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Thank you all for being here this morning. It has been my honor to serve as your president for the past year. I’ve been involved with UCEA since I was a doctoral student at New Mexico State University. The UCEA presidency has been the ultimate way for me to give back to an organization that has given so much for me.

Today, I’m going to guide you through a retrospective journey. But before we launch into that, I must thank those who have made this journey possible.

I am dedicating my presidential address to the loving memory of my mother, Dora Morales Rodriguez, who was my first teacher and served as an educational assistant for students with special needs at both the elementary and high school settings.

I’d like to begin by thanking my family members who are present this morning—my father, Juan José Rodríguez, my husband, Edwin Carrasquillo—the two best men in my life. Thank you both for your guidance and support as I follow my dreams. Thank you to my sister, Irma Riojas, and her husband, Henry, for joining us this morning. Thank you for always keeping me motivated and encouraging me to do my best. Thank you also to the members of the Rodríguez family who are here, my tías and tíos. It means so much to me to have you here today.

I also need to thank my academic family, my faculty at the University of Texas at San Antonio. Thank you for allowing me to learn alongside you for the past 15 years. It has been an exciting journey, and I appreciate the support that each of you has shown me throughout the years. We are true friends. I am blessed to work alongside you everyday.

In appreciation to my students for all of the work they do to be tireless advocates for the children that they serve. Thank you for being
my inspiration. The work that you do in schools every day to provide better learning opportunities for children in the San Antonio area serves as motivation for me to continue my own work. It means so much to have some of you present here this morning.

I must also recognize Laura Marcela Cardona, my intern. She sent me an e-mail over the summer asking if she could work with me as an intern for the upcoming academic year. She asked if I had any special projects that I might need help with. “Why yes,” I replied, “there is this big speech I need to give in Houston in November.” Laura’s time, energy, and words of encouragement have helped me organize this address. The research she conducted to help me prepare has been invaluable.

I also want to thank my UCEA family, in particular the fellow members of the Executive Committee. Each of you is so talented. I’m so glad that we take in this journey together. Thank you for the opportunity to grow with you. There are so many great memories to look back on and many new memories to make.

A huge thank you to Michelle Young, UCEA executive director. I met you while I was still a PhD student at New Mexico State University. I’m thrilled that our friendship and professional associations have continued across all of these years. Michelle, you have served this organization for almost two decades with such grace. Thank you for giving so much of yourself to this organization that has shaped us all. You are an amazing role model. Thank you!

And then, there’s Malú. You know that you are one of the primary reasons that I’m standing here today. You introduced me to this excellent organization and taught me the value of service. I still remember that it was 1998, my first year as a PhD student, and you asked me if I was going to UCEA in St. Louis that year. I replied that I wasn’t because I didn’t have anything to present. You didn’t miss a beat and said, “Sure you do. You’re presenting with me.” And the rest, as they say, is history. I have so much to be thankful to you and Keith for. You’ve housed me, you’ve fed me, you have nourished my soul. I can ALWAYS count on you. You are a shining example of what academic parents should be. I love you.

Recounting the Past

Now let’s begin our journey. I invite you to take a walk with me along a sandy beach. We feel the warmth between our toes. We leave our footprints in the sand as we walk. It can feel soft when there are some smooth patches. It can also feel rough when there are some rocky patches. As we look around we see the vast amounts of sand and notice that its grains are countless. But we’ll come back to that later.

Another way that sand has been used is by drawing the proverbial “line in the sand.” In times of battle, a line was drawn in the sand to indicate where the opposing group should not cross—a line of demarcation. It is a demonstration of the stance that a group or individual has taken. It signals that we “won’t stand for that anymore.” I ask you to reflect on times when you have drawn a “line in the sand.” Consider what led to your decision. Was it your values, your moral code? Was it based on your own experiences? How did you speak out?

I’m going to share three stories with you that describe when a line was drawn in the sand and its educational implications. Let me begin with a personal story. I was born and raised in Brownsville, Texas, along the U.S.-Mexico border. On my father’s side, I’m the granddaughter of Juan and Juanita Rodríguez. They raised 13
children. They provided guidance and support to see all of them earn a high school diploma—and then some. On my mother’s side, I’m the granddaughter of Francisco and Emilia Morales. They raised three daughters and also encouraged them to earn their high school diplomas. My mother, Dora, and my aunt, Ninfa, became educators. A story that includes both of them is one that I’d like to share with you today.

My mother and aunt graduated from Brownsville High School and were members of the Golden Eagle Band. My mother played the saxophone, and my aunt played the clarinet. In the 1940s and 1950s, the Golden Eagle Band experienced some of their most successful years. Mr. James R. Murphy was the director during the years that my mother and aunt were band members. My mom and aunt always remembered him fondly. They considered him to be an outstanding educator, who cared for his students and held high expectations for each of them. That was what they admired most about him. He was the only teacher they referred to when reminiscing about their high school days. I’ve always wondered if his influence helped my mother and aunt in their decisions to become educators. My mother became an educational assistant, and my aunt became a secondary school teacher.

They recounted an experience returning from a band trip up north. The members of the Golden Eagle Band were heading back to Brownsville. Somewhere up north, the bus pulled into the parking lot of a locally owned restaurant. Hungry high schoolers got off the bus eager to eat a juicy hamburger and drink a sweet milkshake. The server began taking orders amid the chatter of the band members and their directors. As the server was heading to the kitchen to drop off the orders, Mr. Murphy made an observation. He called out, “Excuse me, ma’am, but not all of the kids have had their orders taken yet.” She matter-of-factly replied, “We don’t serve Mexicans.” To which Mr. Murphy immediately announced, “Everybody back on the bus. None of us are eating here.” He drew his line in the sand. Let’s explore some history behind this experience.

“We Don’t Serve Mexicans!”

Societal attitudes toward persons of color manifested in overt aggressions as well as with microaggressions. During the decades between the 1940s and the early 1960s, persons from traditionally underrepresented groups faced and challenged segregation in many areas of their lives, such as education, housing, employment, and the denial of equal access to public places. Guglielmo (2006) acknowledged, “Mexican Americans were entitled—sometimes in theory, sometimes in practice—to attend white schools, travel on white railroad cars, adopt white children, marry white partners” (p. 1212). They also had minimal representation in political positions and encountered acts of violence.

Now let’s talk about how such exclusionary acts influenced educational segregation of Mexican American children in Texas. Research by Field (2011) found that segregation in schools in Texas and California had a particular form; because of the “incapacities” or “special needs” associated with children who spoke Spanish, and the Mexican culture, there were two types of schools: the “Whites only” schools and “Mexican” schools. Field stressed that “Latino students were typically assigned to ‘Mexican’ schools. Such practices at schools in Texas involved shorter school days and academic years, less rigorous curriculum, and the reinforcement of low self-esteem” (p. 180). Mexican schools were underfunded. They had fewer resources and educational materials. The school facilities were also inferior, old, and the teachers had lower qualifications.

As Carter described in 1970, American educators, pressed to explain the failure in school of low-status, and minority group children, [relied] on the theory of ‘cultural deprivation.’ The fault was seen to lie in the socialization afforded by the home and neighborhood, and it was assumed that the child must be changed, not society or its educational institutions. (as cited in Vela, 2012, p. 166)

As “woke” educators, we understand that the children in our schools don’t need to be “fixed.” The strengths and gifts that they bring from their homes and communities must be valued in schools. It is the restrictive system in which they learn that must be redesigned.

In the 1930s some school districts that practiced discriminatory practices in Texas argued that the separate buildings for children of Mexican ancestry were a consequence of their “peculiarities” and not a violation of the law. According to the University of Houston’s Guadalupe San Miguel (2010), By the 1940s more than 122 school districts in fifty-nine counties had segregated schools for Mexican-American children. At first, segregation was confined to the elementary grades, because of the high withdrawal rates of Mexican children. When these children sought secondary schooling, officials also established segregated facilities in these grades. Tejanos found Texas schools not only segregated but also unequal. The buildings generally were older and dilapidated, recreation space was minimal and substandard, and school equipment was inadequate. (para. 5)

Such schooling practices compounded and set in motion tracks of low expectations for student success, limited access to high-quality instruction, and minimal opportunities to college access. To that end, almost 200 students from Edcouch-Elsa High School drew a line in the sand and walked out in protest in 1968. They demanded what is a right of every student in this country: a high-quality education. Several students were suspended, and the community called for this to be remedied so that the students could return to school. The Waco News Tribune (1968) published a story in which the principal of Edcouch-Elsa High School, Marvin Pipkin, stated, “We will not yield one iota as long as I am principal. The students will not dictate the policy” (p. 9). If only Mr. Pipkin had graduated from one of our principal preparation programs, he would have learned about culturally responsive leadership, socially just actions, and the value of student voice in decision-making.

In a story authored by Gary Garrison (1968) a few days later in the Brownwood Bulletin in Texas, Bob Sanchez, an attorney representing the students, told the school board, “Some of the teachers here think they are teaching a bunch of animals. Mexican Americans are not animals.” Then he reminded the Edcouch-Elsa school board members, “We [Mexican Americans] have been patient for 400 years, but our
patience is wearing thin” (as quoted in Garrison, 1968, p. 1).

Two years later, in 1970, students in Cristal [Crystal City], Texas also drew their line in the sand and walked out against the discriminatory conditions they encountered in school. These students also faced suspension but argued that they felt compelled to walk out to have their voices heard. Both of these student demonstrations are examples of what Michelle Fine (2017) called “cumulative inequity.” In her recent book, Just Research in Contentious Times, she addressed this concept by stating that for students facing such environments in schools, “over time how yearning for quality educators warps to anger about denied access to such educators, and how pride in self curdles to shame in miseducation” (p. 33).

We must also consider the educational experiences of the children of migrant farm workers and seasonal laborers. My father’s family toiled and put hands to soil so that this great-granddaughter of Mexicans could follow her dreams of becoming an educator. Thank you!

Students in schools today continue to learn in harsh environments. Gándara and Orfield (2010) published a Civil Rights Project report that compared the segregation of English learners in Arizona public schools to the “Mexican room” of the 1940s and ’50s. No longer should we attribute these failures to children as “canaries in the mines” (Guinier & Torres, 2003), for it is the mines (the educational systems) that are already toxic when students enter them. It’s like quicksand that has swallowed students up—body—and—soul. Enough! ¡Ya basta!

My Mission

Ahora, ciertas cosas solo se pueden decir en español. Es mi privilegio, no, es mi derecho poder expresarme en la idioma de mis abuelos. Pero con pleno reconocimiento que esta idioma le pertenece al conquistador. Esa sangre mixteca que corre por mis venas. Que nunca se me olvide el sufrimiento de mis antepasados, su sudor, sus lagrimas; pero tambien sus logros y sus enseñanzas. Sus ejemplos me han formado y educado.

Translation: There are certain things that can best be said in Spanish. It is my privilege, no, it is my right to be able to express myself in the language of my ancestors. This comes with the understanding that this language belongs to the conqueror. With this mixed blood that courses through my veins, may I never forget the struggles that my ancestors faced. I also want to remember their successes and their teachings. The examples that they set have shaped who I am today.

Que quedé claro con mis acciones que yo me entregue totalmente a este trabajo de ayudar a formar directores de escuelas que guardan los éxitos de sus estudiantes en sus corazones. Quiero saber que yo lo di todo, con mis esfuerzos y mis ejemplos. Que por mi no quede! Porque la lucha sigue y no podemos descansar. Y aunque nos tropezemos con obstáculos hay que recordar, como en la letra de Rene Pérez (Residente), en la canción de Calle 13 “Conmigo Vienen los de Atrás.”

Translation: I want my actions to clearly demonstrate that I have given all of me to the important work of cultivating school leaders who hold the needs of the students they serve close to their hearts. I want to know that I have given everything through my work and by the examples that I’ve set. May the journey not end with me because the struggles continue and we don’t have time to rest. Though we may trip and fall while we do this work, we have to pick ourselves up and continue moving forward. This calls to mind the lyrics written by Rene Pérez, better known as Residente, for Calle 13 in the song “Conmigo Vienen los de Atrás” (The Marginalized Move Forward With Me):

Villa, caserio, barrio, todos los proyectos
los deformados, marginados, todos los abyectos
vieniendo firme, recto, directo
sin arrodillarnos bien parados, erectos
venimos caminando por una cuerda finita
pero a nosotros no nos tumba ni la criptonita
mirando al frente vienen los de atras

Translation:

Village, barrio, the “projects”
Persons with disabilities, the marginalized, the outcasts
Walking firmly, moving forward
Proudly standing steadfast
We’re walking a thin line
but not even kryptonite will bring us down
Those coming from behind are looking forward.

(Translation by Mariela A. Rodríguez)

Rise Up in Revolution

Here is a photo that I took of a mural on the side of an apartment building in south San Antonio on my way to a recent school visit. It depicts Emiliano Zapata, the leader of a movement for the campesinos during the Mexican Revolution of 1910. He is attributed with saying, “Prefiero morir parado, que vivir de rodillas” (I’d rather die standing than live on my knees).

Sometimes to make a change, you’ve got to create a revolution!

The Call for Proposals for the 2018 UCEA Convention reminded us that many school leaders “continue to interrupt the inertia of a system resistant to change, a system that remains a colonizing and oppressive space” (p. 1). How are we preparing culturally competent school leaders to lead a revolution? What are we doing differently in principal preparation programs to
help leaders RISE UP—to fight inequities and injustices?

As educational leadership researchers, what are our tools for revolution? We have our teaching, our research, our publications, our presentations, and our service. Sometimes our research is deemed “risky” given the vulnerable student populations that we study in a climate that is resistant to put the needs of students first.

I am reminded of the motivational words by UCEA Past-President April Peters-Hawkins, in her 2017 UCEA Presidential Address, when she implored us to “reclaim OUR time to invoke notions of collective responsibility necessary in order to dismantle oppressive structures” (p. 3). Let’s consider our collective responsibility to the public good. Our scholarly contributions to the existing knowledge base in the fields of educational leadership, principal preparation, and educational policy are only a few components of that responsibility.

The Impact of Our Footprints

Let’s return to that sandy beach for a moment. When we walk along the shore, we leave our mark in the sand. When we look around at the marks that others have left, we cannot distinguish between race, creed, or color. As we all walk on this Earth together, do we not all leave behind the same footprint in the sand? In her book, Youth Held at the Border, Leigh Patel (2011) encouraged us by stating, “The work of seeing our places in a society built on differential inclusion in order to change those conditions rests upon each of us” (p. 111).

Now I want you to consider the IMPACT of your footprint. The difference that you make in the lives of your students. And, in turn, the lives of their school-age students in schools nationwide.

Let’s take the 100 UCEA-member institutions dedicated to high-quality principal preparation. With an average of 10 faculty members per institution, that makes 1,000 scholars. Let’s say each of us teaches about 50 students per year. That’s an estimated 50,000 educators we impact across the country annually. Each of those educators teaches young children in schools, year after year. That is the level of YOUR impact on ALL of these children. This takes me back to the inspiring 2001 UCEA Presidential Address by Malú González when she reminded us “to never lose sight of children and how the adults, who are supposed to work for them in education, impact their very existence” (p. 4).

I invite all of the past and present elementary, middle school, and high school teachers to stand.

I want you to reflect on how our efforts as education researchers help to make a difference in the lives of our students in educational leadership preparation programs. Sometimes we receive words of appreciation that remind us of our contribution to the public good. But what about those students we may never hear from? We’ll never know the full impact that our work has made on them. That reach is like countless particles of sand. This grounds the true meaning of what we do and the awesome responsibility that it carries.

ALMA Leadership

I invite you to consider a leadership model that I am working on: ALMA Leadership. Alma means soul in Spanish. When you lead with your soul, you never stray.

There are three components to this model:

1. **Spirit**: This is what grounds us. Our core beliefs. Our values. Our spirit reflects what we stand for. Our spirit is in a constant state of renewal as our life experiences continue to shape the inner workings of our being.

2. **Passion**: Passion is what ignites our work. It’s what sets off the fire within, that spark that keeps us motivated and revolutionized. We must keep that fire burning bright so that the impact of our work can continue to be felt far and wide.

3. **Action**: Our passion can only be fueled by our actions. What we do connects our spirit and passion so that our alma—soul—is released when and where we are needed most. Our actions are what we do to help others—to bring los de atras, those in the margins, into the light.

The Starfish

As I bring this journey to a close, I ask you to return with me to that sandy beach.

There was an educational leadership researcher walking along the beach. She saw so many starfish lying on the sand. She began picking them up carefully, and, one by one, she tossed them back into the sea. A stranger came across this scene and incredulously observed the researcher’s actions. After watching this go on for a time, the stranger walked up to the educational leadership researcher and asked, “There are so many starfish lying on this beach, how can your actions possibly make a difference?” The educational leadership researcher smiled as she threw another starfish back into the sea and replied, “It’s making a difference to her, and him, and them!” Each of you is that educational leadership researcher. Let your alma be your guide to continue writing that “risky” research, and never forget WHOM you’re writing it for. Draw your line in the sand!
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**UCEA ESSA Policy Briefs**

UCEA is proud to release six policy briefs developed as part of our comprehensive review of the treatment of school leadership in the 52 consolidated state plans (50 states, DC, and Puerto Rico) submitted to the U.S. Department of Education to comply with the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) of 2015.


ESSA offered a renewed focus on school leadership and recognized the impact of leaders on school improvement and effective instruction. As ESSA plans detailed the goals, strategies, and funding priorities for each state’s education system, UCEA felt it was important to analyze how states and territories were taking advantage of the new opportunities to support school leadership. Specifically, the policy briefs look at the treatment of school leadership in six areas:

- **Investments in Quality Leadership Through the 3% Set-Aside.** 42% of plans explicitly stated an intent to exercise the additional 3% set-aside for leadership initiatives.

- **Stakeholder Engagement and Consultation With School Leaders.** All states, Washington, DC, and Puerto Rico engaged with educational leaders.

- **Principal Preparation, Professional Development, and Quality and Effectiveness.** 83% of plans intend to use Title II, Part A funds to improve preparation programs.

- **Certification of Educational Leaders.** 73% of plans explicitly stated an intent to use Title II, Part A funds to support their state’s certification and licensure system.

- **School Leader Equity and Access.** 81% of plans intend to use Title II, Part A funds to provide low-income and ethnic minority students greater access to effective teachers, principals, and other school leaders.

- **Leveraging Leadership as a School Improvement Strategy.** 60% of plans listed leadership as an evidence-based improvement strategy for Comprehensive Support and Improvement and Targeted Support and Improvement schools.

The ESSA plan review was a collaborative research project with contributions made by UCEA policy associates, headquarters staff, and other ESSA plan reviewers. UCEA is grateful to each state plan reviewer who made this project possible.

---

**JCEL Moving to the University of Texas at San Antonio**

UCEA is pleased to announce that the editorial functions of the *Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership* will be moving to The University of Texas at San Antonio (UTSA) under the co-editorship of Mariela A. Rodríguez, Curtis Brewer, Nathern Okilwa, and Mark Giles.

This transition follows the completion of a highly successful term at the University of South Florida under the co-editorship of Zorka Karanxha, Bill Black, and Vonzell Agosto. The UTSA team will assume full responsibilities for the operations of JCEL by July 1, 2019. Many thanks to all of the teams who submitted strong proposals and to the UCEA members who served as proposal reviewers in this process. Congratulations to the outstanding UTSA faculty and deep appreciation to the strong USF team for their leadership.

[https://journals.sagepub.com/home/jel](https://journals.sagepub.com/home/jel)

---

**7th Women Leading Education Conference**

July 8-11, 2019 University of Nottingham, UK

Ways of Seeing Women’s Leadership in Education

[www.nottingham.ac.uk/conference/wle](http://www.nottingham.ac.uk/conference/wle)

---
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Good evening. I would like to begin by recognizing the individuals who invited me to deliver this evening’s keynote: the members of the UCEA Graduate Student Council, which, in addition to Andrene Castro and Bryan Van Gronigen, whom you have just met, also includes Kevin Clay, Nakia Gray, Chandler Patton Miranda, Meredith Wronowski, Shannon Holder, and Matt Stier; and the 2018 Convention Planning Committee members Andrene Castro, Terah Venzant Chambers, Terrance Green, Lolita Tabron, and my former doctoral student, Bradley Carpenter.

It is such an honor to be the inaugural Graduate Student Council sponsored speaker. Thank you so much for the invitation.

The Graduate Student Council or GSC has personal significance for me. I have gotten to know these sharp and committed junior scholars, I have witnessed their dedication to creating meaningful learning spaces and opportunities for their colleagues, and I have watched their careers develop. I take delight in their successes.

I specifically invited these six current and former members of the GSC, Richard Gonzales, Bradley Davis, Meredith Mavrogordato, Erin Anderson, Bryan Van Gronigen, and Andrene Castro, to introduce me this evening for several reasons, but in particular for the role they played at a specific time in uplifting the concerns, talents, and contributions of doctoral students within the UCEA community. First, Richard and Brad were my fearless companions in making the case for enlarging the voice of graduate students in UCEA. In my office in the Sanchez Building at the University of Texas at Austin, we took an idea and mapped a way forward. That map, importantly, included them taking a leadership role in making the case for a GSC to the UCEA Executive Committee and for creating the GSC as an entity. It was important to me that they build an organization based on their vision, their needs, their ambitions.

Soon after establishing the GSC, they went to work, and Erin and Madeline joined Richard and Brad as appointed members of the council—a body that did not shy away from the opportunity to build something of significance for graduate students in educational leadership and policy (including the incredibly successful Graduate Student Summit). The other members of that first group included Sedat Gumus, Amanda Werts, Helen Wang, Rod Whiteman, Jasmine Ulmer, and James Vines. Three of these original members (Helen, Rod, and Erin) are now serving on the UCEA Plenum. Wonderful.

Since then, the GSC has had the benefit of strong leadership from 33 doctoral students from UCEA Member institutions, including the University of Virginia’s own Bryan VanGronigen, who made it his mission to ensure that the GSC broke 200 this year (and he was successful). All of these members have left their mark on UCEA and the broader graduate student community, and given more time, I would have valued the opportunity to have every single one of them participate in this session.

The GSC is a perfect example of how to move an idea into reality by providing resources and autonomy to a diverse group of bright and committed people. The GSC is so much more than I ever imagined. I thank each of you again for your leadership and service and for doing me the honor of introducing me this evening.

In addition to the personal significance the GSC has for me, it also has significance for the future of the field, as you, graduate students, and junior scholars who have been touched, encouraged, and supported by GSC and UCEA initiatives like the Jackson Scholars, the Graduate Student Summit, the Clark Seminar, and initiatives like the UCEA Ambassador program. You are the future. Over 400 graduate students have registered for the convention this year. That is amazing.

**What My Talk Is About**

As I faced the difficult task of determining what to talk about with you this evening, 18 years of opportunities presented themselves: how UCEA has changed over the last two decades, significant accomplishments, my scholarship. I must admit that with my decision to transition out of the UCEA Executive Director position, my mind often bends toward the past: how I spent my time, whom I spent it with, what we accomplished together, what I neglected to do, etc.

In the end, I decided that I would share with you some of the key lessons that I have learned with and from you in my service to UCEA—lessons I think will have meaning for you (regardless of where you are in your career stage, but particularly for those of you who are in your early years in academe). These include:

1. **Build Community Wherever You Go.**
2. **Engage With Others Around Ideas and Goals.**
3. **Care Deeply About People.**
4. **Stay True To Your Core Principles.**

**Build Community Wherever You Go**

When I look out at this room, I see so many people I care about, I have learned from, and whom I am excited to get to know. UCEA is a very special community of scholars, and within the UCEA community, there are subcommunities. Some developed organically, and others were intentionally built to serve a
specific set of purposes: to work with like-minded individuals, to pursue a specific set of research questions, and to grow a community of scholars.

I’ve worked and learned in some very different organizations, some with incredibly strong communities.

The University of Texas at Austin is a good example. As a graduate student, my cohort of graduate student colleagues were amazing; some were from policy, others were from leadership, adult learning, higher education, and social foundations. That community was intentionally developed by the faculty at the time (including Jay D. Scribner, Pedro Reyes, Lonnie Wagstaff, Jim Scheurich, Martha Ovando, Jim Yates, and Deborah Kazel-Thresher). It was reinforced by program alumni and the students (including Linda Skrla, Gerardo Lopez, Anna Pedroza, Ed Fuller, Barb Pazey, Julie Laible, Lance Fusarelli, Celeste Alexander, and Jim Koshorek), and it was powerful.

Faculty involved us immediately in significant research projects, invited us to collaborate on scholarship, invited us to coteach their courses, signed us up to volunteer at various practitioner events, and held Friday afternoon office hours at a local biergarten. Students created writing groups, celebrated accomplishments, and caravanned to national conferences; it was wonderful.

Many of the folks I went to graduate school with went on to build similar communities in their new institutions, as did I. This is so important. It’s important for your mental health. It’s important for your program health, and it’s important for your career. You need colleagues who understand and support your work. You need colleagues with whom you can learn, build things, share a meal, commiserate, laugh, or turn to for ideas, advice, support. If you don’t have a community like that, do whatever you can to create one.

Working in a place without a strong community can be isolating and deflating. If you end up in a place like that, think about what you can do to build a community for yourself and your colleagues. Start a writing group; invite a colleague for coffee; show interest in people; talk about your organization as community; and foster norms that support engagement, curiosity, and care.

Don’t be satisfied with superficial relationships. Getting together with your colleagues and students every once in a while can be really beneficial to you personally and to your professional community. Through such interactions people become more than their research, more than their teaching, and more than their behavior at faculty meetings. And as you build your community (or communities), make sure it is diverse. Make sure that everyone in your community isn’t just like you. The more diverse, the better. You will gain so much.

If you go to a place where community already exists, invest in it and make it stronger. Don’t take it for granted. That goes for UCEA as well. If UCEA is an important professional community for you, invest in it. Get involved. Building community is important work, and it is something that we all have a responsibility to do. Whether it is in your home institution or in a professional association like UCEA, build a community wherever you go. Be intentional.

---

Engage With Others Around Ideas and Goals

Without question, higher education can be an isolating place. The dissertation, achieving tenure—these activities are generally framed as solo rides. But they really aren’t. Think about it: many people contribute to our careers both directly and indirectly.

We aren’t successful merely because of what we do. Progressing through one’s profession isn’t and shouldn’t be a solo activity. Engaging mentors, colleagues, and students around your (and their) ideas generally leads to better thinking and better results.

Likewise, important challenges rarely have easily identified solutions, and when progress is made, it is rarely the result of a single individual. I could share so many examples from my work with UCEA. I can’t think of a single significant accomplishment over the last 18 1/2 years that I have spent with UCEA that was mine and mine alone.

- The UCEA Program Design Network
- The Jackson Scholars
- *The Handbook of Research on Leadership Development*
- The Developing Leaders to Support Diverse Learners Curriculum Modules
- *The Journal of Research on Leadership Education*
- The Graduate Student Council
- The National Commission for the Advancement of Leadership Preparation

We did these things. Not me. We did.

When I started working for UCEA, we took on the challenge of building a diverse and inclusive UCEA community. Why we took on this challenge was not the result of a single individual; it was the result of many individual and collective efforts to put the issue in front of UCEA leadership and the commitment of UCEA leaders to make it a priority.

It was through engaging around ideas with those first UCEA Executive Committee members (Malú Gonzalez, Jay D. Scribner, Barbara Jackson, Nan Restine, Bob Slater, Diana Pounder, Mary Driscoll, Fran Kochan, Gail Furman, Gary Crow, Jim Scheurich, Margaret Grogan, Michael Dantley, Khaura Murtadha, Fen English) and those who followed that the organization you experience today emerged. How many past and present Executive Committee members do we have with us tonight? Let’s give them a round of applause. Each of these people has dedicated at least 6 professional years to nurturing and leading this organization.

As we worked to develop a more diverse and inclusive organization, many ideas were put on the table, discussed, developed, vetted, revised, voted on, etc. We worked to find ways to make diversity and inclusion a part of UCEA governance, UCEA’s values, and UCEA’s future. We revised UCEA policy; we ensured our convention themes and content reflected diversity, equity, and social justice; we established the Jackson Scholars Network in honor of Dr. Barbara Loomis Jackson. In fact, her namesake, the Jackson Scholars Network, is a good example of the point I’m making here.

Through our work together, we had arrived at the conclusion that in order for UCEA to become a more diverse organization, our member institutions needed to become more diverse. Hackmann and McCarthy’s (2011) review of
the professoriate confirmed our belief that the educational leadership professoriate was not diverse, UCEA institutions included.

We understood that changing UCEA membership criteria was a necessary but not sufficient step. We needed a more comprehensive plan if we were going to change the profession. We examined our programs and our practices, and we learned that a large portion of doctoral students of color went back to practice after graduation. We had to find ways to make the professoriate a more compelling and realistic opportunity. We talked with students, alums, faculty, and deans. We explored effective mentoring practices and strategies (Young & Brooks, 2008). We explored what other professions were doing.

And, when Fran Kochan, who was very involved in AACTE at the time, asked why couldn’t we do something like the Holmes Scholars program, click, a light bulb. The Holmes Scholars Program, for those who are unfamiliar with it, is focused on supporting graduate students of color in education broadly. Serendipity? Maybe. It was definitely the spark we needed after a long burn of problem definition, ideation, and design. We recognized the potential and possibility in the idea; others chimed in to offer their ideas, their support, their time to make this idea a reality. And since that day, the program has continued to grow and evolve as UCEA Associate Directors (Jite, Eferakorho, Linda Tillman, Cristobal Rodriguez, Gerardo Lopez, Lisa Bass, and Hollie Mackey) brought their own ideas and commitments; as our pool of mentors has grown and evolved; as we have learned about the needs and wishes of program participants; and as graduate student leaders like Carmen Foster, Angel Nash, and Daniel Moraguez have helped to create memorable moments like our Motown flash mob in Detroit.

The Jackson Scholars Network, just like all of UCEA’s efforts to become more inclusive, must continue to evolve. Becoming a diverse or inclusive organization isn’t something you do and then move on. It must be nurtured. Furthermore, diversity isn’t an exotic artifact that you stand back and admire; it is something you learn from and leverage to make the organization stronger, better, and even more inclusive and equitable.

I am hopeful because I have seen how our work in this area has progressed, and I have seen how much it means to so many people. None of these achievements would have been possible in the absence of an engaged and committed professional community, and so many more things will be possible for that very same reason.

Care About People and Their Ideas

Why do people choose to become engaged in a professional community? Why do people get excited about and dedicate their precious time and energy to their programs, their college, or an organization like UCEA? While there are many idiosyncratic reasons, for some, it comes down to three things:

- Can I make a significant contribution?
- Do I enjoy it?
- Am I valued?

As Executive Director, I have worked with my team and colleagues to think about how we can address these key questions by providing opportunities for faculty to make a contribution to journals, to research projects, to improvement efforts, to graduate student initiatives. We worked to create experiences that were engaging and fun (for example, the UCEA Study Visits, new convention session formats, the Jackson Scholars Moment of MindFUNness), and we intentionally worked to let people know they were valued, through our words, through our awards, and through our interactions.

Our field, organizations like UCEA and your schools and colleges of education, at their core are about people. So as we think about our goals and what we want our organizations to achieve, we must consider our most valuable resource (people), their feelings, their experiences, their contributions, and their goals. Part of valuing people involves being accessible, listening to them, hearing them, and learning from them. This is sometimes very hard to do when you are busy, overscheduled, or running from one meeting or project to another.

Think about the people who have supported you, what did that look like? It might have involved inviting you to work on a project or agreeing to write you a letter of recommendation for a job. Or it might have been a simple appreciative comment about your work. Support comes in all shapes and sizes, and cumulatively it can have a significant impact on you. Just as you can have a significant positive impact on others if you pay it forward.

Think about the people who have made you feel valued, who encouraged you to do more, to be more. I’ll wager that they were kind and that they made time to get to know you so that they would know best how to support you. I have been shown so much kindness and generosity over the course of my career, and I have committed myself to paying that kindness and generosity forward, again and again.

Last week, I read a manuscript that made a compelling case that leadership is less about the tasks we complete and more about our interactions with others. That idea resonates with me.

If leadership is in the interactions, then every day, we have countless opportunities to impact the people around us, either positively or negatively. And the benefits of caring and kindness are significant not just for the recipient but for you. I’m told being kind and supportive of others can have a powerful, positive effect on the immune system.

And (when you can) extend your caring beyond kindness. Invest in people. Keep them in mind. Connect them with opportunities. Share your ideas with them. You may then have an opportunity to see those ideas flourish. For me, this has been one of the most gratifying parts of serving as UCEA Executive Director—the opportunity to support the development of people and ideas, to connect them with others, to discover that “adjacent possible” idea or innovation, and to extend the reach of their efforts.

No single person has all of the best ideas, and they don’t just suddenly appear. When I look at all of you I see wealth, I see an amazing resource for the field of education. And what I have tried to do in UCEA, with my many traveling companions over the years, is create spaces and opportunities that support you, that enable you to share your ideas and to engage with others with similar as well as divergent interests so that great ideas have an opportunity to incubate and flourish.

Importantly, you don’t have to be in a position of power, authority, or influence to support other people, and supporting
your colleagues is not limited to grand gestures. Leadership is in the interactions.

**Stay True to Your Core Principles**

When I get busy, I often default to the goal in front of me, and then the next thing, and the next thing. Just like it is important to remember that everything we do is about people, it is also important to remember why you chose to work in the field of education in the first place—and how that calling or that mission has evolved over your career. Why are you here? Why you are really here? What are you trying to do? Are you doing it?

One of the things that I found compelling about UCEA when I was a graduate student was the passion that people brought to their work. I found in UCEA a community of scholars who, like me, were unabashedly committed to making education a better, more responsive experience for all students and adults who learn and work in schools.

But I also found things that troubled me, things that moved me to critique, things that I wanted to see change. And critique is important—it is essential. Very few important changes in this world have occurred without protest and critique.

When UCEA hired me, I moved from a critical outsider to a critical insider. There is a big difference when you make that transition. As a critic, I didn’t have to have answers to the questions I raised; I didn’t have to have solutions for the problems I identified. As an insider, my work became about addressing the issues that I and others had identified as troubling, to listen to critique, to examine issues in depth, to explore problem contexts, and to seek a path forward.

As I engaged in this work, it became clear that the majority of scholars affiliated with UCEA, whether they came from a place of critique or otherwise, were working toward similar goals. Some through advocacy, some through critique, some through research, and some through development. Some are working from the inside, and some are coming to this commitment externally. This diversity of thought and action is what makes an organization like UCEA robust, creative, and relevant.

So please, if something about this profession distresses you, work to change it. If something is broken, draw attention to it—sound the alarm. And when you identify a problem, have something to bring to the table, bring your analysis, bring your ideas, and bring your commitment.

Be willing to do something about the issues of concern to you, and be sure to build bridges. There are people here within the UCEA community who can be your allies, and sometimes those scholars aren’t who you would expect. I have been surprised again and again over the years by our UCEA colleagues who make you smart, colleagues who make you strong, and communities that make you smart, experiences that drive your work, and generosity that abounds.

There is no better time to get started than now. Goals take time to achieve, and we risk reaching a moment when whatever advantage or ability we had to make positive change will have dissipated. This is our profession. We have a responsibility to nurture it, direct it, and make it stronger. It is up to each of us to stand up for what we believe is right, for our core principles. And I am hopeful because I see in your work, in your actions that we are ready, even impatient, to lead the way toward a more equitable and just future.

UCEA is a special community, and working as UCEA director has been a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity. It has changed me forever, has opened doors to opportunities I never imagined, and has challenged me to lead. I have so many people to thank for this wonderful adventure and for working with me to achieve so much. There is no way that I can mention all of you; the list is far, far too long. But you should know these wonderful people have made a world of difference for me and this organization. It is my sincerest wish that you too will be granted the kindness, generosity, and support that I have received.

As I near the end of my remarks this evening, I hope the meaning of my title is clear:

- We are UCEA.
- We are this community. It wouldn’t exist without you.
- If we don’t like something, we should work to change it.
- If we want it to do more or differently, we must help it do more or differently.
- If we love it, we should invest in it.
- We make it what it is, and it is our mutual responsibility to nurture and shape it to serve a greater purpose than ourselves.

So, let’s raise our glasses. A toast to you, to UCEA, and to our future together. May you have:

- communities that make you strong,
- colleagues who make you smart,
- challenges to keep you curious,
- core values to drive your work, and
- generosity that abounds.

“Leadership is a gift given to you by those who follow” (McCracken, 2011, p. 1). I thank you for the wonderful gift of leading UCEA as its Executive Director for the past 18 years. I’ll see you out there.
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Locally elected school boards in various forms have held primary authority and decision-making power for American school districts for over a century. Brewer and Hall (2014) stated, “Many scholars have described school boards as the essence of representative governance in a democracy” (p. 637), and Björk (2005) explained, “States delegate powers to local school boards to act on their behalf in the provision of education” (p. 4). The National School Boards Association (2018) described their responsibilities as “employing the superintendent; developing and adopting policies, curriculum, and the budget; overseeing facilities issues; and adopting collective bargaining agreements” (para. 3).

The role and power of locally elected school boards has changed and cycled over time, and their function varies across districts nationwide. Local boards govern all types of districts—urban, suburban, and rural. Over half of all school districts nationwide are located in rural communities (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], 2015). As a result of a national trend toward centralization, the number of districts has decreased dramatically from its peak of 117,108 districts in 1939-40 (Linnaccone, 1975). During the 2010-11 school year, there were 13,588 U.S. public school districts, and most were governed by a locally elected school board (NCES, 2011).

Scholars, such as Kirst and Wirt (2009), have questioned whether this venerated American democratic institution is in danger of extinction:

The public has been told repeatedly, after all, how much the nation reveres local school control, told it even by those who have been taking away much of that control. Thus, Americans are largely unaware that local boards as well as local superintendents and individual schools have been losing influence over education programs for some time to state and federal officials and other interests. Indeed, some analysts even view local school boards as an endangered species. (p. 3)

Multiple factors have contributed to this erosion. However, the growing prominence of school choice policies and new actors in the education policy landscape have played a significant part in the changing roles of locally elected school boards in educational governance (Au & Ferrare, 2014; Reckhow, 2013; Welsh & Hall, 2018). Different forces have gradually “squeezed the authority of local school boards and superintendents into a smaller and smaller place” (Kirst & Wirt, 2009, p. 25). From above, state and federal government and the courts increasingly have gained power, as have what have more recently been described as intermediary organizations (IOs). From below, teacher unions and collective bargaining, grassroots IOs, and charter school networks have worn away local power. Additionally, criticisms of school boards have included “petty politics, micromanagement, amateurishness, lack of imagination, kowtowing to the teacher unions, corruption, and waste” (Henig, 2013, p. 68).

The rise of IOs and creation of a new policy network have fundamentally changed the educational policy-making process through funding of research evidence production, promotion, and dissemination; advocacy; reform agendas; and local school board election campaigns (DeBray, Hanley, Scott, & Lubienski, 2018; Reckhow, Henig, Jacobsen, & Litt, 2017). Market-based reform advocates have argued that politics are the primary problem in traditional school districts and that a system of privatization and autonomy provides the solution to finally free education from politics (Chubb & Moe, 1990; Jabbar, 2015). Notably, “by their nature, IOs make ideology, and not evidence, the over-riding consideration,” making this argument problematic (Lubienski, Scott, & DeBray, 2011, p. 2). Jabbar (2015) demonstrated that even appointed school boards, such as the Recovery School District in New Orleans, are not immune to political tensions and divisions. Mayoral or gubernatorial control of school districts also comes with its own set of difficulties (Henig, 2013).

Local school board elections traditionally have existed as provincial, low-profile, local affairs (Feuerstein, 2002; Kirst & Wirt, 2009). Low budgets, dominating teacher unions, and low voter turnout also have characterized school board elections in the past. Many local school board elections are held off cycle, so they don’t attract the same attention of voters as gubernatorial, presidential, or other larger scale elections (Henig, 2013; Kirst & Wirt, 2009). Despite a broader trend toward centralization in education to the state and federal government, local districts have not become obsolete—if anything, their role in the implementation of policies from the state and federal levels is critical (Bulkey, Henig, & Levin, 2010; Henig, 2009). “Recognizing this, national actors may have a growing interest in participating in the shaping of local political regimes (Marsh & Wohlstetter, 2013). Campaign contributions are one key lever for local political involvement” (Reckhow et al., 2017, p. 787). In the case of New Orleans, Jabbar (2015) described the implications of IO and philanthropic influence on elections:

Given the politicized nature of school-board elections ... and the influence of private philanthropy ..., the traditional school board system is certainly not an ideal democratic system. Foundations and reform advocates are able to buy influence in the elections and directly fund new schools. But democratic forms of oversight can potentially provide a structured and institutionalized avenue for change. (p. 767)

Johanna Hanley

University of Georgia
Overall, research and literature largely agree that local school boards and education are fundamental institutions to American democracy but do not exist without challenges. Further exploration providing better understanding into school and district governance and how the changing educational policy landscape necessitates the role of school boards to evolve is critical, and these essays by our contributing authors exemplify such research.

- **Thomas L. Alsbury**, EdD, is professor and director of Educational Leadership at Northwest University. His work and research focuses on school board governance, leadership preparation and development, and organizational change.

- **Daniella Hall**, PhD, is an assistant professor in the Department of Educational and Organizational Leadership Development at Clemson University. Her research addresses education policy and school district governance in rural communities.

In the first essay, Thomas Alsbury describes debates over local versus central control of urban school districts. He provides evidence through U.S. and international examples that overall benefits of the local control model outweigh deficits and that issues can be attributed to its implementation. In the second, Daniella Hall shares research findings from a multisite case study in Vermont, providing insight into rural school board governance in a state where decentralization and local control have reigned. Hall provides critical insight into two central claims of research on locally elected school boards: “Boards are disempowered and confused, and boards act as rubber stamps for district leadership.” I thank them for contributing their perspectives and for sharing their research on this important educational leadership and governance issue.

**Balanced Governance in Urban School Boards**

*Thomas L. Alsbury*

*Northwest University*

Locally elected school board governance as a model has long been under scrutiny with certain policymakers and academic findings questioning its effectiveness. Typically, opponents called for a central governance system that promised to provide more standardization and efficiency and possibly a professionalization of the board (Wong & Shen, 2008). Indeed, research from the 1970s through the 1990s generally indicated that local school board composition and role were not linked to superintendent stability or student performance, especially in urban districts (Alsbury, 2008a). Indeed, some governance researchers proposed that locally elected boards function in a generally undemocratic fashion (Iannaccone & Lutz, 1994). Support for this claim included the lack of participation by candidates and voters in school board elections, infrequent acquiescence by boards to policy demands from local special interest groups or individuals, and inequitable identity representation on locally elected boards (Kirst & Wirt, 2009).

These findings buoyed a school board reform movement by legislators and policymakers in the 1980s for mayoral takeover that occurred in approximately 40 urban school districts, supported by some academic findings and the integrated governance theory (Wong & Shen, 2008). In addition, international school performance on the Programme for International Student Achievement (PISA) and Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study exams seemed to indicate that a centralized ministry of education policy governance structure with national standardized curriculum and testing was more effective and efficient. At the time, educational leaders in the U.S. Department of Education called locally elected boards an anachronism and an outrage and called for their elimination, especially within urban school districts (Hess & Meeks, 2011). Simultaneously, the national mayors association put out guidebooks on how mayors could exercise more influence or take over their urban school district, citing the failed system of local governance.

However, during the early 2000s, new approaches to defining variables in school board research produced data findings that supported the dissatisfaction theory of American democracy, purporting that locally elected boards were indeed democratic and had a significant influence on district policy that could directly impact student performance (Alsbury, 2003). These studies linked board turnover to superintendent turnover and district policy change and indicated that citizens do participate in board elections when they desire change. This increase in the participation of citizens who had become dissatisfied with their school district typically led to a change in the elected school board, the superintendent, and district policy. Notably, in 2010, the first national survey of school board members was conducted (Hess & Meeks, 2011). This provided the first set of comprehensive school board data juxtaposed against what had been selected case studies or single statewide findings. This national study was repeated in 2013 and provided substantive insights into some of the challenges leveled against the effectiveness of locally elected school boards (Alsbury & Gore, 2015). In addition to the national data, PISA exam results starting in 2012 were pointing to a new trend in terms of the efficacy of centralized versus localized school governance in urban districts (Organisation for Economic and Co-operative Development [OECD], 2012).

**Board Demographics**

National study data provided evidence that locally elected boards, despite rhetoric to the contrary, were as equitable as any governance structure in current use (Alsbury & Gore, 2015). For example, in 2013 school boards were generally equitable in terms of gender, with nearly 50% female board members elected, as compared to less equity (about 20% female) in the U.S. Congress and on appointed government and county boards and councils. In terms of ethnicity, urban school boards were approximately 37% African American versus about 10% in the current U.S. House of Representatives. Although locally
elected school boards are still not reflective of their local communities, they are more closely representative than other governance models, including more centralized systems like appointed councils in the U.S. or ministry of education councils internationally (Blissett & Alsbury, 2017). In addition, data indicated that locally elected school boards represent general equity across occupational backgrounds with 33% education, 24% business, 15% professional, and 28% other. In terms of political identification, board members indicated they were 47% moderate, 32% conservative, and 21% liberal (Blissett & Alsbury, 2017).

Approaching equity on locally elected school boards becomes more significant when considering the Blissett and Alsbury (2017) research findings on board identity and effectiveness. The study compared identities of school board members including gender, ethnicity, occupation, income level, educational level, and political disposition to the board members’ self-reported goals of education, issues of urgency, and policy preferences. In this study, which used the 2013 national database noted above, findings indicated differences among urban board members regarding the urgency to reduce the achievement gap and improve policy and programs supporting underrepresented students and community members. Specifically, the study found that whereas educational goals did not vary significantly across identities, board members of color and female board members, for example, viewed all educational issues as more urgent, most notably the need to reduce the achievement gap. Additionally, board members from underrepresented populations supported policies that address issues of equity in school hiring, curriculum, and instruction. Shober and Hartney’s (2014) study supported the efficacy of school board members coming from a cross-section of occupational backgrounds as opposed to a professionalized board, whose members come predominately from education or business backgrounds.

International Trends

In terms of the discussion regarding central versus a local systems of governance, recent international trends in education test results provide some insight. Indeed, many critics of locally elected school boards point to the superior performance on international tests of countries who employ a centralized system of governance. In fact, when looking at current test trends, reports confirm no consistent superiority in the performance based on a country’s use of a central system of governance (OECD, 2012). Indeed, the recent 2012 PISA report, Strong Performers and Successful Reformers (OECD, 2012), used test trend data to conclude that school systems that grant more autonomy to local governance to adapt policy, curriculum, assessments, and resource allocation are now trending upward in their performance. The PISA report concluded that test trends cannot support a nation’s use of central versus localized governance. Interestingly, I traveled to Taiwan (ranked #3 in the PISA) in 2013 to discussing their interest in piloting the use of locally elected boards into their governance structure. In addition, some predominately Muslim countries are considering the infusion of local school boards. In the U.S., it is notable that as of 2018, the number of mayoral controlled urban districts has been dramatically reduced from the 40 noted above to under 10 districts currently. Notable among the failures of centralizing governance systems was the lack of personal contact with the public, the reduction of perceived voice by underrepresented community members, and the lack of substantive academic gains or policy reforms favoring underrepresented students (Alsbury, 2009). Indeed, the general consensus that the benefits of local governance models outweigh the deficits is shared among research findings nationally and internationally (Alsbury & Gore, 2015; Moos & Paulsen, 2014; OECD, 2012). These include the ability for locally elected boards to respond more directly and personally to community needs and adjust policy to adapt curriculum and resource alignment. Local governance models allow change to be more organic and nimble when not hampered by ever-expanding regulation and less flexible state or national program mandates. While it appears that a local system of board governance allows for the necessity of fluid and responsive action to meet unique local need, it does not guarantee every school district board will choose to act effectively or efficiently. Thus the local versus central control argument seems to be more appropriately centered upon the effectiveness of the implementation of the local governance model and not the system of local governance itself.

Urban Board Role

One growing challenge to locally elected urban boards is a growing movement for board members to take on the role of advocacy versus oversight (Truong, 2018). While an advocacy role may appear beneficial, the implementation frequently leads to polarization and dysfunction on school boards and leads to a shorter tenure for board members enacting that role exclusively (Alsbury, 2015). Indeed, early governance models framed this role dichotomy as a trustee versus a delegate board role. In one facet, a trustee role focuses board members on enhanced board collegiality and cohesion, whereas the delegate role focuses on voicing evolving community special interests. Despite the current trend toward board member activism or advocacy, also called the board reform movement, studies find boards who use a balanced governance approach to be linked to a variety of positive indicators, such as improved superintendent tenure and student performance (Alsbury & Gore, 2015). Effective board members practice a nuanced balance between trustee and delegate roles, selectively enacting each role at the critical times and in varying levels of intensity. Practically speaking, effective board members balance providing an advocacy voice for underrepresented students with working in a collaborative fashion with their board colleagues, in order to garner broad support for their policy initiatives while allowing them to stay on the board long enough to shepherd the desired change in the system. The balanced governance construct also emerges when considering the topic of local versus central control. Namely, effective boards accept and enact centrally developed high standards and expectations for all students yet insist on locally designed policy, programs, and procedures to ensure the unique needs of their local community are served.

Another characteristic among urban school board members is the difference in their motivation for service.
Research found that while no board member indicated their service on the board was motivated by personal ego, nearly 25% of their board colleagues and 30% of their superintendents listed non-altruistic reasons for their participation (Mountford, 2008). In addition, board elections in urban settings are more frequently funded by outside special interests and heavily influenced by teachers association support (Hess, 2008). In fact, urban board members are more likely to adopt a special interest and use it as leverage to win their board seat. Unfortunately, what allows an urban board member to win an election is different from what provides longevity and success in enacting the agenda on the board (Alsbury, 2015). Effective election is different from what provides longevity and success in legislating changes on the board.

In fact, urban board members are more likely to adopt a special interest and use it as leverage to win their board seat. Unfortunately, what allows an urban board member to win an election is different from what provides longevity and success in enacting the agenda on the board (Alsbury, 2015). Effective election is different from what provides longevity and success in legislating changes on the board (Alsbury & Gore, 2015).

Effective election is different from what provides longevity and success in enacting the agenda on the board (Alsbury, 2015). Effective election is different from what provides longevity and success in legislating changes on the board (Alsbury & Gore, 2015).

Local “Out of Control” Boards or Vital Democratic Institutions?
Unpacking the Research on Locally Controlled School Boards

Daniella Hall
Clemson University

Local controlled school boards—democratically elected community members who are responsible for the fiscal, political, and managerial oversight of their local school districts—are simultaneously a central and controversial element of U.S. educational governance. Historically, local control was delegated to boards of directors who made decisions on behalf of their communities (Theobald & Bardzell, 2000). As the country grew, however, the locus of control shifted to educational professionals who have relevant expertise to make decisions for public schools (Callahan, 1962). Many school boards were relegated to a supporting role to superintendents: de facto rubber stamps to approve district policies and budgets (Boyd, 1976; Malen, 2003). When boards did retain power, researchers found many undermined governance with ineffective or disruptive leadership due to role confusion (Danzberger, 1994; Danzberger, Kirst, & Usdan, 1992; Glass, Bjork, & Brunner, 2000; Wirt & Kirst, 1989; Zeigler, Jennings, & Peak, 1974).

Although the number of school boards has significantly decreased in tandem with their loss of authority, school boards remain the primary form of democratic participation in U.S. public education (Alsbury, 2008b; Boyd, 1976; Land, 2002). In turn, communities on either end of the political spectrum actively resist efforts to reduce local control through centralization or consolidation. The policy conflict over local control is exacerbated by a lack of understanding of how contemporary local control is enacted, particularly in the nation’s rural communities, which account for over half of all school districts nationwide (NCES, 2015). In this essay, I will unpack two core claims at the heart of research on locally controlled school boards: boards are disempowered and confused, and boards act as rubber stamps for district leadership. Drawing from a multisite case study in Vermont, I will discuss the factors that shape board governance, how they enact local control, and how this contributes to our understanding of locally controlled boards.

Research Methods

The findings presented here are drawn from a qualitative case study of locally controlled, rural school districts. The study was situated in Vermont, a decentralized state with a historic legacy of local control. The case study is comprised of three rural public school districts operating within a regional Supervisory Union. The regional Supervisory Union, known as a multidistrict union, is governed by a central school board and one superintendent (see Hall & McHenry-Sorber, 2017) and enables a unique opportunity to compare different board relationships with the same superintendent.

Using semistructured, role-specific protocols (Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2013), I conducted interviews with the superintendent, school board chairs, current and former school board members, and principals. I also conducted ethnographic observations of school board and community meetings. Publicly available school board minutes, annual town and school reports, and newspaper articles documenting educational issues in the Supervisory Union were collected to substantiate observation and interview data (Miles et al., 2013).

Qualitative interviews, ethnographic fieldnotes, and documents were thematically coded using a priori codes (Miles et al., 2013). Codes were organized into conceptually ordered matrices (Miles et al., 2013), which were comparatively analyzed in an iterative process (Creswell, 2007). Participants provided member checks to clarify questions and evaluate the validity of findings (Creswell, 2007).

Findings

Capacity and control: Understanding governance variations in locally controlled school boards. Locally controlled school boards in this study retained significant control over self-governance. The extent to which each district enacted self-governance varied by two dimensions of local capacity: community capacity and board capacity. In turn, patterns of board–superintendent relationships in each district were influenced by the combined levels of board and community capacity.

Community capacity was a significant factor affecting the extent to which each district enacted local control of school district governance. I define community capacity as the resources available in community for managerial work, such as access to a town clerk or office manager, and the availability of local volunteers to support other business management work. These dimensions of community capacity would register as insignificant in larger suburban and urban districts. However, in rural districts typical of locally controlled states, these dimensions of community capacity significantly shaped the extent to which boards enacted local control. The districts with high community capacity—access to all dimensions of
community capacity—were the most autonomous; districts with low community capacity were the least autonomous.

In addition to community capacity, I found board capacity significantly affected the extent of board governance. I define board capacity as the collective tenure, professional expertise, and social networks of school boards. The breadth of professional expertise of board members, such as financial, legal, and political knowledge and skills, increased capacity for autonomous governance, as board members could carry out complex tasks normally delegated to the central office. Likewise, board members who leveraged social networks to carry out governance and managerial tasks reduced dependence on the superintendent. Length of board tenure and rate of turnover was a third, critical element of board capacity, as multiterm board members ensured leadership stability and institutional memory. However, board capacity can change by election cycle (Linnaccone & Lutz, 1994) and therefore has less stability than community capacity.

Significantly, the case study districts shared a common superintendent, enabling comparison of superintendent–board relationships based on local capacity. Studying the patterns of each board’s interactions with the same superintendent revealed a critical theoretical relationship between community capacity, board capacity, and superintendent–board relations. In sum, boards with higher combined community and board capacity were more likely to resist superintendent governance, whereas boards with lower combined capacity were more likely to rely on the superintendent, regardless of the will for local control in the community.

**Investing in democracy: Understanding the mechanisms of community participation in locally controlled school districts.** Oversight of district budgets is a fundamental role school boards retain, regardless of their autonomy (Malen, 2003; Mountford, 2004, 2008). This study found that rural, locally controlled boards used the educational budget process as the primary mechanism for governance. Rather than acting as a rubber stamp for central office budgets, the locally controlled boards used the budget approval process as a primary mechanism to ensure democratic participation in school programming.

The case study boards retained extensive control over the budgeting process, rather than working with a superintendent and central office. At each case study site, the budget process was used by school boards to align community values with educational practices in the schools. The district boards worked closely with their respective principals to develop and revise their educational budgets, within minimal support from central office staff. Boards then presented their educational budgets to their communities, providing residents opportunities to review and discuss the proposed plan before a public discussion and vote at an annual town meeting.

The budgeting process tightly couples the principal, school board, and community. As a result, the budget reinforces alignment of each school’s technical core with dominant community values. I found that the locally controlled case study boards leveraged elements of school budgets that address the technical core of education, including professional development, instructional materials, and specialist programs. These elements provide opportunities for board members to collaborate with administrators to learn about these programs and why they are school priorities. In turn, the school boards communicated these priorities with the broader community.

It is important to note that case study principals were clear that their boards did not micromanage budgets or direct line-by-line expenses. Rather, specific elements of the budget were opportunities for discourse to deepen understanding of educational practices and priorities between the school board, school administrators, and community at large. Other studies have documented how school board members, as nonprofessionals in educational settings, lack necessary understanding to make informed decisions about educational practices related to the technical core of schooling (Mountford, 2004, 2008; Trujillo, 2013). The budget therefore offers a practical opportunity for school board members to learn from their local educational experts about the decisions and priorities in the school, thereby developing their capacity. Likewise, school boards are able to share their understanding and values with the professional educators, helping develop common understanding of educational values within the district as a whole.

**Conclusion**

“Local school boards are the crucible of democracy,” noted Lutz and Linnaccone (2008, p. 5). School boards play a critical role in ensuring communities have a voice in the governance and practices of their schools. Democratic governance of education can be messy and is prone to conflict (Wirt & Kirst, 1989). This research does not suggest that all locally controlled school boards are effective, engaged, and able to enact democratic, community-based governance. Nor does this research address how dimensions of power, race, class, and privilege affect representation and participation in locally controlled boards. However, the research does introduce new perspectives on the underlying factors that shape the governance of rural, locally controlled boards. Shifting the focus to what locally controlled boards do well, the research creates a path forward for improving the practices of school boards and their community relationships. It also serves as a reminder that education remains one of the foremost democratic institutions in which we can and should participate.
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New! UCEA Networking Tool

The UCEA Networking Tool is aimed to support communication, collaboration, and community. Developed by Sara Dexter at the University of Virginia, the UCEA Networking Tool provides a robust interactive experience for cross-institutional collaboration. Through this tool, you can participate in existing networks to support teaching and program development, research, or service initiatives. The networking tool also allows you to create new networks and invite others to join. This online community-building tool helps UCEA meet several aspirational goals for improved UCEA Community Members’ online experiences.

Single Sign-On Connection

The UCEA Networking Tool is seamlessly integrated with the individual UCEA user accounts. This means UCEA community members automatically have access to the Networking Tool. Upon log-in to your UCEA user account, you’ll find the Networking Tool in the right hand column along with links to UCEA Registration and All Academic.

Better Member Interaction

A “Discussions” feature on the Networking Tool facilitates member engagement through threaded conversations. Unlike flat, text-only Listservs, members can upload videos and attachments and embed HTML graphics into conversations. In addition, UCEA community members can browse the other networks and request to join them, providing an opportunity to find colleagues with similar interests and explore new areas.

Share Knowledge Resources

The Networking Tool allows for uploading and sharing different types of multimedia files in the “Discussion” section to create a knowledge base around specific topical categories. All of these files are automatically saved in a centralized resource library and are easily found based on defined tags or media type. Members can comment, engage, and collaborate with one another about the files.

Centralized Calendar of Events

Members may contribute to a “Community Calendar” to capture dates and deadlines for items such as calls for papers, conferences or workshops, registration for conferences or special events, calls for contributions to special issues of journals, and more. All events are aggregated in a single display, making the community a valuable one-stop resource for all of the important events and happenings in the division’s domain.

Here’s what you need to do to participate:

1. Log in to your UCEA user account at www.ucea.org. Update your email address and profile and add a picture.
2. Click on the UCEA Networking Tool link.
3. Browse the current content or create your own network
4. Get Networking!

This tool not only provides an excellent way to facilitate collaboration, but also offers an opportunity for UCEA community members to set an example for how online member interaction can flourish.

---


Congratulations to the 2019 class of Clark Scholars! If you see or work with any of these emerging scholars, be sure to recognize them! Sponsored by UCEA, Divisions A & L of the American Educational Research Association and SAGE Publications, the David L. Clark National Graduate Student Research Seminar in Educational Administration & Policy brings emerging educational administration and policy scholars and noted researchers together for two days of presentations, generative discussion, and professional growth.
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Innovative Programs:
Reborn for Service and Excellence: Leadership Fellows Program of Texas Christian University

Contributor: Marla W. McGhee
Texas Christian University

It has been almost 7 years since the Master of Education in Educational Leadership (plus principal certification) leadership preparation program in the College of Education at the Texas Christian University (TCU) underwent a complete redesign. Between then and now, we have achieved much together—five public school district partners; full-time, full-year administrative residencies for Leadership Fellows in their second year of study; over $1.5 million raised to help offset tuition costs and provide value-added learning and travel experiences; and over 50 individuals placed into educational leadership positions across Tarrant County. With the sixth cohort of Fellows starting in August 2018, we are presently recruiting for the 2019–2021 Fellows (Cohort VII).

The Fellows program has a range of notable features, including field-centered learning experiences; intentional focus on the adult learner; cohort learning with small and personalized classes; and a cutting-edge, standards-based curriculum rich in instructional leadership. Such features would not be actualized without certain structures and processes built intentionally to support and advance these focus areas.

Collaborative Recruitment and Selection Process

Recruitment, screening, and selection is a 7-month, multifaceted process, the strength of which lies in the unique collaboration and partnership between school district leaders and TCU faculty members. A calendar of all activities and deadlines is jointly determined each fall. Personnel in partner districts (including superintendents, chiefs, executive directors, principals, and program alumni) use principal meetings and other administrative avenues to identify teachers who exhibit strong leadership qualities and potential. Information sessions apprise interested candidates of entry and program requirements, expectations, and level of commitments. District leaders also consider and communicate their specific needs and attributes in candidates they seek such as bilingual individuals, secondary versus elementary background, early childhood experience, or experience in highly diverse communities or schools. This intensive collaborative process has yielded a diverse group of Leadership Fellows; across cohorts I–VI, 63% are students of color and 1/3 are multilingual. In addition to the typical TCU College of Education admission requirements and procedure, three distinct aspects are related to Fellows:

• Application/prescreening: The first formal step in the process is to complete an in-district application, which top district administrators vet for future school leadership potential and possible participation as a Leadership Fellow. Because the candidates spend Year 2 of the program working as paid, full-time principal interns, prospective Fellows must have the written endorsement of their campus principal or immediate supervisor and their district superintendent in order to move forward for consideration.

• Assessment: Those who are endorsed through the district prescreening process are invited to participate in an Assessment Center. District leaders (including executive directors, principals, and human resources personnel) and TCU faculty members work side by side to assess applicants (with a set of scoring protocols) on a range of leadership-oriented tasks, including a group interview targeting leadership concepts, a collaborative-creative activity with an eye to successful teamwork, and an on-demand writing sample addressing effective written communication skills based on an equity-oriented prompt.

• Final decisions: Application information, in combination with the Assessment Center data, is carefully analyzed and communicated to district leaders and decision makers. Only after careful scrutiny and evaluation of all data is a list of finalists compiled. The most highly qualified candidates are jointly discussed and agreed upon by all partners. Each partner district superintendent is given the privilege of notifying candidates of their selection.

Financial Incentives and Externships

TCU is a private institution that does not differentiate between undergraduate and graduate tuition. In order to make TCU’s leadership preparation program more accessible to public school classroom teachers, we partner with various foundations and philanthropic organizations in the Fort Worth area to generate financial incentives for leadership development participants. Students selected as Fellows from partner districts pay one third of regular TCU tuition; the university offsets an additional one third, and program funders offset the remaining third. In addition to providing financial support for tuition, local foundations and benefactors also support Fellows’ travel to the annual UCEA conference/Graduate Student Summit, the Texas Education Agency/TASA-sponsored Mid-Winter conference in Austin, an annual Legal Update at the Regional Education Service Center, and a site visit to the Momentous Institute in Dallas.
Leadership Fellows also experience a summer externship in local businesses or professional organizations. Past experiences have included placements at Lockheed Martin, Sewell Lexus, Freese and Nichols Engineering, and United Way of Tarrant County. These experiences provide insights into sound business and management practices and help Fellows to understand the commonalities of effective leadership across professions. In addition to sharing their own leadership story and beliefs about leadership, organizational leaders engage students on topics such as vision/mission/core values; the process for establishing and communicating organizational culture; core business practices such as organizational design, leadership development, marketing, communications, and public relations; and business and financial practices. Likewise, students forge networks and relationships between themselves—as public school representatives—and the broader Fort Worth community.

**Full-Year, Full-time Paid Internship**

As a function of established partnerships with school districts in the Dallas/Fort Worth area, Principal Fellows serve a high-quality full-time, yearlong, paid principal practicum in their sponsoring district during Year 2 of their study. Fellows earn no less than their prior teaching salary and are assigned to specific campuses with intention and purpose, enabling them to be mentored by veteran principals in schools with large numbers of students of color, English language learners, and students living in poverty. Full-time TCU faculty members (former principals who hold principal certification) serve as university supervisors for each intern. Interns participate in a series of Saturday Seminars across the yearlong experience. In order to become familiar with all levels of schooling, cohort members shadow one another during the internship year (elementary to secondary and secondary to elementary) to see leadership at other school levels. On average, Leadership Fellows experience well over 1,500 clock hours of practical administrative work, as compared with the 160 hours required for the principal practicum by Texas statute.

- **Internship planning**: A formal internship proposal is an integral part of the experience and based upon goals and objectives, leadership skills, areas to strengthen, and standards of practice. This individual plan is developed in collaboration with the site mentor to give the student sheltered experiences required to become successful. The proposal describes student background and career goals and is organized in relation to professional standards with a general outline of activities and an approximate timeline.

- **Planned outcomes**: Purposeful, targeted outcomes for the internship are achieved through a series of field assignments and projects aligned with standards that include demonstrating knowledge, skills, vision setting, and application of concepts related to comprehensive campus leadership and instructional supervision; critical campus ancillary services (e.g., transportation, child nutrition, health, building operations); academic services and special populations and programs; human resources management; comprehensive guidance and counseling programs; library-media services; school safety, crisis intervention, behavior management, and restorative practices; effective written and oral communication; policy and operations rules and manuals; and budgeting, funding, and expenditures.

- **Record keeping, monitoring/evaluation**: An Excel log describing the nature of key tasks, the location of the activity, and the time spent engaged in the activity documents the student’s work and time by principal standard. Artifacts (agendas, meeting minutes, lists, conference notes, etc.) are kept separately and reviewed by the supervisor during on-site sessions. Interns and university supervisors regularly communicate through reflective journal entries to discuss critical incidents. University supervisors conduct an on-site orientation for site mentors and interns followed by additional on-site observations with formative oral and written feedback across the academic year. A collaborative, three-way summative review of the entire experience is conducted at the close of the internship year.

- **Saturday seminars**: These are held throughout the course of the internship year; the last hour is spent in a roundtable discussion with cohort mates and the university supervisors to discuss what students are experiencing on their campuses. The sessions often yield problem-solving and troubleshooting conversations with supervisors and interning peers. University supervisors are always available to students by e-mail, phone, or text to response to serious matters or emergencies.

Please contact Dr. Marla McGhee, m.mcghee@tcu.edu, for further inquiries. More information about the TCU Leadership Fellows Program (Master of Education in Educational Leadership plus principal certification) can be found at https://coe.tcu.edu/master-of-education-in-educational-leadership/
Spotlight on Research by The Wallace Foundation: Launching a Redesign of University Principal Preparation Programs

Craig De Voto
University of Illinois at Chicago

In July 2016, The Wallace Foundation launched the University Principal Preparation Initiative (UPPI). This 4-year, $48.5 million initiative supports seven universities, their district and state partners, and mentor programs to redesign the universities’ principal preparation programs according to evidence-based principles and practices. The goal is to generate lessons other university principal preparation programs and their partners can adopt or adapt as they undertake similar redesign efforts. After its first year of implementation, a new study by RAND Corporation has shown promising results. This spotlight is intended to briefly capture them.

The Wallace Foundation has partnered with RAND Cooperation to conduct a 5-year study of how UPPI programs are being implemented and what early results demonstrate. Findings displayed here are from the Wang et al. (2018) report, *Launching a Redesign of University Principal Preparation Programs: Partners Collaborate for Change*, outlining the UPPI’s first full year (Fall 2016 to Fall 2017). Subsequent reports will offer in-depth assessments and analyses of state reform efforts, program implementation, and candidates’ experiences within redesigned programs. The initial report highlights eight findings gleaned during early implementation. These will be discussed in turn, followed by concluding thoughts.

1. **UPPI programs began with some evidence-based features and contexts already in place.**

University programs had already begun implementing some evidenced-based features. These included selective recruitment and coherent curricula to prepare candidates for the demands of the job. However, most did not align such features with extensive clinical experiences. University programs, with the help of their mentor programs, thus began redesigning them. This included the extent to which a full-time model could be implemented.

2. **UPPI partnerships used the first year to develop a vision for the new program and the redesign process.**

Because UPPI programs brought together supporting universities, districts, state partners, and mentor universities, much of the first year was engaged in planning what principal preparation redesign would look like. Three different activities were involved. First, UPPI leadership teams engaged with standards development. Some adopted new program-level standards, whereas others adopted state or national standards. Second, UPPI leadership teams engaged with program assessment. Specifically, Darling-Hammond, LaPointe, Meyerson, Orr, and Cohen’s (2007) research on exemplary principal preparation practices was used. Third, UPPI leadership teams engaged with logic model development. Steps included identifying goals for the redesign, identifying program features to meet such goals, assembling a model, and making iterative revisions. In the process, these activities helped each UPPI program deepen the redesign vision, determine areas of strength and where development was needed, and develop the partnerships needed to carry out such work.

3. **Each UPPI leadership team focused on redesigning its curriculum and instruction.**

Across leadership teams, redesigning curriculum centered on (a) building core ideas across courses, (b) developing cross-course assessments and assignments, and (c) developing a tighter alignment between courses and clinical experiences. The overall intent was to connect theory to practice in meaningful ways. However, leadership teams acknowledged this became difficult given district partners wanted more practical applications.

4. **UPPI leadership teams explored changes to clinical experiences and candidate recruitment and selection.**

Reflecting evidence-based practices and UPPI goals, leadership teams explored how to enhance the clinical experience. The following evidence-based changes were considered: (a) aligning clinical experiences with standards and curriculum; (b) providing candidates with realistic principal experiences; (c) extending the length of the clinical experience; and (d) considering options for enhancing the mentoring, supervision, and evaluation of candidates during the clinical experience. The intention was to provide candidates with experiences representing authentic principal work. Leadership teams also explored how to enhance recruitment and selection. Toward these ends, district input and more performance-based assessments are now being considered. But at the end of the first year, most leadership teams were still planning such changes.

5. **University-based leads and actively engaged partners drove the initiative in the first year.**

University-based leads helped support relationships across state, district, and program partners. They did so by (a) establishing a culture of trust and collaboration, (b) developing and maintaining a common goal, (c) “going slow to go fast,” and (d) using the logic model to guide the work. This helped drive both vision and buy-in across partners during the first year of implementation. Specifically, two models of collaboration...
emerged: (a) codevelopment, in which representatives from each partner organization worked together in subgroups to execute key redesign tasks, and (b) input and delegation, where partners engaged in work individually and brought back to the cross-organizational leadership team for review. District context, preference, and capacity played a role in which model a partnership utilized.

6. UPPI prompted partner states and districts to consider issues or undertake activities they might not have otherwise.

The initiative not only promoted principal preparation redesign, but also influenced some states and districts to reconsider their policies and practices. At the state level, some partners have adopted new or revised leader standards and certification levels and considered scaling elements of UPPI throughout their state. At the district level, some partners have considered revising principal hiring procedures, started working with other district leaders, and expanded professional learning opportunities for both current and aspiring leaders. They also have begun to plan and build a leader tracking system. Consequently, the UPPI has influenced both principal preparation redesign and tethered political and practical considerations.

7. UPPI leadership teams developed strategies to mitigate the most pressing challenges.

Implementation reforms across organizations often create assorted challenges. For UPPI, early challenges have included (a) innovating within traditional university guidelines, (b) aligning curriculum with multiple sets of standards, and (c) balancing district-specific needs with more general needs. They also have included turnover and limited capacities. Toward these ends, leadership teams have developed several mitigating strategies. Turnover, clear goals, timeline, and documentation have helped most programs maintain focus on redesign work. With limited capacities, choosing the right individuals who had the skills, passion, time, and connections was critical. UPPI partners thus recognize choosing the right organizations and individuals from the outset is needed.

Conclusions From the First Year

Thus far, all seven partnerships appear to be engaging in principal preparation redesign efforts. Teams have developed important relationships and are planning (and in some cases already implementing) evidence-based principles and practices. For example, all teams have made progress toward curricular changes. These included building on core constructs across courses, developing assessments of cross-course assignments, and developing a tighter alignment between courses and clinical experiences. Furthermore, all teams have made progress toward planning for the leader tracking system. This included considering what data to track, for what purposes, and how they would do so. Finally, state and district partners have reconsidered their policies and practices. In this way, the UPPI grants have provided the funding and time needed to engage in such redesign activities that otherwise would not be afforded. This is particularly true for university programs and their partnering districts.

At the same time, UPPI partners identified several lessons learned from their first-year experiences. These can inform future UPPI-related principal preparation program reforms and other reforms conducted outside.

First, selecting the right partner organizations and individuals from the outset is critical. Partners should value innovative approaches to preparing leaders, demonstrate a willingness to be flexible, and have a strong voice within their respective organization.

Second, developing strong relationships across partnering organizations is needed. This helps encourage commitments to the redesign process, UPPI aims, and needs of each partner.

Third, early uncertainty and slow progress should be expected. Partnering organizations have their own values, capacities, and needs. Therefore, working towards innovative principal preparation takes time.

In sum, the first year of the UPPI appears to show many promises. All seven partnerships are engaging in principal preparation redesign. As planning transitions to implementation, the next few years should be particularly exciting to watch unfold as The Wallace Foundation continues its mission to promote evidence-based principles and practices across university-based principal preparation programs. Please consider reading the full RAND report for a detailed analysis of the UPPI’s first year.
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District–university partnerships have been identified as a promising way to help develop educational leaders who are equipped to produce more equitable outcomes for all students (Miller, Devin, & Shoop, 2007; Young, Petersen, & Short, 2002). There is a rich history of efforts to position institutions of higher education (IHEs) and local education agencies (LEAs) in a more productive relationship with one another, in service of students and communities (Brooks, Havard, Tatum, & Patrick, 2010; Orr, 2012; Sanzo, Myran, & Clayton, 2011). Central to the Carnegie Foundation’s Improvement Leadership Education and Development (iLEAD) initiative is the belief that improvement science and networked communities offer district–university partnerships new tools to solve pressing local problems of practice and advance learning in the field. iLEAD seeks to establish a network of partnerships that can learn together as they work to embed improvement into the day-to-day practice of educators. In what follows, we reflect on the first year of iLEAD and highlight how it has evolved as a collective endeavor.

Using Networked Improvement Science to Localize Leadership Development

Since 2008, the Carnegie Foundation has been advancing the use of improvement science in networks (i.e., networked improvement communities or NICs) to redress longstanding educational inequities. By combining the disciplined practice of improvement (Langley et al., 2009) with the capability of networks to foster innovation and social learning (Daly, 2010), the foundation seeks to accelerate how the field of education learns to get better at getting better. A networked improvement approach organizes social action to engage in theory-based learning, developing knowledge around what works, for whom, and under what conditions (Gomez, Russell, Bryk, LeMahieu, & Mejia, 2016).

Early success of Carnegie-initiated NICs—such as the Carnegie Math Pathways, a network centered on the problem of remedial math (Bryk, Gomez, Grunow, & LeMahieu, 2015; Huang, 2018)—has helped promote the use of networked improvement science in K-12 as well as postsecondary institutions. Today, the Tulare County Office of Education, National Writing Project, and Better Math Teaching Network, to name a few, use improvement principles and NICs to tackle their own complex problems. The Carnegie Foundation supports these and other institutions engaged in improvement work in a variety of ways, including providing capacity-building scaffolds (e.g., professional education courses) and technical assistance through improvement coaching and reviews. As IHEs increasingly integrate improvement science into course offerings, capstone projects, and scholarly pursuits, the foundation aims to nurture and amplify these efforts to help embed the practice of improvement in the core fabric of what all educators do.

Launching the iLEAD Network

In September 2017, the Carnegie Foundation launched iLEAD to catalyze and extend the efforts of district–university partnerships committed to localizing leadership preparation through the use of networked improvement science principles, methods, and tools. By bringing these institutions together, the foundation seeks to cultivate a network in which partnerships can learn from and with each other, as they develop sustainable collaborative relations focused on specific problems of practice and disciplined by a shared analytical approach. At present, iLEAD is comprised of eleven partnerships:

- Chesterfield County Public Schools and the University of Virginia;
- Denver Public Schools and the University of Denver;
- Evansville Vanderburgh School Corporation and the Indiana University, Bloomington;
- Fairfax County Public Schools, the George Washington Graduate School of Education, and George Mason University;
- Florence School District #1 and the University of South Carolina;
- High Tech High’s Graduate School of Education and the High Tech High Network;
- Mamaroneck Free Union School District and Fordham University;
- Newberg Public Schools and Portland State University;
- Oxford School District and the University of Mississippi;
- Prince George’s County Public Schools and the University of Maryland; and
- UPrep High School/Pittsburgh Public Schools and the University of Pittsburgh.

These partnerships demonstrate strong potential to make networked improvement science a central component of leadership preparation, enact systematic improvement efforts around a local problem, and establish sustainable working relationships within and across institutions. Networked improvement science provides a common language and tools, allowing each iLEAD partnership to contribute to a colleagueship of learning through active sharing of resources, experiences, and expertise.

Learning Our Way Together

iLEAD provides opportunities to learn not only at the partnership level, but also at the network level. To date, partnerships have participated in four full-team, in-person convenings. These events are designed to support knowledge-sharing and relationship-building and provide opportunities for team collaborations, joint planning, and discussions. For instance, at the most recent Fall 2018 convening, teams reflected on the accomplishments
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- Florence School District #1 and the University of South Carolina;
- High Tech High’s Graduate School of Education and the High Tech High Network;
- Mamaroneck Free Union School District and Fordham University;
- Newberg Public Schools and Portland State University;
- Oxford School District and the University of Mississippi;
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and challenges from the first year. This included conversations around common issues such as advancing improvement-focused scholarship, developing practical measures to aid in improvement efforts, and exploring the use of technology to foster greater collaboration. Past convenings have given iLEAD members opportunities to engage in role-alike groups, allowing faculty, graduate students, and district leaders to connect with peers across the network on a host of issues (e.g., research and publishing, creating sustainable funding streams). Evaluations consistently identify these cross-team exchanges as central to advancing the work and thinking of iLEAD members.

Between each convening, partnerships not only focus on their local initiatives, but also generate common products shared across the network. These include progress reports, annual plans, and other documentation of iLEAD-related work. During these “action periods,” Carnegie Foundation staff conduct “collegial support” calls to check in with each partnership and provide any necessary supports. These calls allow iLEAD members to think and problem-solve with foundation senior fellows and executive leaders on a range of topics, such as organizational and staff development, strategic planning, and building will among policy makers. Carnegie staff also serve as connectors, advising partnerships on who else in the network may be able to provide insight and support on their particular efforts or dilemmas (e.g., the design of improvement science professional development institutes).

To support learning in the network, the foundation established an iLEAD dedicated site on its social learning platform, the Networked Improvement Learning System. Through the Networked Improvement Learning System, members can create online discussion boards, post and share resources, and collaborate on projects. The foundation has extended to iLEAD participants free enrollment in its mediated online course entitled Introduction to Networked Improvement Basics; this course combines online videos and assignments, site-based team activities, as well as live virtual discussions and group reflections.

Lastly, to help guide the development and strategic direction of iLEAD, a steering committee, comprised of one district and one university representative from each partnership, has been established. This committee will, among other things, help advise on key decisions, build a broader funding base for the network, and provide leadership to efforts aimed at expanding learning opportunities for iLEAD members. In addition, the committee will help create NICs, connecting partnerships together that are committed to solve the same problem (e.g., increasing third-grade literacy).

**Developing a Common Guiding Framework**

iLEAD seeks to nurture both local efforts, which respond to specific place- and problem-based concerns, and network-wide learning, built on common issues and aspirations. Given the number of partnerships involved in iLEAD and the wide variation among them, creating effective conditions for learning requires a common language. Thus, through a series of facilitated activities during the Winter 2018 convening, network members coconstructed a working set of Developmental Progressions. These Progressions serve as a common language and framework, which helps anchor and define the work in which the iLEAD network is collectively engaged.

The Developmental Progressions identify 24 areas of work, at the district, university, and partnership levels, critical to the success of district–university collaborations. These areas were first defined by taking stock of the efforts already underway at each of the partnership sites and, later, by engaging in collective visioning (answering the question, “What would success look like?”). For example, seven areas of work have been identified at the partnership level:

1. **Partnership relations.** How might we characterize the quality and health of the LEA–IHE partnership?
2. **Joint development of targeted problems of practice.** How might partners focus on common challenges and continuously learn from their ongoing work?
3. **Formalizing data agreements.** To what extent are partnerships establishing agreements and structures that can sustain leadership transitions?
4. **Learning to improve.** To what extent are partnerships developing continuous improvement feedback systems?
5. **Formalizing a joint LEA–IHE “new leaders development program.”** To what extent is the partnership central to developing the leadership pipeline throughout the district(s) being served?
6. **A shared partnership narrative.** To what extent do partners internalize a common rationale and vision for the work they do together?
7. **Public communications.** To what extent do partners communicate their goals and progress on the various areas of work identified by the Developmental Progressions?

Each area of the Progressions exists on a continuum. Currently, the Progressions characterize the stages of growth in four ways: piloting, emerging, articulating, and institutionalizing. For instance, in the area of “Learning to improve” (see above), a partnership at the emerging phase would be “exploring how to work together using improvement science/NICs,” while one that is institutionalizing is “documenting and jointly reviewing evidence from a quality improvement system and using this to plan the next set of improvement cycles for the partnership.” By using the Developmental Progressions, partnerships are able to self-assess where their efforts have resulted in substantial development and where they remain nascent.

Over the past year, iLEAD partnerships have applied the Progressions in different ways. During the action periods, some partnerships have used the Progressions as a self-assessment tool. In doing so, the diverse efforts happening at the IHE, LEA, and partnership levels are made more visible for everyone across the network. The Progressions also have been incorporated into a shared annual planning and documentation process, in which partnerships locate and categorize their activities and priorities within particular areas of work.
Learning From the Experiences of iLEAD Partnerships

The Developmental Progressions are designed to be continuously revised by the network so that they better represent and guide the efforts of partnerships. Recently, Carnegie has examined the degree to which the Progressions could be used as an analytical and organizing tool to understand the experiences of partnerships the first year of iLEAD. Based on preliminary analyses of qualitative data, namely the work products of partnerships (e.g., documentation of work during action periods, materials developed during convenings), we find that the Progressions serve as a sense-making tool that can help more precisely locate areas of work critical to partnerships’ successes and challenges. Based on data from four representative partnerships, we find three major themes emerging as particularly promising in ensuring that partnerships are effective and long-lasting:

1. **Detailed understanding of district priorities and ways of working** means the degree to which partnership efforts respond to and align with the district’s identified problems and strategic planning processes.

2. **Direct and active involvement of executive leadership** is the level of involvement of executive leaders in the partnership’s substantive work and strategic decision-making.

3. **Organizational improvement capacity** includes partnerships’ strategies to develop district and university stakeholders’ capabilities to engage in systematic improvement work.

Data suggest that attending to these three areas may help partnerships gain and sustain momentum, leverage resources, and develop spread and scale strategies that can withstand changing district and university conditions. Our analysis also suggests that the Progressions could be further refined to account for the interrelated and causal relationship between the various areas of work—some of which may play a stronger role in the development and sustainability of partnerships.

In addition to the analysis above, Foundation staff have collected feedback formally and informally on partnerships’ experience using the Developmental Progressions (e.g., through the “collegial support” calls). We find that partnerships differ in how they employ the Progressions. Whereas some partnerships use the Progressions to take stock and “name” their activities, strategies, and initiatives using the categories represented, others find the Progressions too abstract and far too numerous to employ in any meaningful way. As such, some members have suggested sharpening the Progressions to the most essential elements and articulating further the qualities of each developmental stage. The network will continue to engage in the process of revising the framework so that it better responds to collective needs.

Looking Ahead

As we reflect back on the first year of iLEAD, we are struck by not only how individual partnerships have evolved, but also how the network has matured. Some notable developments include partnerships being better able to define and scope their work, establish organizational routines that prize scientific thinking (e.g., Plan-Do-Study-Act inquiry cycles) as a way to achieve improvements, and develop curriculum and learning experiences that train leaders how to apply networked improvement science to address critical community issues.

In sum, we believe that the complexity of operating district–university partnerships can benefit from a networked approach. As we move into the second year of iLEAD and further refine the vision, mission, and future direction of iLEAD, we will continue to build our collective knowledge base and hone our skills in capturing and deploying this knowledge across the network and our field more broadly, in meaningful ways.
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The Education Leadership Program at Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, NY, is comprised of distinguished faculty committed to the advancement of educational leadership preparation, scholarship, and practice. Our aim is to prepare the next cadre of culturally responsive leaders in education—whether as school principals, urban district superintendents, independent school heads, or education leadership research faculty—to serve as effective and transformative agents of change in their respective educational organizations, school communities, and policy environments. We prepare aspiring leaders and leadership faculty through four different degree programs, all of which emphasize the acquisition of theoretical and evidence-based knowledge and the development of skills, habits of mind, and values essential to creative and highly effective leaders. Our programs are also distinctive in their focus on leadership contexts, adult learning and development, self-awareness and reflection, and cultural responsiveness. With eight core full-time faculty (five tenured research faculty, three clinical faculty) who both lead and teach in our degree programs while working in close collaboration with a stellar team of part-time and adjunct faculty, our Education Leadership Program ensures our students have access to a wealth of both academic and practitioner knowledge and expertise as they pursue their own leadership journeys.

www.tc.columbia.edu/organization-and-leadership/education-leadership/

Located at Indiana’s premier urban research university in downtown Indianapolis, the School of Education reflects IUPUI’s express commitments to urban communities, civic engagement, equity, diversity and inclusion, and research that is community engaged and translational. The undergraduate and graduate programs prepare exemplary teachers, leaders, counselors, and researchers for work in urban contexts. Through sustained partnerships with schools and districts; community members and organizations; and local, state, and national leaders, we promote antiopressive practices to ensure students across our schools and communities receive high-quality education. The School of Education and the Educational Leadership program are distinguished by a diverse and dynamic faculty, who share a demonstrated commitment to social justice, community engagement, and scholarship that advances antioppressive education through critically informed pedagogies, leadership and policy analysis and advocacy.

Current full-time Educational Leadership faculty include Khaula Murtadha, Associate Vice Chancellor for Community Engagement; Samantha Paredes Scribner, Associate Professor of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies; Brendan Maxcy, Associate Dean of Research and Faculty Development; Thu Suong Thi Nguyen, Associate Professor of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies; Hardy Murphy, Clinical Associate Professor of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies; David H. K. Nguyen, Assistant Professor of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies; and Kari Carr, Visiting Professor. In addition, our work is supported by practicing leaders who teach classes, mentor students, and provide guidance in program development and delivery.

www.ucea.org

New Associate Member
Teachers College,
Columbia University

New Full Member
Indiana University–Purdue
University Indianapolis

Teachers College Education Leadership Program Faculty (L to R): Mark Anthony Gooden, Ellie Drago-Severson, Alex Bowers, Nancy Streim, Jeffrey Young, Sonya Douglass Horsford, Nicole Furlonge. Not pictured: Pearl Rock Kane and Brian Perkins.
New Associate Member
The University of Texas at Tyler

The School of Education at The University of Texas at Tyler offers a Master of Education in Educational Administration, including the required courses for the Texas Principal Certification. Additionally, the School of Education offers the required courses for the Texas Superintendent Certification. The faculty is committed to excellence by providing relevant and rigorous learning opportunities for aspiring educational leaders. They are dedicated to continuous inquiry and research to build new knowledge while seeking to improve the education of all students in Texas. The Educational Leadership team consists of five faculty members; three are former school superintendents, and all are former school principals, with a combined total of 94 years of experience in rural and urban public education, as well as 41 years in higher education. The Educational Leadership faculty have published over 107 refereed articles and presented at 100 peer-reviewed state, national, and international conferences. In addition to an unwavering commitment to teaching excellence and scholarship, the Educational Leadership faculty are actively involved in the community and provide an extensive range of services to local and state education agencies. The faculty leads school improvement efforts across the region; edit a state educational administration book published every legislative year; edit the journal Diversity, Social Justice, and the Educational Leader; and coedit the nationally refereed Texas Council of Professors of Educational Administration's journal, School Leadership Review. The service provided by the UT Tyler faculty goes beyond Texas, as members of the team work closely with schools in southern Belize, where they provide professional development for teachers and school leaders.

http://www.uttyler.edu/academics/graduate/educational-administration-degree.php

UT Tyler Educational Leadership faculty (L to R): Dean Ross Sherman, Vance Vaughn, Gary Miller, Yanira Oliveras-Ortiz, Jennifer Jones, Wesley Hickey (Director of School of Education)

New Associate Member
Old Dominion University

Old Dominion University is a research university located on the Elizabeth River in Norfolk, Virginia serving over 27,000 undergraduate and graduate students. The ethos of the university and its colleges is academic rigor, strategic community partnerships, entrepreneurialism, and civic engagement. The Educational Leadership Services (ELS) program area in the College of Education and Professional Services is dedicated to transforming today’s teachers into tomorrow’s leaders. Situated within the Department of Educational Foundations and Leadership, the ELS program area primarily serves students, educators, and leaders in more than 300 schools across seven urban school districts in the Hampton Roads area. Through innovative program design and delivery, though, the ELS programs also reach suburban and rural areas of Virginia, North Carolina, and beyond.

The ELS master’s and education specialist degree programs lead to PK-12 administrator licenses. These degree programs are designed to educate aspiring leaders at the intersection of school leadership and the critical areas of social justice, organizational learning and improvement, and educational policy. Further, ELS programs provide students with the skills and dispositions to apply knowledge, innovate, advocate, and bring about change in schools and communities on behalf of children. In addition to licensure programs, ELS provides advanced educational leadership and policy studies at the doctoral level.

Through continuous self-reflection, the ELS faculty have developed a program envisioned as much more than degree programs. To meet its service mission, faculty work with the education community to collaboratively identify and address needs through annual working conferences; webinars; and hands-on, field-based engagement reaching thousands of educational stakeholders over the past decade. ELS’s faculty consist of five research-oriented and one clinical full-time faculty members and a cadre of successful and field-based adjunct faculty.

https://www.odu.edu/efl/academics/els
I. General Information

The 33rd annual UCEA Convention will be held November 21-24, 2019 at the Hilton New Orleans Riverside in New Orleans, LA. The purpose of the 2019 UCEA Convention is to engage participants in discussions about research, policy, practice, and preparation in the field of education with a specific focus on educational leadership. Members of the 2019 Convention Program Committee are Gerardo R. López (University of Utah), Erica Fernández (University of Connecticut), Frank Hernández (Southern Methodist University), and Kevin Lawrence Henry, Jr. (University of Arizona).

II. UCEA Convention Theme

The 33rd Annual UCEA Convention theme, *Where y’at: Validating subaltern forms of leadership and learning within and outside of schools*, aims to center a broad array of knowledges, discourses, practices, experiences, epistemologies, and ways of knowing that historically have been marginalized, downplayed, and/or rendered invisible in the larger field of educational leadership. In this regard, the “subaltern” specifically refers to individuals who have been marginalized in our field and in society: women, people of color, native populations, the undocumented, the poor, LGBTQIA+ communities, people with disabilities, older people, people from minoritized religions, people experiencing homelessness, those with intersecting identities, and/or those whose identities are not often recognized in society. Moreover, the “subaltern” also refers to individuals who have been prevented from accessing social, political, or economic power within a particular society, group, or organization. In K-12 school settings, these might be those with constrained agency or silenced voices: students, parents, grandparents, extended family members, teachers, instructional assistants, parent volunteers/liaisons, cafeteria workers, custodial staff, etc. Another understanding of “subaltern,” more generally, might refer to concepts, ideas, and norms that stand outside hegemonic configurations, for example, nontraditional or novel perspectives that are not acknowledged or widely circulated. Within our field, nontraditional perspectives might refer to different understandings/manifestations of leadership, alternative formulations of education, diverse organizational structures, or different institutional norms that guide/shape the overall philosophy of a school.

When taken holistically, the conference theme aims to purposefully center the “history of the historyless” (Bhattacharya, 1983) in order to shed light on perspectives and positions that have not been largely represented in the educational leadership arena. The Italian post-Marxist scholar Antonio Gramsci coined the term subaltern to specifically refer to social groups that are excluded from participation in society and are—by virtue of their social position—denied agency and voice in the larger social structure. While subaltern was historically synonymous with proletariat, postcolonial scholars eventually appropriated the term in the 1970s and gave it a broader meaning. Subaltern has now come to denote a range of identities that interact and intersect with economic class in complex ways. The term currently refers to individuals and groups that are rendered one-down because of their social position, rank, or station in society.

One should be cautious, however, not to apply the “subaltern” name too loosely, because not everyone who occupies a marginalized space is necessarily subaltern. As postcolonial scholar Gayatri Spivak (1992) so cogently summarized, “Subaltern is not just a catchy word for ‘oppressed’” (p. 44). Rather, the subaltern refers to those who do not have access to traditional hegemonic structures (social, legal, educational, economic, political, etc.). In this regard, the subaltern denotes both individuals from a particular social location as well as the mechanisms and practices that created hierarchical social categories in the first place (i.e., colonialism, imperialism, capitalism, etc.).

As academics, we have responsibility to shed light on the effects of these mechanisms on ordinary human lives by intentionally “inserting the subaltern into the circuit of hegemony” (Spivak, 1992, p. 46). The goal of such a project is not to fetishize the subaltern or center their practices in voyeuristic fashion, but to disrupt existing power relations while highlighting the limitations of our own thinking and practice. In effect, we have a responsibility to actively work against subalternity by working for, with, and in the interest of the subaltern. To be certain, this process is easier said than done, as it necessitates critical reflection and painstaking care to not reproduce the range of power relations that are always present in society. For example, we don’t simply give the subaltern voice by speaking “for” them in our journal articles or casually bringing them into to our classes and lecture halls as curious objects for inquiring spectators. Rather, we must proactively clear academic and nonacademic spaces so that the subaltern can speak for themselves as breathing/living subjects. Only by working for the subaltern are we able to flip the script and challenge power relations in our field and in the larger social order.

It is apropos that we collectively explore this theme in New Orleans, a city born from French colonialism, Spanish fortuitousness, and U.S. expansionism. The subjugation, destruction, and enslavement of Native populations—in particular the Chitimacha, Atakapa, Choctaw, Houma, Natchez, Caddo, and Tunica tribes—began when the French laid claim to these North American territories. After 100 years of colonial rule, the mass production of cotton and sugarcane opened the door to the domestic slave trade of Africans in the South. Because the U.S. had outlawed the trade of trans-Atlantic slaves in 1808, it turned to domestic
enslavement as a source of economic exploitation and human domination. Eventually, New Orleans became the primary U.S. location where domestic slaves were bought and sold. By the late 1800s and early 1900s, a new wave of European immigrants arrived in New Orleans as a result of two World Wars, and new arrivals from other parts of the world arrived in the decades that followed. These new populations added their own traditions, cultures, and folkways to the city. While this gumbo of cultures seemed pleasant on the surface, the racial, economic, and structural roots of racism and colonization ran deep. Sadly, the devastation and destruction of Hurricane Katrina in 2005 shook the city to its core, revealing vestiges of racism, poverty, and structural inequalities that had shaped the city for centuries.

In short, one cannot engage with New Orleans or its people without engaging with history itself. Its past is its present; the lingering effects of history can be witnessed in its music, cuisine, culture, religion, customs, traditions, ways of speech, and everyday practices. As Leslie Harris (2009) summarized, New Orleans is a subaltern city with subaltern citizens. Despite the fact that racial, social and economic arrangements have persisted through time, its traditions and heritage have passed on from generation to generation. For example, children learn jazz music informally and aurally—through mentoring, apprenticeships, jam sessions, and group improvisation. While jazz education has certainly become formalized in recent years, particular styles and embellishments are often honed on street corners, living rooms, nightclubs, and other nontraditional spaces. These types of hidden or subaltern forms of “education” are important, for they help us break away from the notion that education only happens in traditional/formal arenas.

To address the 2019 UCEA Convention theme, “Where y’at: Validating subaltern forms of leadership and learning with/in and outside of schools,” UCEA invites submissions that (1) center the discourses, epistemologies, and ways of knowing of non-traditional/marginalized populations; (2) shed light on nontraditional forms of learning and education; (3) challenge traditional understandings of leadership and how we prepare school and district leaders; (4) explore the myriad ways of centering voice and agency of all stakeholders in schools; and (5) explore new possibilities for engaging policy makers and elected officials.

The following five topics and related questions are provided to stimulate thinking about the 2019 UCEA Convention and theme, Where y’at: Validating subaltern forms of leadership and learning with/in and outside of schools. Importantly, proposals addressing related themes and topics are also welcome.

1. **Centering different communities, discourses and ways of knowing.** Although we have made great strides in recognizing diversity as a “strength,” we still have a long way to go truly honor, value, and center communities that have been minoritized in society and marginalized in our field. Why do these voices/perspectives remain largely absent? How do schools limit agency and/or voice to subaltern populations? How can we create socially just and equitable schools that are inclusive and humane for all stakeholders? How can we broaden our profession and knowledge base to be more critical and inclusive?

2. **Rethinking education, learning, and schooling.** Schooling is the formal process within an educational institution that has received most of our attention. But education extends well beyond the institution of school. Moreover, merely attending school does not necessarily result in learning. What is meant by education, learning, and schooling, and why have we conflated these terms in our field? What new understandings arise when we disentangle these constructs? What can we learn from “everyday” forms of education that are happening at kitchen tables, living rooms, coffee shops, bars, street corners, barber shops, playgrounds, basketball courts, etc.? How do we prepare school leaders to recognize and value the broad range of learning that happens both inside and outside of school?

3. **Exploring new ideas in leadership.** Traditional understandings of “leaders” and “leadership” have dominated our field for years—profoundly shaping how we come know who a leader is, what leadership looks like, and what a leader does. Although we have certainly explored new understandings of leadership for some time (e.g., leaderless organizations, bottom-up leadership, collaborative leadership, followership, etc.), the field, as a whole, has been recalcitrant to fully embrace these alternatives. How can we recognize and embrace new ideas in leadership, particularly those that emerge from nontraditional spaces? How do current social structures and arrangements reify particular understandings of leadership? What does leadership look like outside of U.S./Western contexts?

4. **Centering voice and agency of all stakeholders.** Educational leaders must give agency and voice to all stakeholders, including students, parents, teachers, cafeteria workers, community organizations, government agencies, community and faith-based organizations, local businesses, etc. How do educational leaders build empowering alliances that are affirming, reciprocal, and validating of all stakeholders? How do communities benefit from such partnerships, and how are they sustained over time? Who is invited to the proverbial table, and why? How does power play a role in shaping whose voice and perspectives are privileged in schools?

5. **Exploring new possibilities in politics and policy.** Educational policies and politics shape leadership and relationships within and across school communities, yet policies can also be mechanisms of control that reproduce inequities and existing social arrangements. In what ways can school leaders work against the disciplinary nature of policy? What does it mean to work for the subaltern, and against subalternity? What should we do when our ethical and political commitments to our various stakeholders conflicts with our leadership responsibilities and duties?
The 2019 UCEA Convention Call for Proposals strongly encourages submissions that explore the listed themes; however, UCEA also welcomes proposals focused on quality leadership preparation; effective preparation program designs and improvement efforts; leadership practice; policies concerning educational leadership issues; successful coalitions that enhance leadership, policy work, and politics; collaborative research that enriches the community; research on global issues and contexts influencing the field of educational leadership and policy; and other issues that impact the current and future practice of educators and policymakers. Those engaged in research, policy, or practice in educational or youth-serving agencies are strongly encouraged to submit proposals for consideration.

III. UCEA Convention Session Types

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.

B. **Ignite Presentations.** Ignite presentations 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. 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 applicable), and examples of questions or areas to be addressed. Example of an Ignite Session: http://www.youtube.com/user/iGNiTe?blend=1&ob=4#p/u/3/rqSkulkwQ98

C. **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 provide electronic copies of papers presented during the session.

D. **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 session format, and a list of the national contexts that will be represented.

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. **Critical Conversations and Networking Sessions.** These sessions are intended to stimulate informal, lively discussions around a series of provocative questions or research in process. Sessions may be structured in a variety of ways: (a) a session could include a panel of participants who facilitate and guide the conversation; (b) a session could be organized as a dialogue where the organizers and attendees discuss an issue or series of questions, or (c) a session could be structured to provide scholars with common research interests dedicated time to meet, plan, discuss, and consider developing collaborative projects, papers, linked research, and other scholarly pursuits that will be a continued focus beyond the convention. 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.

G. **UCEA Film Festival.** Participants may submit 5-minute videos that explore broadly the landscape of quality leadership preparation, including research and engaged scholarship, preparation program designs and improvement efforts, policy work, and the practice of educational leaders. These submissions cannot be submitted through All Academic. Additional details can be found in the UCEA Review and on the UCEA website: http://www.ucea.org. Video submissions are due July 31, 2019.

H. **Post Convention 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.

IV. Submission Guidelines

Submission length **must not exceed 3 single-spaced pages** (about 1,500 words or 6,000 characters) using 12-point font (Times New Roman). References are **required** and must not exceed **1 single-spaced page** (about 400 words or 2,200 characters).
Through the act of submitting a proposal, an individual is entering a professional agreement to review proposals for the convention; to attend and deliver the content described in the proposal; and, in the event that a paper is being presented, to share a copy of the work with convention attendees. Furthermore, lead authors are required to upload an advance copy of their paper into the All Academic System through the UCEA Convention site 3 weeks prior to the convention (October 30, 2019). Ignite presenters are expected to upload a two-page summary of the talking points they will be sharing at the convention prior to the October 30 deadline. Failure to live up to these commitments may lead to the submission being removed from the convention program.

V. 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.

VI. Criteria for Review of UCEA Convention Proposals

All proposals will be subject to blind, peer review by two reviewers, which will occur electronically. Proposals MUST NOT include names of session organizers or presenters. Primary authors of submitted proposals agree to serve as proposal reviewers.

Research Paper Proposals will be evaluated for

- Relevance of the proposal to educational leadership and/or convention theme,
- Appropriateness of the theoretical/conceptual framework,
- Appropriateness of the methods, including analytical strategies,
- Anchoring of proposal content to relevant scholarly literature,
- Quality of writing, and
- Audience appeal.

All other proposals will be evaluated for

- Relevance of the proposal to educational leadership and/or conference theme,
- Thoroughness and clarity of the proposal,
- Consistency of proposal content and purpose with proposed format,
- Anchoring of proposal content to relevant scholarly literature, and
- Audience appeal.

VII. Proposal Reviewers

UCEA invites all convention attendees and participants to serve as reviewers for the 2019 Convention. Through the act of submitting a proposal, an individual is entering a professional agreement to review proposals for the convention. UCEA encourages submitters to invite their co-authors to participate in this important professional activity. Individuals can volunteer to serve as a reviewer on the UCEA website.

VIII. Participant Registration and Attendance Requirement

All presenting authors of accepted papers and all participants in accepted sessions (including session facilitators) are required to register for and attend the Annual Convention and to be present at the scheduled sessions. Submission is a commitment to do so.

IX. Deadlines

Proposals must be received by Sunday, May 5, 2019, by midnight Eastern Standard Time. 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 March 27, 2019.

X. Graduate Student Summit

Successfully launched at the 2012 Convention in Denver, the Symposium will be returning once again this year for the 2019 Convention in New Orleans, LA. Doctoral students from UCEA member institutions are invited to submit proposals for this preconference event. Further details regarding the Graduate Student Summit call for proposals can be found on the next page of the UCEA Review and the Graduate Student portion of the UCEA website: http://www.ucea.org/graduate-student-opportunities/graduate-student-summit/
UCEA 2019 Graduate Student Summit
Call for Proposals
“Where y’at: Validating subaltern forms of leadership and learning with/in and outside of schools”

I. General Information

The 8th annual UCEA Graduate Student Summit (GSS) will be held at the Hilton New Orleans Riverside in New Orleans, LA. The GSS will commence at 12:00 pm on Wednesday, November 20, 2019 and conclude at 11:30 am on Thursday, November 21, 2019. The purpose of the GSS is to provide graduate students a space to engage in authentic dialogue about their scholarly work. This GSS will offer opportunities to meet and network with graduate students and faculty, to present your work, and receive feedback on your research. It will include:

- **Paper sessions**, in which you will share your research and receive constructive feedback.
- **Ignite! sessions**, in which you will share your research and/or ideas for research projects and receive constructive feedback.
- **Roundtable sessions**, in which you will share your research and/or ideas for research projects and receive constructive feedback.
- **Mentor feedback sessions for paper, Ignite!, and roundtable presenters**, in which you will get direct feedback from distinguished faculty on a work that you would like to publish, a proposal, or your dissertation research plan.
- **Networking sessions**, where you will have the chance to network with faculty and students from other UCEA institutions interested in similar research topics and talk with UCEA Executive Committee members and Plenum Session Representatives.
- **Social gatherings for graduate students**, where you will have the chance to make connections with others sharing similar life experiences in graduate schools across the globe.
- **Developmental workshops for graduate students**, where you will hear from emerging and established scholars on such topics as creating a research agenda, crafting a CV, applying for jobs, the publishing process, and grappling with and making it through graduate school.

II. Theme

The GSS is an extension of the UCEA Convention. In keeping with the UCEA Convention, students should demonstrate how their proposals for the GSS address the UCEA Convention theme, “Where y’at: Validating subaltern forms of leadership and learning with/in and outside of schools.” Please refer to the 2019 UCEA Convention Call for Proposals for a full discussion of the 2019 Convention theme.

III. Graduate Student Summit Proposal Submission Categories

This year, we are providing three session categories, each of which provides a tiered outlet for ideas and works in various stages of completion. If you will have a manuscript-length paper completed by the end of October, you should submit a proposal for a paper presentation. If you have an idea that is in-progress, a useful strategy to share, or poignant idea/question to propose, you should submit a proposal for an Ignite! presentation. If you have an idea about a potential research project and/or have an outline developed, but would like feedback on how to proceed, you should submit a proposal for a roundtable presentation. Please note that most of the works graduate students present at the GSS are works-in-progress. A key purpose of the GSS is to create a safe, constructive space for graduate students to receive feedback from faculty mentors and fellow graduate students on how to strengthen their work.

A. **Paper proposal.** A paper proposal is intended for reporting research results or analyzing issues of policy and practice in an abbreviated form. You should submit for a SINGLE paper presentation only—not an entire paper session. Presenters are required to upload electronic copies of their papers 3 weeks before the GSS begins. Your submitted paper proposal should include a statement of purpose, conceptual/theoretical framework, findings (even if preliminary), and implications/conclusions. For research reports, also describe data sources and methods.

B. **Ignite! presentation proposal.** An Ignite! presentation proposal is intended to stimulate informal, lively discussions using a 5-minute presentation with no more than 20 slides, where each slide is displayed for approximately 15 seconds while the presenter 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 audience members. Ignite! presentations are an ideal way to present innovations, effective strategies and tools, problems of practice, collaborations, etc. You should submit for a SINGLE 5-minute Ignite! presentation only—not an entire Ignite! session. Your submitted Ignite! presentation proposal should be for an individual (5-minute) Ignite! presentation that describes the purpose and topic of the 5-minute presentation, relevant literature, findings (if applicable), and examples of questions or areas to be addressed. View an example of an “Ignite” Session here: http://www.youtube.com/user/iGniTe?blend=1&ob=4#p/u/3/rqSkulkwQ98
C. Roundtable proposal. These sessions are intended for discussing early works-in-progress where you may have an outline developed, but have not started writing the formal elements of a paper, collecting data, and/or drafting final assertions/implications. Presenters are required to upload electronic copies of their outlines 3 weeks before the GSS begins. Your submitted roundtable proposal should include the overall topic, research questions, relevant literature you are pulling from, and a general outline for the research study.

Sample proposals for each will be posted to the UCEA graduate student development webpage at http://gradstudents.ucea.org by early March. Please refer to those exemplars as you craft your own proposal. Should you have questions about proposal drafting, feel free to email the UCEA Graduate Student Council at uceagradconnex@gmail.com.

IV. Criteria for Review of Proposals

To participate in the GSS as a presenter, you must submit a proposal, and that proposal must be accepted. All proposals will be subject to blind, peer review by the UCEA Graduate Student Council and at least two outside reviewers. Priority will be given to single-author papers or papers co-authored by graduate students. The lead author of each proposal also agrees to serve as a reviewer for other GSS proposals. An author’s failure to live up to either of these commitments may lead to the proposal being removed from the GSS. **The text of the proposal must not include author names; for many reviewers, this is grounds for proposal rejection.** Proposals 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;
- conceptual/theoretical framework, methods, analysis, and presentation of findings (for empirical research); and
- significance, especially for PK-12 educational leadership and/or PK-20 education policy.

V. Submission and Participation Guidelines and Proposal Deadlines

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

**Proposals must be received by Sunday, May 5, 2019 11:59 pm Eastern Standard Time.** All proposals must be submitted electronically at the link to be provided at the UCEA homepage (http://www.ucea.org). The site will open March 27, 2019. Please follow the prompts for submitting to the 2019 GSS.

You may submit more than one proposal to the GSS, and you may submit the same proposal to both the GSS and the UCEA Convention. Please note that these submissions are separate. If you submit a proposal to the GSS and also wish to submit it to the UCEA Convention, you must go through all the same steps in the AllAcademic system but through the pathway for the UCEA Convention, too. If you plan to use the same title for both proposals, please append your GSS submission title to include “(GSS)” at the end (minus quotes).

Submission length **must not exceed three (3) single-spaced pages** (approximately 1,500 words or 6,000 characters; excluding references and tables/figures) **using 12-point font** (Times New Roman). References are required and **must not exceed one (1) single-spaced page** (approximately 400 words or 2,200 characters). **The text of the proposal must not include any author names.**

The lead author of the proposal is required to upload an advance copy of the work into the AllAcademic system through the UCEA Convention site 3 weeks prior to the GSS (October 30, 2019). This is required for your faculty mentor to review your work to offer feedback. By submitting a proposal, the author of the proposal also agrees to serve as a reviewer for GSS proposals. An author’s failure to live up to either of these commitments (uploading an advance copy and/or failing to serve as a reviewer) may lead to the proposal being removed from consideration and/or the GSS program.

Please carefully review your proposal before submitting it. The AllAcademic system directly copies the information provided in the proposal for the program, so check your title, author names, and affiliations.

VI. Graduate Student Summit Registration

The GSS immediately precedes the 2019 UCEA Convention. Registration for the 2019 UCEA GSS will be available online through the UCEA registration site in June 2019. The cost of attending the 2019 GSS will be announced along with the regular Convention registration rates. **The cost of registering for the UCEA Convention is a separate fee, and registration for both the UCEA Convention and the GSS is required for presenting during the GSS.**

If you have questions at any time, please feel free to email the UCEA Graduate Student Council at uceagradconnex@gmail.com.
Call for Nominations: 2019 Exemplary Educational Leadership Preparation (EELP) Award

Intent to Apply due Monday, April 29, 2019
Deadline to Submit Materials: Friday, June 28, 2019

THE AWARD

Quality leadership preparation is essential to quality leadership practice. Research reveals an important relationship between preparation and leaders’ career outcomes, practices, and school improvement efforts. Exemplary/effective university-based programs evidence a range of program features that collectively contribute to robust leadership preparation. To celebrate exemplary programs as well as to cultivate a group of exemplary programs that model and can help to catalyze and support ongoing program improvement in other universities, UCEA has established the Exemplary Educational Leadership Preparation (EELP) Award. This award complements UCEA’s core mission to advance the preparation and practice of educational leaders for the benefit of all children and schools.

Leadership educators are invited to nominate their programs for recognition at the 2019 UCEA Convention. The program or programs (up to three) determined most worthy of recognition will receive a cash award, an engraved plaque, and recognition in multiple UCEA publications. In addition, the award-winning program(s) will be recognized at a session during the UCEA Convention, on the UCEA website, and through a case-study publication. Award-winning programs/faculty are likely to be tapped by UCEA at various junctures to serve as models and illustrations for other preparation programs or faculty teams engaged in ongoing program improvement.

This award will be made to programs within colleges, schools, and departments of education. For example, university-based programs preparing leaders to lead in elementary, middle, or high schools or programs focusing on the development of district-level leadership are eligible for recognition. More than one program within a department, school, or college of education may apply.

AWARD CRITERIA

Applications will be judged on the extent to which the programs are (a) aligned with research and scholarship about exemplary and effective leadership preparation and (b) have evidence of program effectiveness and impact. Although the 2012 research-based document titled UCEA Institutional and Program Quality Criteria provides an accounting of features, content, and experiences associated with effective leadership preparation, more recent empirical and scholarly literature on effective and exemplary leadership preparation provides additional insights about important dimensions of these criteria that are considered as programs are reviewed for this award. The Handbook of Research on the Education of School Leaders (2nd ed., Young & Crow, 2016) is one such source of more recent information.

THE PROCEDURE

For the full set of award criteria and instructions, please visit www.ucea.org/opportunities/exemplary-university-based-educational-leadership-preparation/

Step 1: Read through the award criteria and instructions. View the 2019 EELP Award Rubric (http://3fl71l2qoj4l3y6ep2tqpwra.wpengine.netdna-cdn.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/EELP-Award-Rubric-.pdf)

Step 2: Submit a statement of intent to apply (through the link above) by Monday, April 29, 2019. Upon receipt of a program’s intent to submit an Award Application, the program contact will be invited to an Award Dropbox Folder where program application materials should be deposited.

Step 3: Review recent empirical and scholarly literature on exemplary/effective leadership preparation and review program information associated with prior EELP award-winning programs. This information will help your program to deepen its understanding of exemplary/effective principal preparation and things to “look for” when completing a self-assessment of your program. Use the UCEA Institutional and Program Quality Criteria (http://3fl71l2qoj4l3y6ep2tqpwra.wpengine.netdna-cdn.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/UCEAProgramCriteria.pdf) to identify potential sources of evidence to self-evaluate the extent to which your program meets the 2019 EELP Award Rubric criteria.


Step 5: Prepare Parts I–V of the Award Application as described at the above URL. Please note: We encourage all programs to carefully craft Parts I, III, and IV of your Award Application for the purpose of this award submission. If your program pulls existing documents/text not expressly written for this application, it is likely that the strengths of your program will not be effectively made visible to award review readers.

• Part I: Program Description: The program description should draw upon the UCEA Institutional and Program Criteria and more recent literature on effective/exemplary leadership preparation and align with the EELP Award Rubric. It should be no more than 25 pages. We strongly encourage you to use subheadings for a discussion of each award criterion. We strongly encourage you to provide evidence (strategic use of key/high-value evidence sources to be included either in an appendix or via hot links) to support claims made in this portion of your application submission.
Step 6: Prepare Parts I-V of the application and save each part as a separate PDF file. Be sure all file names correspond to the Nominations.

To nominate a candidate, please navigate to the following link and follow instructions for the following office in order to include additional information about the award presentation.

We discourage the submission of an assortment of existing documents without a narrative that explains/elaborates submitted artifacts.

Part IV: Program Effectiveness and Impact: Evidence of program effectiveness and impact can include such things as (a) program participant program quality feedback (e.g. individual course evaluations by year for multiple years, focus group/interview/survey results regarding the quality of courses/clinical experience); (b) first-attempt passage rates on state leadership licensure exams; (c) job placement statistics for program graduates following preparation by role and timeline to role; (d) key findings from follow-up studies of program graduates (e.g., focus groups, interviews, surveys); (e) analysis of a variety of data sources about the leadership practices (quality of practices) of program graduates who are leaders (e.g., INSPIRE practice, INSPIRE 360, aggregate principal evaluation ratings by principal supervisors); (f) analysis of a variety of data sources about organizational, instructional and/or student learning outcomes of schools led by program graduates (e.g. CALL, Five Essentials); and (g) a summary of accreditation evaluations and reviews. Please be sure to share information about the timeframe of these data (when were they were collected) and discuss in detail how these data are used by the program. Please do not exceed 10 pages of evidence..

Part V: Faculty Vitae: Please provide a curriculum vitae for each faculty member who participates in the delivery of the program. Please specify in detail this person’s actual contributions to the program during each of the last 2 years.

Step 6: Prepare Parts I-V of the application and save each part as a separate PDF file. Be sure all file names correspond to the applicable part, for example: Part.I.ProgramDescription.pdf. Submit the Cover Sheet and Parts I-V by depositing them in the Dropbox noted in the explanation for Step 2 above.

Please Note: All materials must be submitted by Friday, June 28, 2019.
Please email mar5q@virginia.edu or call (434) 297-7896 with questions.

Call for Nominations
2019 Excellence in Educational Leadership Award

Deadline: Monday, April 1, 2019

THE AWARD
The Executive Committee of the University Council for Educational Administration is asking for nominees for the 22nd Annual Excellence in 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 Monday, April 1, 2019.

After that time, UCEA will provide official certificates of recognition to universities who have designated a recipient. UCEA will publish the names of the award recipients and their sponsoring university in the UCEA Review and place the recipient’s names 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 navigate to the following link and follow instructions for the following:

1. Navigate to http://www.ucea.org/opportunities/excellence-educational-leadership-award-2/
2. Upload a letter of nomination.
3. Complete the fields in the electronic nomination form which include specific bio data fields and a field for a 1- to 3-sentence Statement of Significant Contribution.

Nominations must be received by Monday, April 1, 2019. Please email ucea@virginia.edu or call (434) 243-1041 with questions.
Congratulations to the 2018 UCEA Hidden Figures

The Planning Committee for the 2018 UCEA Convention invited UCEA members to nominate a Hidden Figure in the UCEA Community to be honored at the Convention in November in Houston, TX. We honor five scholars who are the quiet giants in the field on whose shoulders we stand. It is a time for us to show them that what they have sowed is fruitful and is carried on in today’s generation.

Who Are Hidden Figures?

- They are the behind-the-scenes scholars whom you may not see but whose work you cannot ignore.
- They are foundational scholars and trailblazers who have broken barriers and opened doors so that today’s generation can stand tall with dignity and integrity.
- They are our council of elders who provide wisdom, guiding strength, and love and serve with joy, enthusiasm, and excellence expecting nothing in return.
- We see their influence and legacy embraced in today’s rising scholars, and we know that today’s generation is able to unleash their gifts because of their sacrifice.
- They are dynamic individuals who have made significant contributions to the field and will continue to advance educational leadership and policy.
- Their research embraces key aspects of UCEA’s mission to promote rigorous research, improve professional development of educational leaders, and influence educational policy.
- These individuals are intellectual pioneers opening the doors for new and innovative research and scholarship.
- They have made significant impact beyond their own institutions, providing service in a variety of offices, committees, etc.

Judy Alston  
Ashland University

Kofi Lomotey  
Western Carolina University

Encarnación Garza  
University of Texas at San Antonio

Lisa Kensler  
Auburn University

Susan Faircloth  
Colorado State University

Kofi Lomotey  
Western Carolina University
UCEA Announces 2018 Award Recipients

UCEA’s annual awards were presented at the 32nd annual convention in Houston, TX, November 15-18, 2018.

Roald F. Campbell Lifetime Achievement Award:
Pedro Reyes
Daniel L. Duke

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 2018 recipients of the Roald F. Campbell Lifetime Achievement Award are Pedro Reyes (University of Texas at Austin) and Daniel L. Duke (University of Virginia).

UCEA Master Professor Award:
Shelby Cosner

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 2018 UCEA Master Professor recipient is Shelby Cosner (University of Illinois at Chicago).

Jay D. Scribner Mentoring Award:
Encarnación Garza

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. The 2018 recipient is Encarnación Garza (University of Texas at San Antonio).

Jack A. Culbertson Award:
Chad R. Lochmiller

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 2018 Jack A. Culbertson award recipient is Chad R. Lochmiller (Indiana University).

Hanne Mawhinney Distinguished Service Award:
Gordon Gates
Sharon D. Kruse
Stephen L. Jacobson

On occasion, UCEA’s leadership has found it appropriate to honor UCEA faculty for their outstanding service to the organization and the field. In 2015, the award was renamed in honor of Hanne Mawhinney, who embodied the idea of distinguished service and went above and beyond the call of duty in service to UCEA. The Hanne Mawhinney Distinguished Service Award was given in 2018 to Gordon Gates (Washington State University), Sharon D. Kruse (Washington State University), and Stephen L. Jacobson (University at Buffalo, SUNY).

Edwin M. Bridges Award:
Michelle D. Young

The Edwin M. Bridges Award recognizes significant contributions to the preparation and development of school leaders. The award recognizes contributions to preservice preparation as well as continuing professional development aimed at school leaders broadly defined, and the locus can be in universities or in the field. The 2018 recipient is Michelle D. Young (University of Virginia).

Paula Silver Case Award:
Jada Phelps Moultrie
Paula Magee
Samantha M. Paredes Scribner

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 2018 recipients are Jada Phelps Moultrie (Michigan State University), Paula Magee (Indiana University), and Samantha M. Paredes Scribner (Indiana University) for their article, “Talk About a Racial Eclipse: Narratives of Institutional Evasion in an Urban School–University Partnership,” Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership, 20(1), 6-21. doi:10.1177/1555458917690429

JRLE Best Article Award:
Melissa A. Martinez
Anjalé D. Welton

Criteria for the Journal of Research in Leadership Education (JRLE) Best Article Award include contribution to knowledge in the field regarding leadership preparation (significance), overall quality of the article, and impact or “reach.” The 2017 recipients of the JRLE Best Article Award are Melissa A. Martinez (Texas State University) and Anjalé D. Welton (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign) for their article,

Looking Ahead
It’s not too early to think about honorees for the 2019 convention. The next cycle of UCEA awards begins in late spring with selections completed by the end of summer. 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. Please refer to future announcements in UCEA Review, in UCEA Connections, and on the website.

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.

Award Nominations for 2019
Nominations for UCEA’s 2019 awards competition are due June 1, 2019. Please see www.ucea.org for information on criteria and the nomination process.

UCEA Film Festival
Thank you for your enthusiastic participation this year in the UCEA Film Festival. Here are the 2018 winners for the film festival:

- **Culturally Responsive Leadership: Witness to the Possible** (University of Notre Dame: Steve McClure, Melodie Wyttenbach)
- **The Minnesota Model: Developing Leaders in Agricultural Education and Communication** (University of Minnesota, Twin Cities: Troy McKay)
- **Educating Nigeria’s Youth for a Sustainable Future: A Critical Mission in Developing Leaders, The Raphael & Evelyn Education Foundation** (University of Louisiana at Lafayette: Dorothy F. Slater, Nancy P. Autin, Anselm I. Ofodum)
- **Transforming Education in Belize** (University of Texas at Tyler: Yanira Oliveras-Ortiz, Wesley Hickey)

We are looking forward to receiving your films for UCEA 2019. Deadline for submission is July 31, 2019

Awards Ceremony at the 2018 UCEA Convention. From left to right: Daniel Duke (University of Virginia), Pedro Reyes (University of Texas at Austin), Michelle D. Young (University of Virginia), Shelby Cosner (University of Illinois at Chicago), Chad Lochmiller (Indiana University), Melissa Martinez (University of Texas at San Antonio), and Encarnación Garza (University of Texas at San Antonio). Other award winners not present.
Thank You to Our UCEA 2018 Convention Sponsors

In the 32 years that UCEA has held its convention, many institutions have served as generous sponsors and exhibitors. In all cases, these cooperative endeavors served to create a more dynamic relationship between UCEA and those institutions and organizations. UCEA acknowledges the substantive contributions that the following sponsors and exhibitors have made to this year’s 32nd Convention. We greatly appreciate their support and continuing endorsement.

Host Sponsors

Partner Sponsors

 Contributor Sponsors
The 2017-2019 and 2018-2020 Jackson Scholars and their Mentors participated in several stirring events during the 2018 UCEA Convention in Houston, TX. The Jackson Scholars Network Convocation featured moving keynote addresses by Dr. Judy Alston of Ashland University and Dr. Fernando Valle of Texas Tech University. Immediately following the Convocation, second-year Scholars presented their dissertation research to date in the Annual Jackson Scholars Network Research Symposium. As an exciting and valuable addition to this year’s programming, for the first time, second-year Scholars participated in roundtable feedback sessions with their symposium facilitators. The 12 paper sessions were the following:

**Racial Voyeurism and the Lived Experiences of African American Students.** Facilitator: Dr. Kofi Lomotey, Western Carolina University
- Courtney Bell, University of Minnesota
- Jerrel Sherman, Sam Houston State University
- ArCasia James, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
- Chaddrick Gallaway, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

**Administrative Decision-Making: Implications for School Reform.** Facilitator: Dr. Pamela Tucker, University of Virginia
- Lam Pham, Vanderbilt University
- Minseok Yang, University of Wisconsin-Madison
- Lixia Qin, Texas A&M University

**Critical Studies in Black Education: Understanding the Salience of Race Narratives.** Facilitator: Dr. Kristina Hesbol, University of Denver
- Jacqueline Forbes, University of Wisconsin-Madison
- Bodunrin Banwo, University of Minnesota
- Brandon Allen, Purdue University
- Natalie Lewis, University of Denver

**Teachers: Essential Inputs for School Success.** Facilitator: Dr. Van Lac
- University of Texas at San Antonio
- Bryan Duarte, University of Texas at San Antonio
- Isela Peña, University of Texas at El Paso
- Ivory Gabriel, Florida State University
- Jeong-Mi Moon, University of Missouri

**Responsible Leadership and System-Level Reform.** Facilitator: Dr. Karen Ramlaftkan, University of South Florida-St. Petersburg
- Tessie Williams, Auburn University
- Justine Lee, University of Maryland
- Alounso Gilzene, Michigan State University
- Darrell Harris, University of North Carolina at Greensboro

**Responsible Leadership and System-Level Reform II.** Facilitator: Dr. Daniel Spikes, University of South Carolina
- Angelica Sleiman, University of San Diego
- Tiffany Aaron, University of Georgia
- Diana Barrera, Texas State University
- Hamada Elfarargy, Texas A&M University

**Alternative Approaches in K-16 Education.** Facilitator: Dr. Robert Donmoyer, University of San Diego
- Stephanie Hawkes, Wayne State University
- Shantalea Johns, Wayne State University
- Lashia Bowers, Clemson University

**Academic Achievement and the Hispanic Community: Revisiting our Commitment and Legislative Perspectives.** Facilitator: Dr. Benterah Morton, University of South Alabama
- Augusto Merchan, Sam Houston State University
- Edgar Torres, University of Texas at Austin
- Juan Salinas, University of Texas Rio Grande Valley
- Maricela Guzman, University of Texas at San Antonio

**Education Through Cultural Phenomena: An Exploration of Epistemology.** Facilitator: Dr. Juan Manuel Niño, University of Texas at San Antonio
- Kimberley Jenkins, Miami University
- Omotayo Adeeko, Ohio State University
- Yang Jiang, University of San Diego

**Effective Leadership for 21st Century Schools.** Facilitator: Dr. Encarnación Garza, University of Texas at San Antonio
- Brandon Clark, Iowa State University
- Courtney Mauldin, Michigan State University
- Kofi LeNiles, Howard University

**Images That Speak: Black Perspectives in Pursuit of Educational Opportunity.** Facilitator: Dr. Gwendolyn Webb-Hasan, Texas A&M University
- Krystal Huff, Loyola Marymount University
- Ransford Pinto, University of Missouri
- Lateasha Meyers, Miami University
- Dana Nickson, University of Michigan

**In Pursuit of Democratic Education.** Facilitator: Dr. Jennie Weiner, University of Connecticut
- Jason R. Swisher, Texas State University
- Nattawan Junboota, Rutgers University
- Fawziyah Qadir, New York University
- Ruqayyah Perkins-Williams, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

The Jackson Scholars Network is proud of all of the members of the 2017-2019 cohort for their research and presentations. Symposium facilitators complimented the excellent research that the Scholars presented. The Jackson Scholars Network is grateful for the dedication and guidance that the faculty facilitators so willingly offered. The feedback and mentoring provided at this year’s convention will serve our Scholars for years to come.

The Jackson Scholars Network also hosted the Annual Julie Laible Memorial Orientation Session for 2018-2020 cohort members and their Mentors. Their time together included an overview of the expectations and responsibilities associated
with being a member of the Jackson Scholars Network. Mentors and Scholars launched their mentoring relationships and planned the best way for Scholars to be, and feel, supported in their doctoral studies and paths to the professoriate for the duration of their mentorship.

Jackson Scholars and Mentors concluded their time together at the Convention at the Jackson Scholars Network Recognition Ceremony and Reception. This annual, meaningful tradition included a welcome from UCEA President-Elect Gerardo R. López (University of Utah) and address from UCEA Executive Director Michelle D. Young (University of Virginia). Julia Mahfouz (University of Idaho) offered an insightful reflection about her journey as a Jackson Scholar alumna and her work as an academician in the educational administration field. Judy Alston (Ashland University) led the group in our inspiring Circle Ceremony tradition, “I am because we are, and we are because I am,” and closed the recognition ceremony with a moving benediction.

The Jackson Scholars Network “Have a Field Day” Moment of MindFUNness fundraising activity on Saturday morning was a barrel of laughs! Early birds gathered for a true test of their mettle. In teams of four, participants competed in challenging tasks such as the balloon toss, chopstick relay race, tissue box shake (you had to be there), and face-the-cookie. Proceeds from the event benefited the Jackson Scholars Network funding efforts to continue to provide meaningful mentoring for graduate students of color. As always, all convention attendees were welcome. If you missed the event this year, we hope you will join us next year!

Throughout the Jackson Scholars Network programming at the convention, Co-Associate Directors for the Jackson Scholars Network Lisa Bass (North Carolina State University) and Hollie Mackey (University of Oklahoma) provided thoughtful leadership and welcomed our new and returning Scholars with warm greetings and support. The convention proved to be a huge success for the Jackson Scholars Network, Mentors, and Scholars. Many thanks to Angel Miles Nash (Chapman University) and Terah Venzant Chambers (Michigan State University) for invaluable support and assistance. I am because we are, and we are because I am!
UCEA/SAGE Journals

Educational Administration Quarterly

EAQ publishes prominent empirical and conceptual articles focused on timely and critical leadership and policy issues of educational organizations. EAQ embraces traditional and emergent research paradigms, methods, and issues. The journal particularly promotes the publication of rigorous and relevant scholarly work that enhances linkages among and utility for educational policy, practice, and research arenas.

Editor: Gerardo R. López, University of Utah
https://journals.sagepub.com/home/eaq

Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership

JCEL publishes, in electronic format, peer-reviewed cases appropriate for use in educational leadership preparation efforts across the globe. The cases provide a narrative and teaching notes with the aim being to prompt rich discussion and inquiry about issues pertinent to educational leadership across global contexts. JCEL encourages cases that are supported by digital media or other creative forms of expression.

Editors until July 1, 2019: Zorka Karanxha, Bill Black, and Vonzell Agosto, University of South Florida.
Editors after July 1, 2019: Mariela A. Rodríguez, Curtis Brewer, Nathern Okilwa, and Mark Giles, the University of Texas at San Antonio
https://journals.sagepub.com/home/jel

Journal of Research on Leadership Education

JRLE, an electronic peer-review journal, seeks to promote and disseminate rigorous scholarship and provide an international venue across multiple disciplines and contexts to inform the field of educational leadership. We strongly encourage submissions such as:

Co-Editors in Chief: Catherine Horn and April Peters-Hawkins, University of Houston
https://journals.sagepub.com/home/jrl

2019 UCEA Calendar

March
27 UCEA Convention 2019 proposal submission site opens www.ucea.org

April
1 Deadline for submissions, UCEA Review
1 Deadline for nominations, Excellence in Educational Leadership Awards
5 William L. Boyd Workshop, Toronto, Canada tinyurl.com/boydstudent2019 tinyurl.com/boydmentor2019
5-9 AERA meeting, Toronto, Canada www.aera.net
29 Deadline for intent to nominate, EELP Award
TBA Finalist selection, UCEA Executive Director

May
5 Deadline, UCEA Convention 2019 proposal submission www.ucea.org
5 Deadline, UCEA 2019 Graduate Student Summit proposal submission www.ucea.org

June
1 Deadline, UCEA 2019 awards nominations
28 EELP Award nomination materials due

July
8-11 Women Leading Education Conference, Nottingham, UK www.nottingham.ac.uk/conference/wle
31 UCEA Film Festival 2019 submissions due www.ucea.org

October
30 Deadline to upload advance copy of accepted UCEA 2019 Convention and Graduate Student Summit papers www.ucea.org

November
20-21 UCEA Graduate Student Summit, New Orleans, LA www.ucea.org
21-24 UCEA Convention, New Orleans, LA www.ucea.org
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