby give _________, (hereafter, “University”) the absolute and irrevocable right and permission, with respect to the photographs or video footage taken of me on _______ 20__, at __________, and recorded on video tape, audio tape, film, DVD or CD, or any other medium;

a. To copyright the same in its name, _________________________;

b. To use, reuse, publish and republish and sell the same in whole or in part, individually or in conjunction with other photographs, videos or images, in any medium, including, but not limited to, posting on websites, broadcasting on television, screening in theatres and public events, releasing on DVD;

c. To use my name, likeness, voice and biographical material in connection with these recordings; and

d. To use my name in connection therewith if University so chooses.

I hereby release ____________, a public corporation, each and every member of the ____________, its employees, agents, assigns and any designee from any and all claims and demands arising out of or in connection with the use of such photographs, videotape and soundtape, including but not limited to any claims for defamation or invasion of privacy. I am of legal age (18 years or older), and have read the foregoing and fully understand the contents thereof.

Name: _________________________     Witness Signature:____________________

Address: _________________________________      Phone ________________          E-mail  _________________

Signature: _________________________     Witness Signature:____________________

---

**Notice of Videotaping and Photography**

This notice is to inform attendees of the ________ event on ______ 20__, at _____________, that ____________ will be taking photographs and making audio and visual recordings on behalf of ____________ during this event open to the public. ____________ reserves the absolute and irrevocable right and permission, with respect to the photographs, audio, or video footage recorded on video tape, audio tape, film, DVD or CD, or any other medium;

a. To copyright the same in its name, _________________________; and

b. To use, reuse, publish and republish, and sell the same in whole or in part, individually or in conjunction with other photographs, videos or images, in any medium, including, but not limited to, posting on its websites, for University purposes.

For full-size samples, see www.ucea.org
2012 Jackson Scholars Research Seminar

On Thursday morning, November 15, 2012, the Jackson Scholars Research Seminar featured second-year scholars presenting various stages of their research to date. UCEA scholars, Jackson Scholars Mentors, and first-year Jackson Scholars provided insight and feedback to the presenters. In the afternoon, UCEA Associate Director for Graduate Student Development Cristobal Rodriguez opened the annual Julie Laible Session to introduce first-year Jackson Scholars to the network and engage them with their cohort and mentors.

On Friday evening, November 16, 2012, UCEA's General Session IV honored Jackson Scholars and featured Dr. John H. Jackson, president of the Schott Foundation for Public Education. His presentation promoted scholars as activists for change and paid tribute to the recent passing of Barbara Jackson and her legacy as an inspiration for their scholarly accomplishments. Cristobal Rodriguez provided certificates of participation to second-year Jackson Scholars who presented at the Research Seminar and distributed certificates to welcome first-year Jackson Scholars.

The Jackson Scholars Summit followed this session hosting a networking reception for scholars and mentors. Current first- and second-year Jackson Scholars total 100 doctoral students—the largest ever since the 2004 inception of the Jackson Scholars Network—with 60 first-year scholars in the 2012-2014 cohort and 40 second-year scholars in the 2011-2013 cohort. The following second-year Jackson Scholars presented at the 2012 UCEA Jackson Scholars Research Seminar:

Nnenna Amu – Pennsylvania State University
Joshua Childs – University of Pittsburgh
Leah Dardis – University of Arizona
Terrance Green – University of Wisconsin-Madison
Maritza Lozano – University of Pittsburgh
Eligio Martinez – University of Washington
Berlinda Morton – Louisiana State University
Chinasa Ordu – Clemson University
Kimberley Stiemke – California State University–San Marcos
Daniela Torre – Vanderbilt University
Kathryn Torres – University of Washington
James Vines – Clemson University
Yinying (Helen) Wang – University of Cincinnati
Reginald Wilkerson – University of North Carolina–Greensboro
Sabrina Zamora – New Mexico State University

2013 Clark Scholars

Bowling Green State University – Gereon Vaughn Methner
Cleveland State University – Glenda Toneff-Cotner
Florida A&M University – Dwayne Raiford
Florida State University – Scott Grubbs
Indiana University – Colleen E. Chesnut
Loyola Marymount University – Dana Lebental
Michigan State University – Dorothy Hines
Michigan State University – Sean Williams
New Mexico State University – Wendi Miller-Tomlinson
Ohio State University – Lauren Bailes
OISE, University of Toronto – Vidiya Shah
Pennsylvania State University – Emily Hodge
Pennsylvania State University – Hilario Lomeli
Sam Houston State University – Leah McAlister-Shields
San Diego State University – Richard Vernon Moore
Syracuse University – Douglas Wieczorek
University of Arizona – Thad Dugan
University of California–Davis – Liseeth Cruz
University of California–Davis – Rosalyn Earl
University of Cincinnati – Qinghua Huang
University of Cincinnati – Yinying (Helen) Wang
University of Georgia – Ann Elizabeth Blankenship
University of Georgia – Jia Liang
University of Illinois at Chicago – Jessica Gottlieb
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign – Jason A. Swanson
University of Kentucky – Twanjuja L. G. Jones
University of Maryland–College Park – Kathleen Mulvaney Hoyer
University of Missouri – Haigen Huang
University of North Carolina–Greensboro – Tiffany Perkins
University of Oklahoma – Regina Lopez
University of Oklahoma – J. Taylor Tribble
University of Pittsburgh – Jennifer Rene Crandall
University of San Diego – Tammy Wu Moriarty
University of Texas at Austin – Rebecca Cohen
University of Texas at Austin – Melinda A. Lemke
University of Texas at Austin, LBJ School – Jenna Cullinane
University of Texas at San Antonio – Chryssa Delgado
University of Texas Pan American – Richard Kirk
University of Texas Pan American – Dagoberto Ramirez
University of Vermont – Vincent Mutembeya Mugisha
University of Washington – Wesley Henry
Vanderbilt University – Xiao (Art) Peng

www.ucea.org
UCEA Announces 2012 Award Recipients

UCEA’s annual awards were presented at the 26th annual convention in Denver, Colorado, November 15-18, 2012.

Roald F. Campbell Lifetime Achievement Award: Kenneth Arthur Leithwood

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 2012 recipient of the Roald F. Campbell Lifetime Achievement Award is Dr. Kenneth Leithwood, Professor Emeritus of Educational Leadership and Policy, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto. Dr. Leithwood's research and writing concerns school leadership, educational policy, and organizational change. He has published more than 70 referred journal articles and authored or edited more than 30 books. For example, he is the senior editor of the first and second International Handbooks on Educational Leadership and Administration (Kluwer, 1996, 2003). His most recent books include Distributed Leadership: The State-of-the-Science (2008), Leadership With Teachers’ Emotions In Mind (2008), Making Schools Smarter (3rd edition, 2006), and Teaching for Deep Understanding (2006). Professor Leithwood is the recent recipient of the University of Toronto’s Impact on Public Policy award and is a Fellow of the Royal Society of Canada. Among his current research projects is a large, 5-year Wallace Foundation study, with colleagues, aimed at determining how state, district, and school-level leadership influences student learning.

UCEA Master Professor Award: María Luisa González

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 2011 UCEA Master Professor recipient is Dr. María Luisa González, associate dean and professor at the University of Texas at El Paso. Before completing her doctorate at New Mexico State University (NMSU), she worked with the El Paso Independent School District as a teacher, teacher leader, and instructional specialist. She also served as a statewide consultant supporting the development of teachers and administrators in the education of English language learners. After receiving her doctorate, she joined the Research and Development unit in the Dallas Independent School District, where she was initially involved in district-wide testing and the school reform unit. She also worked as a principal of an inner-city school that received Congressional recognition for its exemplary work with homeless children. Dr. González served at NMSU for 24 years. During her time as a faculty member and the 10 years she was department head, she was the recipient of several awards, including the Regents Endowed Professorship, Rousch Award for Teaching Excellence, and New Mexico Governor’s Award for Outstanding Women. She was executive director for a center serving rural and border schools. Dr. González brought over $20 million to NMSU through numerous grants that offered innovative designs in the preparation of leaders serving English language learners. Her publications include a book on the schooling of Latino children, chapters in edited books, and articles in national journals on school leadership and the impact on vulnerable student populations.

Jay D. Scribner Mentoring Award: James Joseph Scheurich

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. James Joseph “Jim” Scheurich is Professor of Urban Education Studies and the coordinator of the PhD Program in Urban Education Studies at Indiana University–Bloomington. He graduated with his doctorate from the Ohio State University and served as a professor for 12 years at the University of Texas at Austin and as a professor in the Department of Educational Administration and Human Resource Development at Texas A&M University. Dr. Scheurich has helped prepare over 20
doctoral students who are now university professors across the country and in Texas, and he has chaired to completion 27 doctoral students. One of his students won the Dissertation of the Year from two AERA Divisions (D & G) in the same year. He has raised over $6 million in external funds, all focused on improving schools for low-income children and children of color and most focused on urban districts. He has served on editorial boards including EAQ and the Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership. He has served on the UCEA Executive Committee, the AERA Publications Committee, and the AERA Presidential Nominating Committee. Since 1998, he has been the editor of the International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education. He is the author of two books, Anti-Racist Scholarship and Research Method in the Postmodern, and coauthor of The Knowledge Base in Educational Administration. In addition, he and a coauthor have another book under contract and nearly completed, Equity and Accountability. He is the author or coauthor of numerous articles in journals including Educational Researcher, Journal of Education Policy, Urban Education, EAQ, Education and Urban Society, and the International Journal of Leadership in Education.

Jack A. Culbertson Award: Alex Bowers

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 2011 Jack A. Culbertson award recipient is Dr. Alex J. Bowers, associate professor of Educational Leadership at the Teacher’s College at Columbia University. He was an assistant professor in the College of Education and Human Development, Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at the University of Texas at San Antonio. His research interests include organizational behavior, school and district leadership, data-driven decision making, high school dropouts, educational assessment and accountability, leadership preparation, and school facilities financing. Dr. Bowers’s research methods strengths include data visualization and early student outcome prediction; comparative causal effects research design; comparative organization case-study design; large state and national-level database analysis; and longitudinal multilevel student, school, and district achievement analysis. He earned his PhD in Educational Administration from Michigan State University in 2007.

Paula Silver Case Award: Lisa Bass, Gregg Garn, & Lisa Monroe

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 three recipients this year, Dr. Lisa Bass, Dr. Gregg Garn, and Dr. Lisa Monroe. The award reflected the following criteria: (a) complexity, in a case that would challenge students who would be discussing the case in a graduate-level educational administration class; (b) rich contextual detail; (c) ambiguity that would stimulate students to offer multiple interpretations and varied solutions to the problems described; and (d) relevance to most students in educational leadership programs. In addition, the committee looked for a case that was free of ideological bias—a case that did not suggest a particular ideological approach to an educational leadership problem but rather encouraged case readers to suggest multiple approaches and ideological perspectives when analyzing and discussing the case.

Bass (pictured), Garn, and Monroe wrote a case entitled “Using JCEL Case Studies to Meet ELCC Standards,” published in the March 2011 edition of the Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership (JCEL). The purpose of this article was to discuss the value of JCEL in teaching the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) standards. In this article, the authors discussed the process of how a department of educational leadership developed an appreciation for the journal by aligning JCEL cases to NCATE standards for the purpose of the instruction of educational leadership. Next, a faculty member shared her experience with employing case studies in her teaching. Finally, a table (including cases through 2009) that is distributed to faculty members of the department was included.

Looking Ahead

It’s not too early to think about honorees for the 2013 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.

Nominations for UCEA’s 2013 awards competition are due May 31, 2013. Please see www.ucea.org for information on criteria and the nomination process.

Contributions to the award fund are welcome and should be sent to UCEA, the University of Virginia, Curry School of Education, 405 Emmet St., Charlottesville, VA, 22903.
Call for Proposals: UCEA Convention 2013

“Seeking New Understandings of Persistent Challenges: A Call to Action to (Re)Unite Research, Policy, and Practice With Community”

I. General Information

The 27th annual UCEA Convention will be held at the Hyatt Regency Hotel in Indianapolis, Indiana. The convention will commence Thursday, November 7, 2013, at noon and will conclude Sunday, November 10, 2013, at 1:00 p.m. The purpose of the 2013 UCEA Convention is to engage participants in discussions about research, policy, and practice in educational leadership and administration. Members of the Convention 2013 Program Committee are Mark A. Gooden (University of Texas–Austin), Terah Venzant Chambers (Texas A&M University), Muhammad Khalifa (Michigan State University), and Samantha Paredes Scribner (Indiana University–IUPUI).

II. UCEA Convention Theme

The 27th Annual UCEA Convention theme, “Seeking New Understandings of Persistent Challenges: A Call to Action to (Re)Unite Research, Policy, and Practice with Community,” is meant to capture the importance of the role of community contexts in which we all exist, navigate, and serve. At times, educational reforms are discussed in the absence of a community's role in education. This year’s theme addresses connections between and among research, policy, and practice, with attention to a broad range of community concerns. To this end, the conference theme acknowledges that many of the challenges facing educational leadership are longstanding and have important historical contexts that must be considered. Given the chronic nature of these issues, we intend for the 2013 Convention to provide a forum for fresh, engaging, and viable ideas that will be useful to researchers, practitioners, and policy makers and, more importantly, to encourage coalitions where these constituent groups can work together to put these ideas into action.

We acknowledge that there are competing notions of what or who counts as “community” and how local, state, and federal politics and current reforms may privilege or disadvantage different “communities.” Educational leaders, increasingly, must skillfully navigate the politics of “community” and its competing conceptions. Thus, we encourage broad, far-reaching interpretations of community and welcome submissions that consider the role of educational leadership in international settings; local neighborhood contexts; local, state, and federal environments; and, of course, communities within schools. Further, we realize that community will resonate in diverse ways across the field of educational leadership, ranging from “school community” and “professional learning community” to “the Black community” and “a community of scholars,” and we welcome these and other broad applications of the community theme.

Common to all of these notions of community is a sense of coming together for a purpose, such as seeking new understandings of persistent challenges. We invite submissions that dare to make bold connections within and across these many notions of community in order to address both old challenges and new permutations of those challenges facing educational leadership. Finally, given the convention’s focus on community, we strongly encourage conversations and presentations that involve collaborations with community stakeholders.

To address the 2013 UCEA Convention theme, “Seeking New Understandings of Persistent Challenges: A Call to Action to (Re)Unite Research, Policy, and Practice With Community,” we invite members of the UCEA community and other educational leaders to come to explore new ways to conceptualize community by (a) sharing their relevant research and proposing viable methods to employ research to inform leadership preparation, practice, and policy at local, state, national, and international arenas; (b) developing ways in which educational leaders can work with the community to improve academic excellence, center equity, and conduct social justice work in P-20 educational contexts; and (c) engaging in dialogue, planning, and collaborative scholarship to enhance our efforts to create quality leadership preparation. The following suggested topics and related questions are provided to stimulate thinking about the 2013 UCEA Convention and theme, although proposals addressing themes related to other aspects of community are welcomed.

A. Leadership in the Urban Context. “Community” is a particularly complex notion in urban environments, which offer an opportunity to consider complex, multilayered challenges in a large-scale context. Indeed, “community” may be most important in these settings. Thus, we ask how might educational leaders foster a sense of community in these multifaceted environments. At the same time, in what ways must school leaders juggle the competing demands of diverse communities within their schools as well as surrounding neighborhoods?
B. Educational Leadership in the Global Community. As technology advances, the idea of a global community becomes more meaningful. In what ways do educational leaders, researchers, and other constituent groups create international community, and what can we learn from our international neighbors that might inform the work we do in our local communities? In what ways are community ties created and sustained internationally?

C. Community in Educational Leadership Preparation Programs.

a. What role should the community play in leadership preparation program content and experiences? What responsibility do we have to encourage future leaders to cultivate meaningful partnerships with and within the community? If faculty members teaching in preparation programs have not cultivated relationships with the community, is it reasonable to expect that students will have the tools to do this in their own schools?

b. There are particular challenges inherent in creating community in online teaching and learning environments. Is it important to create community in online classes? Increasingly, leadership preparation programs are moving to hybrid (online and face-to-face) or 100% online formats. What is the role of community in these environments? What considerations are there in enhancing the sense of community in online classes and programs?

c. Given the increasingly challenging contexts in which educational leaders practice, what is the role of district partners in educational leadership preparation? Is it important to prepare leaders for and within the communities in which they will eventually lead? What value is added by partnering with local districts in preparation?

D. Community Partnerships. Educational leaders have to develop partnerships with organizations across multiple sectors, including educational organizations across the P-20 continuum, community and faith-based organizations, businesses, and educational reform networks. How do leaders effectively develop and sustain such partnerships? How do schools and communities benefit from such partnerships? What are the measures of effective partnerships? How are leaders prepared to ethically and effectively navigate partnership work?

E. Politics and Policy. Local, state, and federal policies shape and are shaped by communities in and around schools. How do educational leaders negotiate educational policy environment in the interest of developing equitable and high-quality programs for all students? How are community interests represented in local, state, and federal politics? How are educational leaders prepared to navigate the intersections of school/district policies with other local politics and policies (e.g., housing, immigration, law enforcement, etc.)?

F. Collaborative Research. A focus on reconnecting research, policy, and practice to community-based concerns calls for attention to the work scholars are doing in collaboration with community members outside the university, in and around school communities. How are scholars collaborating with community members, organizations, practitioners, or other constituents to engage in community-based educational research? How is collaborative research carried out ethically and in the service of educational progress? How is technology utilized to enhance collaborative research? What kinds of products emerge from such research? How are community voices represented in this work?

The 2013 UCEA Convention Call for Proposals encourages submissions that explore the above themes as well as proposals focused on the landscape of quality leadership preparation; research and engaged scholarship on connections to leadership in the urban context; research on global issues and contexts influencing the field of educational leadership; effective preparation program designs and improvement efforts; successful community partnerships that enhance leadership, policy work, and politics; collaborative research that really enriches the community; and other issues that impact the current and future practice of educational leaders and augment the latitude of influence of educational leadership research.

Based on feedback from 2012 convention attendees, the 2013 convention will bring back two new session formats—unconference1 and Ignite2 sessions. These sessions provide purposeful opportunities for in-depth, spontaneous dialogues and deliberations on topics critical to educational leadership. The unconference sessions will reflect Open Space Technology3 principles that honor the expertise present, the power of self-organized social networks, and the value of learning conversations. We invite all attendees to step out of our traditional formats and boldly think “as if there is no box” by sharing innovations, collaborating, networking, and learning through these unconference sessions. Unconference sessions offer a unique opportunity

to engage in intense discussions and expand collaborative networks for exploring topics or research of interest, building off of ideas generated by a prior session or keynote, sharing submissions that were not accepted, etc. No proposal, only attendance, is needed for participation in unconference sessions.

Ignite sessions are best summarized by the motto, “Enlighten us, but make it quick.” The Ignite sessions follow a specific structure for sparking interest and awareness of multiple topics while encouraging additional thought and action from the audience. Presenters focus on a single message that shares personal and professional passions and/or unique strategies and approaches. The submission of a proposal is needed for an Ignite session, and details are included in the Session Descriptions section of this call. It is our hope that new research, publications, collaborations, and professional relationships will emerge from these nontraditional sessions.

III. UCEA Convention Session Categories

A. Paper Session. 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 policy, research, or practice issues from several perspectives; contribute significantly to the knowledge base; and allow for dialogue and discussion. Session organizers are expected to chair the session and facilitate discussion. Symposium participants are expected to develop and provide electronic copies of papers presented during the session.

C. 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. These sessions must focus on critical issues of leadership practice, development, or research from 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.

D. Critical Conversations/Dialogue. 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.

E. Innovative Sessions and Mini-Workshops. 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 or mini-workshop (to be held during the convention), the innovative format, and how the format will enhance adult learning and discussion.

F. Ignite Sessions. These sessions are intended to stimulate informal, lively discussions using a cluster of four to five 5-minute presentations with no more than 20 slides per presentation, where each slide is displayed for approximately 15 seconds while the speaker addresses the audience. The intent of an Ignite session is to spark interest and awareness of multiple yet similar topics while encouraging additional thought and action on the part of presenters and members of the audience. Ignite sessions are an ideal way to present innovations, effective strategies and tools, problems of practice, collaborations, etc. The proposal summary should be for an individual (5-minute) Ignite presentation that describes the purpose and topic of the 5-minute presentation, relevant literature, findings (if relevant), and examples of questions or areas to be addressed. Examples of “Ignite” Sessions:

http://www.youtube.com/user/iGNiTe?blend=1&ehh=4#p/u/3/rqSkulkwQ98
http://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PL9790118FDAAA1D9A

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 directly 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.

UCEA is offering two additional ways for engagement in the 2013 Convention. First, for graduate students, UCEA has established a Graduate Student Symposium for doctoral students as a preconference session. Successfully launched at the 2012 Convention in Denver, the Symposium will be returning at the 2013 Convention in Indianapolis. Doctoral students from UCEA member institutions will be invited to submit proposals similar to UCEA’s format and present them during this preconference session. Further details regarding the call for proposals for this graduate student presession will follow later this month and can be found on the Graduate Student portion of the UCEA website: http://www.ucea.org/graduate-student-development/.

Second, for those who are handy with audio-visual technology, the 2013 UCEA Convention will again play host to a Film Festival! UCEA has opened an opportunity for submissions of 5-minute videos that explore broadly the landscape of quality leadership preparation, including our research and engaged scholarship, our preparation program designs and improvement efforts, our policy work, and the practice of educational leaders. Video submissions may relate to the conference theme or share educational leadership program features, innovations, and impacts. Additional details are posted in the UCEA Review and on the UCEA website: http://www.ucea.org.

IV. Criteria for Review of UCEA Convention 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 proposal reviewers. Proposals for papers, symposia, and international community building sessions will be evaluated for
- relevance of research problem, policy, or 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 10, 2013. All proposals must be submitted electronically at the link to be provided at the UCEA homepage (http://www.ucea.org). This site will officially open April 1, 2013.

Submission length must not exceed 3 single-spaced pages (approximately 2,000 words or 8,000 characters) using 12-point font (Times New 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 (October 17, 2013). 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 appear as first author on no more than two proposals. In addition, an individual may appear on the program no 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 headquarters, committees, or publications.

DEADLINE: May 10, 2013

www.ucea.org
Contributing to the UCEA Review

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

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

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

Interview Editor:
Lisa Bass (North Carolina State University)
lrbass@ncsu.edu

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

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

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

2013 Calendar

February 2013
2013 UCEA Convention Planning Meeting

March 2013
Executive Committee meeting, UCEA HQ
Excellence in Ed. Leadership nominations due Mar. 15

April 2013
David L. Clark Graduate Student Research Seminar, San Francisco, Apr. 26-27
Barbara L. Jackson Scholars Research Summit, San Francisco, Apr. 27
William L. Boyd National Educational Politics Workshop, San Francisco, Apr. 27
AERA convention, San Francisco, Apr. 27-May 1

May 2013
UCEA 2013 Convention proposals due May 10
UCEA Award nominations due May 31

November 2013
UCEA 2013 Convention Nov. 7-10, Indianapolis, IN
UCEA 2013 International Summit, Nov. 10, Indianapolis