The UCEA Executive Committee is proud to announce that Mónica Byrne-Jiménez, EdD, will be the new Executive Director effective June 1, 2019. Established more than 60 years ago, UCEA has been committed to the advancement and improvement of educational leadership preparation, research, and policy.

With her experience in both K12 and higher education, Dr. Byrne-Jiménez will lead the organization and continue the work of UCEA member institutions. She will be UCEA's sixth full-time Executive Director. Dr. Michelle Young, UCEA's outgoing Executive Director, stated, “I couldn’t be more pleased that the UCEA Executive Committee has selected Mónica Byrne-Jiménez to be the next UCEA president. Mónica brings an unmatched commitment to UCEA, a distinguished record of scholarship and a wealth of deep relationships that will benefit UCEA long into the future. I know the consortium will thrive under her leadership.”

UCEA President, Dr. Terah Venzant Chambers, echoed support for the selection, saying, “The road to selecting a new Executive Director has been long, but the result is undoubtedly positive. I have absolute confidence that Mónica Byrne-Jiménez will provide competent and strong leadership for this organization we all love. I stand ready to work with her to ensure UCEA’s continued success.”

Please join the UCEA Executive Committee, the UCEA Headquarters staff, and the faculty at UCEA’s host institution, the University of Virginia, in welcoming Mónica Byrne-Jiménez to the Executive Director role. We look to the UCEA community to provide support as she continues to address the challenges in our field and seeks opportunities on behalf of UCEA to enhance educational opportunities and excellence for all of our children, youth, and adults.
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Contributing to the Review

The content of the UCEA Review is not peer reviewed, and any opinions printed in the Review should not be viewed as a statement by UCEA, UCEA Executive Board members, UCEA member institutions, or UCEA faculty. The opinions expressed are those of the authors alone. The UCEA Review serves as a source of information and news and a place where program innovations are shared and critical questions are raised. Members use the review for debate, to share opinions, and to engage the educational administration community in conversation and debate. If you have ideas concerning substantive feature articles, interviews, point/counterpoints, or innovative programs, UCEA Review editors would be happy to hear from you. The Editorial Team (see back page of the Review) meets twice a year. One to two features appear in each issue of the Review, which is published three times a year.

Deadlines: April 1, August 1, December 15

Commitment to UCEA

Mónica has been active in UCEA since 2006 and has served in various capacities including on the UCEA Review, Convention Planning Committee, module development for Preparing Leaders to Support Diverse Learners, Plenum Representative, facilitator in the Program Design Network, member of the Executive Committee, Associate Director for International Affairs, associate editor for Educational Administration Quarterly, and past president. She has also represented UCEA on the ELCC Program Review committee for CAEP and on the National Educational Leadership Preparation Standards Committee. Mónica says,

From the beginning of my academic career, UCEA has been an integral part of my development and identity as a scholar and leader. I will continue to do all within my power to work with the EC, Plenum, and diverse member institutions to ensure that UCEA continues to provide the highest quality research and preparation of emerging and future scholars. Our work to create just and equitable schools for all children and communities is more important now than ever. In our role as a consortium and a community of scholars we must continue to prepare educational leaders who will change the world one student, one teacher, one classroom at a time.

Professional Experience

Mónica earned her EdD degree from the Teachers College, Columbia University, in Organization and Leadership. Before becoming faculty, she was an elementary bilingual teacher, bilingual reading teacher, and literacy instructional specialist in New York City. She also has experience coordinating an early childhood program and after-school learning center as part of Project Reach Youth in Brooklyn. In addition, she worked as the associate director of the Accelerated Schools Center where she supported whole-school and district reform. Currently, Mónica is on the faculty at Indiana University, where she has taught Introduction to Educational Leadership, School–Community Relations, and Intersecting Identities and School Leadership. While at Hofstra University and the University of Massachusetts–Boston, she taught Qualitative Inquiry Methods, Leadership for English Language Learners, Facilitating Professional Growth, Culture of Urban Schools, Teaching and Learning in Urban Contexts, and Organizational Leadership. She also served as doctoral director and program coordinator throughout her career.

Dear UCEA Community,

It is an honor and privilege to be selected as UCEA’s new Executive Director. As I assume this responsibility, I am energized and inspired to continue our work as scholars, leaders, and advocates. As stated in UCEA’s mission, we are committed to advancing the preparation and practice of educational leaders for the benefit of all children, educators, and school communities. This mission will guide my work as Executive Director.

Since the announcement from the Executive Committee, I have been overwhelmed by the expressions of excitement and support from the UCEA community and beyond. This encouragement reaffirms my pride in the UCEA community that I care about so deeply. Please know how much I value all of the UCEA membership and appreciate the many, many messages of support.

I also know that to be successful I will need to rely on all of the UCEA membership to contribute to our shared vision. I hope each of you will help me by extending your words of support into constructive action. This is a moment of both importance and opportunity for our nation’s education system broadly and the educational leadership field specifically. It is a moment that will require collective action. I look forward to working with each of you and will be calling on your expertise, time, and support in the years ahead.

In an effort to solicit input regarding the next chapter for UCEA, I participated in listening sessions at the AERA Annual Meeting in Toronto and will be participating in listening sessions at UCEA’s convention in New Orleans. Please look for forthcoming announcements on the dates, time, and location of the listening sessions. I truly hope you will join me at those sessions and offer thoughts about your future vision for UCEA as I will benefit from your advice and suggestions.

I want to extend my sincere gratitude to the UCEA Executive Committee, Executive Director Search Committee and staff who have worked tirelessly during the transition period. Their efforts cannot be understated and are deeply appreciated. I also want to express my deep appreciation to Michelle Young and her leadership as Executive Director. I have learned much from her leadership and will work to hard to continue—and build on—her legacy.

In my Presidential Address at the 2016 UCEA convention¹, I discussed “leadership as an act of love.” I challenged the UCEA community by asking, “How will our story be told? Who will tell it and to what purpose? What is our responsibility individually and collectively in telling the many stories that need to be told, remembered and reclaimed?” Please join me in not only telling the next chapter of the UCEA story but making it the brightest and most successful yet.

Thank you for your faith and trust in me. I am humbled by this opportunity and ready to get to work.

With hope for the future, sinceramente,

Mónica Byrne-Jiménez
Incoming UCEA Executive Director

¹See https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=a-lZMJJQIWM&t=1128s or the 2017 Winter UCEA Review: http://www.ucea.org/resource/ucea-review/#archive
This issue of the UCEA Review marks my 57th contribution of From the Director and the end of my term as UCEA Executive Director. I first came to UCEA as a graduate student when its annual meeting was held in Houston, TX. Sticking close to my advisor, Professor J. D. Scribner, I discovered the power of the organization to foster generative discussions, important scholarly connections, and the evolution of a professional community.

My tenure as UCEA’s Executive Director coincided with increased disdain for higher education educational leadership development and the emergence of new players in the education space. The Wallace Foundation, for example, solidified its focus on education leadership, and that same year, New Leaders was launched by a former educational advisor for Al Gore.

My years with UCEA have only heightened my respect for this extraordinary institution. At every turn, the UCEA community stared challenges in the face, sought to understand them, and looked for opportunities to make a positive difference. Through our work at the national level with our professional and policy association colleagues, at the state level with programs and state departments, and at the member level with faculty and graduate students, UCEA has changed policy, minds, and practices. I have savored the opportunity to work on what Steve Jacobson referred to as “yeasty problems,” to work through debates, both civil and uncivil, and to work with wonderful leaders, scholars and colleagues. As I noted in my November address at the UCEA Convention, being UCEA Executive Director is the best job I have ever had. “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.”

Now it is time for change. Change is in the air. We must be ready to be ever bolder, to think ever more expansively, and to find and collaborate with new colleagues. I am delighted that Mónica Byrne-Jiménez is joining UCEA as its next Executive Director. She is the leader that UCEA needs as it turns the next page in its remarkable history. Mónica has long been an invaluable leader within the UCEA Community. She contributed for many years as a PSR, Associate Director, and Executive Committee member and is one of the lead designers of the Preparing Leaders to Support Diverse Learners curriculum module focused on English language learners.

Mónica is an accomplished scholar working at the intersection of leadership, equity, and activism. Her scholarly interests include leadership development for principals and superintendents, ethnicity/identity in leadership, and the role of facilitators in fostering adult learning. She is coauthor of Developing Effective Principals Through Collaborative Inquiry (Teachers College Press). Other work has appeared in the Leadership and Policy in Schools Journal, Handbook of Research on Educational Leadership for Diversity and Equity, Journal of Cases in Education Leadership, Voices in Urban Education, and other online sources.

Mónica will bring bold ideas and leadership to UCEA. Please join me in wishing her the very best.

---

Young, M. D. (2019, Winter). We are UCEA. UCEA Review, 60(1), p. 10.

---

Preparation Leaders to Support Diverse Learners: FIPSE LSDL Modules

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developing Advocacy Leadership</th>
<th>Leading Learning &amp; the Learning Environment</th>
<th>Leading for English Language Learner Success</th>
<th>Engaging Families &amp; Communities</th>
<th>Building a Community of Trust Through Racial Awareness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allocating Resources Based on Data &amp; Student Needs</td>
<td>Developing Culturally Relevant Teaching Practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Available for use at http://www.ucea.org/fipse/
Dear UCEA Community,

During the February 2019 meeting of the UCEA Executive Committee (EC), the EC voted to send out a Request for Proposals (RFP) to host UCEA headquarters. This is a change from the original plan, which was to continue UCEA’s hosting contract with the University of Virginia. However, the financial situation at the University of Virginia has shifted, and the organization is no longer in a position to provide the generous level of support that it has in the past. Thus, the EC determined that it was in the best interest of the consortium to begin a search for a new headquarters institution immediately.

Hosting the consortium’s headquarters is the ultimate contribution a member university can make to UCEA and the nationwide improvement of school and school system leadership preparation. It is a mutually beneficial arrangement. UCEA brings with it multiple opportunities for host faculty and graduate students to engage in research and program initiatives; to participate in or lead UCEA publication efforts; and to build national and international relationships that are significant for the faculty and students, the program, the school of education, and the broader institution.

RFP to Host UCEA Headquarters:

See next page of the Review or go to this URL:
https://files.constantcontact.com/0d94938e401/a576e9aa-0c9c-4406-86d2-67fb93091396.pdf

Over the last 8 years, the University of Virginia (UCEA’s current host) has worked with UCEA to fulfill its mission of advancing the preparation and practice of educational leadership for the benefit of all children and schools. Specifically, the University of Virginia has collaborated with UCEA in promoting and publishing research on the essential problems of practice, working to improve the preparation of educational leaders, and influencing educational policy and practice. We appreciate their significant contributions to UCEA and the broader field.

As UCEA enters its 65th year, the organization continues to serve as the field’s leading professional organization and maintains an international reputation as a consortium of the most prestigious universities with doctoral programs in educational leadership. Hosting the consortium is an opportunity to share in this leadership and to become intimately involved in the challenges and opportunities facing our field.

The RFP describes UCEA, the benefits of hosting UCEA Headquarters, and the elements, criteria, and calendar to be used in selecting a host university for the 5-year period beginning July 1, 2020. All UCEA member universities are eligible to submit letters of intent. If you are interested, please send a letter of intent prior to May 30, 2019. The letter of intent should include the signatures of the chair of educational leadership program or department chair and the dean of the college or school of education. Interested universities may request copies of the current hosting agreement and any other information that might be useful in their evaluation of feasibility. We welcome letters and phone inquiries related to this RFP. Please feel free to contact Terah Venzant Chambers (terah@msu.edu) and Michelle Young (MichelleDYoung@virginia.edu).

Our timeline for this process is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 31, 2019</td>
<td>Letters of intent due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 31, 2019</td>
<td>Proposals due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept.–Oct. 2019</td>
<td>Site visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2019</td>
<td>Finalist conversations with UCEA EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2019</td>
<td>Decision made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2020</td>
<td>Final negotiations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1, 2020</td>
<td>Official move</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please let us know if we can be of help as you consider this opportunity and its relationship to the goals of your university.

Sincerely,

Terah Venzant Chambers
UCEA President

Michelle D. Young
UCEA Executive Director
Request for Proposals:
Hosting the Headquarters of
The University Council for
Educational Administration, 2020-2025

For over 60 years, UCEA has pursued its mission of advancing the preparation and practice of educational leaders for the benefit of all children and schools. UCEA fulfills this purpose collaboratively by (a) promoting, sponsoring, and disseminating research on the essential problems of practice; (b) improving the preparation and professional development of school leaders and professors; and (c) influencing policy and practice through establishing and fostering collaborative networks.

Currently, 100 doctoral and masters granting universities are members of UCEA. The consortium always has depended on the energy and generosity of its member universities to accomplish its work. Of particular note is the generosity of the seven universities that have hosted the UCEA headquarters: Teachers College of Columbia University (1956–1959), The Ohio State University (1959–1984), Arizona State University (1984–1991), The Pennsylvania State University (1991–1996), The University of Missouri (1996–2006), the University of Texas (2006–2011), and the University of Virginia (2011-2020). UCEA could not have continued to thrive without these institutional contributions.

UCEA is an advocate for high-quality educational leadership education. To this end, UCEA initiates, manages, and supports an array of important program initiatives (see Appendix). These initiatives provide many substantive opportunities for UCEA member faculties and graduate students to work with higher education colleagues from around the globe and with stakeholders from national leadership organizations.

Benefits to the Host University

The benefits that accrue to universities hosting the consortium differ, depending on the characteristics of the host, its location, faculty, dean, etc. The possibilities for benefit fall under three categories: benefits to (a) the university/college, (b) the educational leadership program/faculty, and (c) the graduate students.

University/College Benefits
As provider of the UCEA headquarters, the host university shares the international spotlight with UCEA for professional leadership, facilitation of improvement of educational leadership education, and research advocacy. The host university's college/school of education, and particularly its department of educational leadership/administration unit, increases its national visibility and has the opportunity to exhibit model characteristics. The host university is also co-host to international and domestic visitors, UCEA meetings, and working teams and task forces sponsored by UCEA. These visitors often provide opportunities for interaction with faculty and students as well.

Educational Leadership Program/Faculty Benefits
The host preparation program benefits from the presence of UCEA staff generally, by increased focus on scholarship and program improvement initiatives. UCEA has a history of collaborating with host institution faculty on research, policy, and program initiatives. Such initiatives bring
positive institutional, state, and national visibility to the program. Specifically, the program benefits from the involvement of the UCEA executive director and other staff in departmental committees, college task forces and committees as well as from the executive director’s membership on dissertation committees, contributions to program courses, and service activity.

Host faculty participate in UCEA activities through informal colleagueship, leadership roles in UCEA projects, editorial roles for UCEA publications, management responsibilities for some UCEA activities, development of curriculum and instructional materials, publication of UCEA-sponsored research, and many other ways. The extensive UCEA library and historical archive of the profession are an invaluable resource for research and program reform.

The information network, job openings, electronic journals, etc. are all a part of UCEA’s day-to-day operations. The host program shares in the benefits of these resources.

**Graduate Student Benefits**

Assistantships, internships, and informal relationships afford students at the host university the opportunity to work with a wide range of scholars from all over the world and the opportunity to travel and participate in UCEA-sponsored and other professional meetings.

The student group working with UCEA shares a special colleagueship with UCEA staff and each other. They have access to a great range of scholarly resources. Students have the opportunity to gain valuable experience in the editorial and publishing activities of the consortium. They have access to UCEA computers and other equipment used in the work of the consortium.

**Proposal Components**

**Part I:** Description of the host institution, including intellectual program and resources that can be instrumental in UCEA mission attainment.

**Part II:** Overview of the proposed structural relationship between the executive function of UCEA and the host institution. (UCEA is an independent nonprofit corporation with a legally constituted board of directors and corporate code. The consortium may not enter into legal agreements that curtail the authority or responsibilities of its Board of Directors, i.e. the UCEA Executive Committee.)

**Part III:** Detailed description of staffing arrangements proposed for executive function and headquarters operation of UCEA, including staff and clerical positions. Preference will be given to proposals that grant academic standing at an appropriate level to the director.

**Part IV:** Description of facilities and equipment that will be provided for headquarters operations.

**Part V:** Description of support services that will be provided directly and those that will be available through purchase arrangement. Examples of services to consider are telephone, library, printing, duplicating, and mailing.

**Part VI:** Description of financial, accounting and personnel benefit systems that may be applicable to UCEA operations.

**Part VII:** First-year budget detail showing wages, benefits, facility costs, equipment costs, and support costs and other expenses related to headquarters operation. Indicate which costs will be charged against UCEA funds and which will be absorbed by the host institution.
Letters of Intent Due May 31, 2019          Proposals Due July 31, 2019

Finalists meet with UCEA Executive Committee          October/November, 2019
Decision by UCEA Executive Committee          November, 2019
Contract negotiations with selected host institution          February, 2020
Report to the Plenary Session          February, 2020
Transition to selected host institution          July 1, 2020

Appendix
UCEA Program Initiatives

The UCEA Annual Convention. This three and a half day conference, which focuses on leadership preparation, practice, policy, and research, serves as an important opportunity for leadership professors, graduate students, practitioners, and others to join in a quality professional development experience.

UCEA Program Centers. UCEA co-sponsors with member universities 10 centers for the study of various timely issues facing education and school leadership.

UCEA Task Forces. UCEA uses task forces to probe troubling issues facing the profession. These task forces ultimately report to the consortium and often result in legislation, recommendations for program initiatives, or UCEA publications.

The Joint Task Force on Research in Educational Leadership Preparation. Through the years, the consortium has led the way in examining the adequacy and relevance of the knowledge educational administration claims as its own. In partnership with several other educational leadership organizations, UCEA is providing leadership for research focused on building a knowledge base around educational leadership preparation.

UCEA Journals. UCEA's high-quality journals include the Educational Administration Quarterly (EAQ), Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership (JCEL), the new Journal of Research on Leadership Education, Implications From UCEA, and UCEA Research Briefs.

The UCEA Review. UCEA has published a newsletter for 50 years. Over 4,000 copies are distributed to professors, graduate students, and leaders all over the world.

Professional Publication. UCEA publishes books and monographs that are important to the preparation of educational leaders and the field broadly.

Awards Program. Each year UCEA recognizes the article judged most excellent in an EAQ volume with the William Davis Award, the most outstanding case in a JCEL volume with the Paula Silver Case Award, a promising junior professor with the Jack Culbertson Award, a senior professor's lifetime of commitment with the Campbell Award, and exceptional practicing administrators with the Educational Leadership Awards.

UCEA Membership Review Process. Member universities go through a review every 7 years to determine if they continue to meet the criteria for membership in the consortium. These criteria press issues related to program excellence.

Instructional Designs and Materials. UCEA develops and distributes instructional materials for use in the preparation of school and school system leaders, including podcasts created through UCEA's new interview series.

UCEA Graduate Student Council. Student led governance committee that provides voice for graduate students regarding the work of the organization.

UCEA Graduate Student Summit. UCEA hosts pre-conference summit as well as a series of graduate student sessions at its annual convention with the purpose of supporting students' networking, research, publishing, and academic job searches.

Barbara L. Jackson Scholars Network. This program is focused on recruiting and sponsoring graduate students of color who intend to enter the field of educational leadership as professors.

The David L. Clark National Graduate Student Research Seminar in Educational Administration and Policy. UCEA manages and supports (with AERA Divisions A and L) this seminar, which brings together the top doctoral students in the field and provides them with a valuable opportunity to work with distinguished faculty and colleagues.

The National Commission for the Advancement of Educational Leadership. UCEA established, sponsored, and continues to manage this effort focused on the improvement of leadership education.

The National Policy Board for Educational Administration. UCEA is a founding member of the NPBEA. Through this body, the voice of higher education is heard by the other areas of the educational leadership profession.
Innovative Programs:  
A Look Into Exemplary Educational Leadership Preparation Awardees
Grace J. Liang  
Kansas State University

The most recent issue of the Journal of Research on Leadership Education (JRLE) focused on the winners of the UCEA’s Exemplary Educational Leadership Preparation (EELP) award. In this special issue, three of the five awardee programs are featured, namely, the University of Denver Ritchie Program for School Leaders and the Executive Leadership for Successful Schools, the North Carolina State University Northeast Leadership Academy, and the University of Washington Leadership for Learning Program. As the guest editors, Michelle Young and David Eddy Spicer (2019) noted in their introductory article that these winning programs, each, in its own ways, has disrupted conventional approaches and charted a different course in relation to partnerships, curricular alignment, and learning and teaching, and each program provides a model for others, as well as multiple examples of how to effectively recruit, select, and evaluate candidates; how to design a standards-based curriculum that meets the needs of the field; how to engage candidates in powerful learning experiences; and how to work with colleagues to continually improve their programs. (p. 5)

As such, for this round of the Innovative Programs column, I would like to capitalize on this concerted effort of documenting and reflecting on the collective knowledge of “excellence” and “innovation” as I share some of the highlights in the articles written by the faculty-scholars from the exemplary programs featured in this JRLE special issue.

University of Denver, Ritchie Program for School Leaders

Constructed by the University of Denver’s Educational Leadership and Policy Studies (ELPS) department and Denver Public Schools in 2003, “this 1-year certificate program (with opportunity for licensure at completion) emanated from a shared theory of action that transformative and courageous leadership is critical to school success” (Korach et al., 2019, p. 32). According to Korach et al. (2019), “the values, pedagogy, and practices within the Ritchie Program influenced and became foundational in all the academic programs within ELPS (certificate, MA, EdD, and PhD) programs and professional learning programs delivered by ELPS faculty” (p. 33). The core principles of “co-construction, interdependence, and reciprocity define a partnership ethos for program development, continuous improvement, teaching, service, and research” (Korach et al., 2019, p. 33).

Partnership Effective Continuum Framework

The Partnership Effective Continuum indicators provide the organizational framework for the partnership ethos within the ELPS department and also serve as a tool to guide partnership development and evaluation for other programs. The Partnership Effective Continuum contains six research-based dimensions of partnerships: (a) partnership vision; (b) institutional leadership; (c) joint ownership and accountability for results; (d) communication and collaboration; (e) system alignment, integration, and sustainability; and (f) response to local context (Korach et al., 2019). The first three dimensions are regarded as Category 1 of “vision, values, and norms”; the next two belong to Category 2 of “joint ownership and accountability”; and the final two are set as Category 3 of “reciprocity and research.”

Practice of Partnership Ethos in the Ritchie Program

Vision, values, and norms

• The program design team consisted of diverse perspectives and experiences: (a) an affiliated ELPS faculty member, (b) a former director of a leadership academy of another state, and (c) a retired district leader.
• Rather than beginning with the existing coursework, the initial program design team began to coconstruct the program by clearly identifying the type of leader the district desired, researching the current context, and establishing shared values to guide the creation of the program and serve as descriptors for graduates of the program.
• Garmston and Wellman’s (1999) Seven Norms of Collaborative Work was used as the behavioral norms to support the values and establish a learning culture (Korach et al., 2019).

Joint ownership and accountability

• The pedagogical anchoring for the program is that practitioners are “legitimate knowers and knowledge generators.”
• Each course is codesigned and co-led by a teaching team composed of at least one school/district leader and an ELPS faculty member.
• Across all programs, the Ritchie Program included, is a “focus on preparing professionals for authentic work and engaging students as generative partners” (Korach et al., 2019, p. 36).

Reciprocity and research

• Reciprocity is situated in work that has tight connections to local contexts with a commitment to improve educational conditions for each school and student. For example, each project in the Ritchie Program requires students to gather data and engage in leadership
actions to advance the improvement goals and efforts at their school.
• With Categories 1 and 2 in place, the program allows bridging preparation, practice, and research.

Practice of Partnership Ethos in Certificate and MA Programs

Vision, values, and norms
• Program values are a touchtone for students to identify with or build upon.
• A variety of theoretical perspectives inform the program, such as the theory of action science, systems, change and culture, the perspectives of espoused theory versus theory-in-use, and change theory.

Joint ownership and accountability
• Each student in the program has a “personal team” consisting of an ELPS faculty, a cohort instructor, and a mentor principal to guide his or her learning through a yearlong investigation aligned to the yearly cycle of schools and principal leadership.
• From an initial application, students begin to understand that the district and the ELPS department collaborate to provide a unique and personalized leadership program. Often, ELPS program alumni play a role in recruitment by identifying and referring potential candidates and participating in the interview process and selection of students (Korach et al., 2019).

Reciprocity and research
• Cohorts are led by a teaching team of one ELPS faculty member and cohort instructors/adjuncts (practitioners) to allow for an 8:1 student–faculty ratio.
• Each student completes a job-embedded internship with an existing leader with activities customized to the needs of the student and the school. Internship plans are cocreated to fill the gaps and expand the repertoire of the aspiring leader.
• Students have opportunities to reflect on their experiences, applications, and learning.
• Students leave the program with a network of cohort members, faculty, mentor principals, and program alumni who serve as critical friends and support as they navigate their roles as leaders (Korach et al., 2019).

North Carolina State University’s Principal Leadership Academies

As Fusarelli, Fusarelli, and Drake (2019) noted in their article, North Carolina State University’s “framework is a result of years of study and experience, built on research-based practice, incorporates elements of deep reflection and applied practice, and is contextualized for high-need schools” (p. 12). That has led to “a fluid praxis where assignments are purposeful and relevant, linked to [the program’s] theory of action and national and state standards for school executives, and focused on solving real school issues” (Fusarelli et al., 2019, p. 12).

Closed Cohorts, Instruction Based on Adult Learning Theory, and Divergent Thinking

Specifically, a comprehensive 360-degree ongoing, real-time assessment of each student’s knowledge, skills, and practices through the use of Individual Leadership Learning Plans is the basis for the student’s principal residency learning needs assessment.

Instructional Leadership Skills and Building a Teacher Coaching Toolkit

Through a series of interactive seminars and field-based applications, students learn and apply context-specific, research-based teaching strategies and processes associated with effectively improving the academic achievement of students in high-poverty, high-minority schools.
• Partnering with the Hill Center, students learn to lead literacy data gathering and analysis to design, implement, and monitor literacy interventions.
• Centering on equity via (a) intentional focus on racial equity given the communities in which the schools are and (b) in addition to an equity course, students attend a 3-day equity retreat where they identify their sources of their own bias, begin to examine school problems through an equity lens, and develop a personal definition of social justice upon which they anchor their leadership practice.
• Full-day school site visits allow students to experience and apply their leadership learning during the daily flow of a school in session.
• Authentic, reflective learning experiences include case studies and role plays of authentic scenarios with a video camera recording the session for reflective practice, to name a few.
• Leadership in digital learning environments is explored. For example, the program partners with the Friday Institute for Educational Innovation to teach future leaders to create and implement a vision for personalized and digital learning.
• During a full-time, yearlong clinical practice of authentic settings, students are granted a provisional North Carolina assistant principal license. They receive support from an executive coach, principal mentor at their school site, and North Carolina State University faculty. An integral part of the principal residency is the Residency Problem of Practice that requires students to work through an entire cycle of collaborative inquiry and action (Fusarelli et al., 2019).
• Community internships through the North Carolina State University 4H Extension Office offer a focused experience in the local community where students provide service to a community agency and write grant proposals for funding to connect the community agency to their residency school.
• Multiple opportunities exist for candidates to be observed and coached: (a) the residency principal mentor is carefully vetted and coached; (b) multiple venues are available for assessments; and (c) when grant funding is available, executive coaches continue to work with candidates as they are hired into leadership positions.
**Proactive Recruitment**

Last but not least, the program is proactive and intentional in aggressive recruitment of individuals who are committed to becoming exceptional school leaders, which is key to the program’s quality and success. The multistep selection process is to identify and recruit candidates who embody the five specific characteristics/dispositions the program targets (see Fursarelli et al., 2019 for details).

**University of Washington, Leadership for Learning (L4L) EdD Program**

The L4L program can be characterized as anchored on “greater coherence, field-based learning, and equity-focused action” (Honig & Walsh, 2019, p. 57). To that end, the faculty have developed four performance standards, strengthened the transfer of theory to practice, infused equity throughout the program, and conducted continuous quality improvement.

**Developed the L4L Performance Standards: The Foundation for Coherence**

- The four standards are (a) leadership for equity and excellence, (b) inquiry and data-informed leadership, (c) leadership for high-quality teaching and learning, and (d) leadership for equitable systems. Within each standard are four clearly defined strands.
- Curriculum alignment within each strand is ensured by developing overarching framing arguments about what counts as leadership in each area.
- Coherence across strands results from by mapping out each scope and sequence by month and identifying specific ways to leverage candidates learning across the strands.
- Faculty established a common set of routines across the curriculum to reinforce that all strands were part of a program-wide curricular and instructional approach (Honig & Walsh, 2019).

**Strengthened Theory to Practice Linkage and Transfer: Action Orientation**

- The L4L Standards provide candidates with specific and measurable descriptions of relevant leadership actions consistent with promoting educational equity.
- Assignments ask candidates to take action in real time on strand content and submit authentic products from their leadership rather than academic papers or reading reflections.
- In inquiry, candidates must engage in extended projects in the first 2 years in which they marshal a team in their setting to take a cycle-of-inquiry approach to a pressing problem of practice that matters for strengthening educational equity for particular students in their system.
- Faculty have adopted “leading your own learning” as a cross-cutting them, focusing on ensuring each assignment or experience helps candidates intentionally support their own growth. Also, faculty developed an intensive professional growth planning process to support candidates’ significantly more active engagement in leading their own learning along the L4L Standards.
- Grounded in the relevant research, faculty developed an annual portfolio process, focusing on demonstration of actual leadership practice (Honig & Walsh, 2019).

**Equity Infused Throughout the Program in Progressively Deeper Ways**

- Continuous revision of standards reflects that equity and excellence are both specific areas of focus for the program and infused throughout the curriculum.
- Faculty pay close attention to and subsequently take actions accordingly regarding racial dynamics of program participation, program application, participation in the superintendent internship option, and completion of the program on time.
- Faculty rebuilt the internship program to function as a core formal aspect of the program that prompted candidates to see themselves in a superintendent role, even if they had other professional aspirations (Honig & Walsh, 2019).

**Intentional Data Collection and Consultation With Research Across Fields: Continuously Inform Program Practice and Improvement**

- Each month, candidates complete an electronic evaluation survey that probes on the quality of teaching and relevance to practice of each strand, as well as broader issues such as the extent to which the cohort and candidates contributed to their own learning.
- Faculty receive results within days of survey completion. In a monthly faculty meeting dedicated to collaborative planning for the upcoming session, faculty carefully review and discuss all findings from the prior month. The program director meets with individual faculty to discuss trends in their feedback and implications for their growth and the program.
- The director also e-mails candidates monthly with all of the raw feedback data and a narrative reflective summary of how faculty discussed the data, any next steps on which faculty agreed, and an invitation for candidates to respond to how well faculty interpreted their comments and decided how to move forward.
- Other data and sources used for program quality and improvement include (a) surveys and focus groups with cohort members at the end of each 3-year program, (b) examples of student work and data on student progress, (c) faculty second monthly meeting for long-term planning, and (d) core faculty deep learning such as reading common texts on critical race or critical pedagogy perspectives and collectively examining and reflecting on data interpretation and teaching.

The column editor would like to thank Dr. Michelle Young for suggesting such a focus. For more details and the featured articles, please refer to the special issue of the *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, Volume 14, Issue 1, at https://journals.sagepub.com/toc/jrla/14/1.
UCEA Welcomes New Associate Member:

The University of Delaware College of Education and Human Development offers masters and doctoral programs in two academic units: Human Development & Family Sciences and the School of Education. Human Development & Family Sciences offers an MS and PhD program designed to prepare the next generation of scholars for positions as researchers, professors, or leaders in human development, family studies, human services, and related fields. Online master’s programs are available as well. The College of Education and Human Development leverages resources to discover solutions to the problems that face schools and the challenges encountered by children, adults, and families in the 21st century. The college focuses on applied research to advance knowledge in the fields of education and human development.

The School of Education Graduate Program is consistently ranked as one of the top 50 schools for graduate education by U.S. News & World Report’s “America’s Best Graduate Schools.” Master’s and doctoral students work closely with renowned faculty in a rigorous program, conducting evidence-based research in real-world educational settings. Online and traditional master’s degrees, PhDs, and an EdD provide students with the knowledge and skills to become leaders in their field. The program offers an EdD in Educational Leadership, PhD in Economic Education, and PhD in Education.

The EdD program equips candidates with the knowledge, skills, and tools to gather and utilize information effectively in decision-making and problem-solving related to organizational improvement. The program’s 27-credit core is built around the themes of leadership, educational improvement, and evidence-based decision-making. Coursework builds practitioners’ knowledge and skills in scholarly analysis, empirical inquiry, organizational analysis, improvement planning strategies, and oral and written communication as well as in substantive domains of leadership theory, curriculum, technology, and education policy. Fifteen credits of elective options allow students to pursue their academic interests, professional preparation needs, and career goals.

The program is grounded in the Educational Leadership Program Standards developed by the Educational Leadership Constituent Council. Candidates in K-12 leadership positions can earn Delaware administrative certification (District Office Personnel and Assistant Superintendent and Superintendent Certificates). As intellectual and professional leaders, EdD graduates are expected to inspire and lead by taking on complex problems and designing solutions across a broad range of K-12, higher education, and educational environments.

For more information, contact Program Coordinator Danielle Ford at djford@udel.edu.

http://www.education.udel.edu/docorial/edd/
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Book Review:

Authentic Quantitative Analysis for Education Leadership Decision-Making and EdD Dissertations: A Practical, Intuitive, and Intelligible Approach

Jennifer Ellen Cook

UCEA

When Stanley Pogrow suggested I review this book, I protested, “I’m not a statistics expert!” He pointed out that made me the perfect reviewer. I have worked for 18 years as a dissertation consultant and editor and have carefully read, edited, and generally sought to improve over 1,000 dissertations, most for EdD students. Students often hire out the data analysis to statisticians, intimidated by stats, yet then don’t know how to interpret the results. I find students’ greatest obstacles are (a) a lack of basic understanding of how to read and critique research, as well as how to design and interpret their own research, and (b) their professors’ lack of understanding of those same things.

Students can benefit from the simple yet thorough explanations Dr. Pogrow provides in this text, and professors can use it to refresh their thinking. This book will dramatically increase anyone’s ability to interpret data analysis and critique research for practical benefit.

Students in EdD programs are trying to solve problems of practice in their own schools or districts. They need to be able to evaluate whether interventions will have large, practical benefits to their schools. As Pogrow (2019) explained in The American Statistician, “A new criterion of practical benefit is recommended for evaluating research finding about the effectiveness of interventions in complex organizations” (p. 223). Pogrow’s comprehensive, innovative textbook has an unusual but increasingly popular, practical approach to statistics for educational leaders. The text provides a basis for reforming how quantitative methods are taught in EdD programs ... transitioning such courses away from a primary focus on teaching statistics to one of learning how to use quantitative analysis and evidence to support the types of decisions that leaders have to make to improve their schools. (p. viii)

The most revolutionary aspect of this approach is a focus on practical benefit rather than statistical significance. Practical benefit provides leaders with an intuitive way to determine whether research results are likely to produce noticeable benefits in their schools. In an era of emphasis on “best practices,” “evidence-based interventions,” “scientifically based practice,” and so on, such a commonsense approach is needed. According to Pogrow, the original contributions of the text are (a) an alternative conception of the theory–practice relationship, (b) use of a simple three-number method to critique articles and determine practical benefit, and (c) a description of how to use improvement science and networked improvement communities (NICs).

In keeping with UCEA’s mission, Pogrow noted, “Analyzing quantitative research evidence in a deliberative and systematic process to select interventions is one of the best ways that leaders can improve their schools and increase social justice” (p. ix). His ideas arose from his 35 years teaching quantitative methods and advising PhD and EdD students at four universities, following a career as a New York schoolteacher and state and federal administrator. He is also known for developing the successful Higher Order Thinking Skills project—and for critiquing the research on Success For All.

This book is definitely intelligible (per the title) and offers clear guidance to nonstatisticians on how to critique (and then conduct) quantitative research. The comprehensive nature of the text means it can be used in various graduate courses, including replacing stats texts, and it’s only around $37. I would read the initial Introduction (pp. vii–xx) first, then skip forward and read the introduction to Part III (pp. 209–215). Then go back and read starting at Part I.

Part I: Critiquing and Applying Quantitative Research for Leadership Decision-Making

Chapter 1 provides a basic introduction to theory and practice, ideal for 1st-year graduate students in education. Chapter 2 describes basic aspects of quantitative research in clear, intelligible ways, including concepts of correlation, causation, sampling, analysis of covariance, and internal and external validity. Pogrow relates the importance of external validity in researching problems of practice to the need for replication studies, particularly when practitioners are bombarded with commercially available interventions and federal requirements to use “evidence-based” practice.

EdD research should enable practitioners to decide whether a reform or program will result in big enough results, in their schools, to justify implementation. In Chapter 3, Dr. Pogrow illustrates, with many examples, the problem with accepting statistical significance and small effect sizes as the end-all test of a program’s effectiveness, which can misdirect practice. Statistical significance can be misleading if a study has a very large or very small sample and does not indicate whether
the effect was negligible or very large. Pogrow thus explains the value of examining effect size. He reminds professors and students both that Cohen’s effect size of .2 represents “difficult to detect” (Cohen, 1988, p. 25). He explains the common use of weighted scores and how to interpret $R^2$ and descriptive statistics. This discussion helps leaders (a) critically analyze published articles, especially those professing to provide evidence of an intervention’s success, and (b) prevent making mistakes in their own studies.

In Chapter 4, How to Determine the Practical Benefit of Research Evidence for One’s Schools, Pogrow proposes practical benefit as a measure and introduces his three-number system. The three numbers are the (a) unadjusted mean/median of the experimental group only, (b) standard deviation, and (c) effect size. Pogrow takes the information provided in Chapter 3 and shows readers how to use it to determine practical benefit. The subsection “Descriptive Statistics to the Rescue” clearly explains the proper interpretation of mean, median, and SD. He provides his final definition of practical benefit for leadership decision-making: “whether the actual unweighted/unaligned Mean/Median performance of the experimental group (only) in a study represents a BIG improvement over how your school is already doing” (p. 109).

Educational research has shown greater typical effects on immediate (proximal) gains and among younger students, leading Pogrow to develop suggested effect sizes based on those factors (Table 4.9, p. 113). A skeptic might say these effect sizes are somewhat arbitrary; however, Cohen made the same point. Lipsey et al. (2012) also suggested field-specific effect-size cutoffs. Basically the idea is that an intervention should show that students in the treatment group did better than students are doing in the practitioner’s school, with a large effect size and a big impact.

The second part of Chapter 4 describes the importance of personal theory of action, or a practitioner’s experience. EdD students are frequently required to provide an elaborate theoretical basis for their work, which (in my experience) they not only rarely fully grasp but also tend to describe based on secondhand reviews of theorists’ works, rather than going to the originals. Often dissertations are based on a cursory understanding of the “theory of the moment.” (For instance, one of my clients concluded a teacher did not provide fully individualized instruction, based on multiple intelligences, because high school math students did not sing songs about math. I don’t think this is the sort of conclusion Gardner intended.) Also, many professors do not understand the importance of replicating research. Professors also often discount students’ experience and logical insights—what Dr. Pogrow describes as personal theory in action. Pogrow states, EdD programs can play a major role in developing the tradition of leaders initiating their own critical, focused review of research evidence as a tool to solve a problem of practice, as well as developing their skills in applying the principles of potential practical benefit or practical benefit to conduct such a review. (p. 129)

Chapter 4 concludes with simple rules for determining the practical benefit of research and rating forms for assessing the practical benefit of studies. Case studies and solutions follow.

Part II: Designing Innovative Practices and Analyzing School Data to Improve Your Schools

Whereas Part I focuses on applying published research findings, Part II discusses what to do if students cannot find useful research for improving their schools. Part II shows leaders how to use the techniques of improvement science and continuous improvement to design innovative practices in their organizations, and how to use data as the basis of the design and for monitoring its effectiveness.

Pogrow uses an innovative focus on improvement science and the use of NICs. An NIC can design a new approach providing big improvement that, over time, can be scaled larger. In Chapter 5, after a discussion of the value of “crowd-sourced clinical tinkering across a network” (p. 158) to improve practice, Pogrow encourages students to be fearlessly innovative in designing improvement science studies (or design-based research) rather than feeling constrained by current theory. Design-based research involves mixed methods, multiple iterations of the design, collaboration between researchers and practitioners, and continued evolution of design to determine the contexts in which the intervention works. This is the most personal of the chapters, as Pogrow describes the process of developing his Higher Order Thinking Skills program and waxes about intuition and metaphor. A series of pilot studies is well suited to EdD dissertations, and Pogrow notes EdD programs adding a design-based research component can engage students with valuable experience in designing new interventions by creating design centers in colleges of education. (Later, Chapter 10 provides the building blocks for developing such a dissertation.) In this era of big data, Chapter 6 describes types of data management systems and analyses and their use in a culture of continuous improvement.

Part III: Developing a Rigorous EdD Dissertation That Contributes to Improving Practice

Part III provides a roadmap on how to combine rigorous scholarship with the practical needs of solving a problem of practice. Pogrow seeks “to update the conception of the EdD dissertation and present it as a rigorous, authentic scientific endeavor that is directly applicable to the improvement of practice” (p. 191). In the Introduction to Part III, Pogrow describes many of the controversies of EdD programs. Many programs are “PhD-Lite,” yet “rather than the careful analysis of research and theory, these are done in superficial ways— with casual acceptance of the academic theories of the moment” (p. 211). Overemphasis on academic theory leads to underemphasis on critical analysis of evidence and devalues the knowledge and experiences of practitioners. Pogrow notes that EdD students often have “access to sites and data that faculty only dream of being able to access” (p. 227), allowing for great contributions of EdD dissertations to an NIC.

Chapter 7 describes desired characteristics of an EdD dissertation, including some notes on writing style. I can support that having someone read your dissertation to you out loud is the best way to make it readable. Beginning on p. 224, the chapter provides suggestions to professors for helping EdD students connect a program of practice to the literature and existing constructs.
Chapter 8 provides an introduction into database uses for determining the extent of the problem being studied and beginning the dissertation study. Chapter 9 describes how to develop a high-quality literature review, including key constructs and critiques of the literature, as taught in Chapters 3 and 4, to determine real practical benefit rather than mere statistical significance. Table 6.1 on p. 260 summarizes how to critically report on quantitative research in a lit review.

Chapter 10 clearly presents ways to analyze data without overloading nonstatisticians with every type of statistic imaginable. This chapter enables anyone to learn how to select the best statistical procedure for his/her dissertation in about an hour. Once students determine which statistical procedure they will be using, they can focus on getting more details and help on how to proceed with that procedure. (p. 214)

Of particular value is the chart on p. 280. Pogrow also explains the structure of an improvement science dissertation as a pilot study and then as a test of the iteratively improved version of the intervention. This structure allows “two shots to try and produce substantial benefits” (p. 283), whereas a traditional evaluation is a single effort.

Chapter 11 reiterates the importance of one-way correlations and effect sizes in determining practical benefit.

If you have a single implication for practice that is supported by a finding of practical benefit the dissertation is a major success. Of equal importance is a finding advising against taking action on some approach because there is no evidence to support its use. (p. 305)

This is something student researchers need to understand: the undesired result is still useful. Students typically do not understand that finding no useful impact of an intervention is a valid finding, preventing districts from wasting money. I agree with Pogrow that often students interpret negative results as indicating a need for professional development; instead, the intervention simply may not be effective. Determining practical benefit of specific programs for the practitioner’s school or district is an obvious choice for EdD students.

In keeping with the idea of continuous improvement, Dr. Pogrow welcomes conservations about the ideas in this book. His blog is at leadership-quantmethods.blogspot.com, and you may e-mail him at spogrow@sfsu.edu
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Congratulations to Melanie Bertrand of Arizona State University, Phoenix, recipient of the 2019 William J. Davis Award! The William J. Davis Award is given annually to the authors of the most outstanding article published in Educational Administration Quarterly (EAQ) during the preceding volume year. The Davis Award was established in 1979 with contributions in honor of the late William J. Davis, former associate director of UCEA and assistant professor at the University of Wisconsin–Madison. The award was given for the following article, with the accompanying abstract:


Students of Color hold intimate knowledge about institutional racism and White supremacy in schools—expertise that could be leveraged in school leadership. One approach that could mediate efforts to include Students of Color in leadership is youth participatory action research (YPAR), in which students and adult partners research school and community issues and take action. Guided by cultural historical activity theory, this article explores how YPAR may be a path to realizing the vision of including Students of Color in school decision making by sharing findings from a study of an after-school YPAR program for seventh and eighth graders. A range of data was collected, including videos of YPAR meetings and presentations and interviews with YPAR youth and school adults. Ethnographic and inductive approaches were used to analyze the data. Analysis of the data indicated that students within the YPAR program (re)positioned themselves as leaders through their production and presentation of intersectional, social justice research. School adults, however, positioned the students in contradictory ways. They verbalized support for student input without also positioning students as leaders while, in some cases, dismissing the students’ research and viewpoints. This article adds to the educational leadership field by indicating that YPAR and similar programs can act as mediators to increase the potential for Students of Color to expand their leadership at schools by shining light on existing leadership and opening up possibilities for students to further reposition themselves as leaders.

http://eaq.sagepub.com/
Interview With Anthony Craig

Alyson Honsa
University of Washington

Anthony Craig, EdD, is the current director of Leadership for Learning (L4L), the University of Washington’s doctorate (EdD) in educational leadership. L4L is dedicated to producing equity-focused, systems-level leaders, and the 3-year program is designed for professionals currently working in or with K-12 school systems. Prior to his role as L4L director, Dr. Craig served in various education roles throughout Washington state and in tribal communities, including as a teacher; instructional coach; principal; and district director of diversity, equity, and outreach. He also has served as a member of the Association of Washington School Principals Diversity & Equity Committee and is the cofounder and lead facilitator of the Everett Community College Educating the Whole Child Conference. He was named Washington State ASCD Outstanding Young Educator of the Year in 2014. He joined the University of Washington as the newest director of L4L in January 2018.

Honsa: Thank you for agreeing to speak with me; I appreciate your time. To start off, usually there are many important experiences that influence people’s career paths. What are one or two experiences that stand out to you in particular that were critical to leading you to working in education?

Craig: I come from a family of educators, and I watched my dad and my uncles, my aunts, several cousins, my grandparents, all serving in public schools in various roles. And we really saw our work as an opportunity to both serve our community, but also redefine for our particular tribal community what school could mean and do and provide to a broader range of students and families. And you’re really trying to reimagine what is the role of public education? What could systems do to truly reflect the community, and then what are the responsibilities of those of us working within those systems? The broader experiences are about growing up in this family that had an eye toward public schools, and also we’re really grounded in who we were as tribal people.

Honsa: Thank you. To what extent do those experiences connect to your own leadership approach, especially at this point in your career?

Craig: I draw a direct connection. I think there’s a lot to be said about these notions of insiders and outsiders in schools and school systems. And really every community has a particular history or set of histories that play out in contemporary times. In understanding my family and community’s particular history, that helps inform how I think about approaching any other community. And I think that in my leadership work, I want to make sure who’s included on the inside is not just formal educators or people with particular certificates or titles, but instead we’re listening to the voices of students and their families. We’re looking at leaders who don’t have necessarily positional authority, people closest to students and families, in really thinking about whose voices are included in system design and system improvement.

Honsa: You are currently serving as the director for L4L, the University of Washington’s EdD program that prepares systems-level educational leaders. When you think about L4L’s approach and design as a leadership preparation program, what do you think is most essential to the program’s character? What is it that makes L4L unique?

Craig: One is that the previous directors have made it really clear during the design that people’s current work matters. The context they are in now matters, and everybody leads. If we have a cohort for systems leadership, it’s not just focused on the superintendency, not just focused on formal public school systems for example, but instead nonprofits, community agencies, all sorts of other organizations. A design element of L4L that I think is significant is that when we say everybody leads, we spend time making sure that the assignments are embedded in lots of different places that were supporting leaders all throughout the system and multiple systems in doing the work. So that job-embedded nature is one thing I would highlight. I think it allows us to invite students to engage with the current literature in the field about what it means to lead and lead well. What it means to lead for equity, because people say that a lot, and in L4L we really get down to what we think that looks like in action. We reflect on how leaders are taking action toward equity, so that job in embedded nature is important. And the idea that everybody leads in order to truly achieve equitable systems is critical to L4L. And the real emphasis over time on students shifting practices and tracking those shifts, and that growth and improvement over time are I think some of the most exciting parts of L4L.

Honsa: You’re a graduate of L4L yourself, and now you’re directing the program. What about the program has evolved since you were a student, and what do you see as remaining consistent?

Craig: One thing that has evolved is there has been in the last cohort, and now in the cohort that I am able to lead, a genuine effort to understand what it will mean to diversify pathways into educational leadership, or pathways into L4L in particular. When we talk about diversity, we’re really paying attention to regions of the
Craig: I think it’s really about this broad understanding that we’re paying attention to people’s racial and ethnic diversity. We’re paying attention to how many female leaders there are given the state of the field in terms of superintendency in Washington and beyond. And really understanding when we talk about diversity, we’re not talking about checking a box. We’re really talking about inviting, encouraging, and requiring diverse ideas be in the space to improve the setting in L4L and beyond for all of us. I think that there has been an intentional shift before I got there and most certainly now that I am there to really understand what it means to have a diverse cohort, to recruit intentionally and then to form curriculum that meets the needs of that diverse group. So while it’s not solely my work, it’s something that I picked up and intend to continue.

And I think what has maintained the same since I’ve been there, and another thing that I think is critical to L4L, is the inclusion and expertise of tenure-line faculty. These national experts in the field of educational leadership are our instructors, and people are excited to be working with Meredith Honig, Ann Ishimaru, Nancy Beadie, and Jessica Rigby. They know their work; they see them around the region. I think that there is necessarily this component at L4L that says our faculty is top-notch and you’ll see them in the field. They’re in research–practice partnerships with people in our state, in our region.

Honsa: Knowing educational equity is such a core principle of the program and also knowing that concept is a constantly evolving one, what would you say is L4L’s current definition of educational equity?

Craig: I think it’s really about this broad understanding that equity is most certainly not about test scores, although data like test scores are important. It’s really about understanding our definitions of equity are inclusive of the strengthening of communities, the strengthening of families and seeing students as part of systems that are larger than just the individual. I think that is one way that we can hold off this notion that we can define equitable outcomes on a test score, when it doesn’t tell you anything about the students and their broader ecology, their family, their community, their goals in life. I think that L4L’s definition of equity includes this broader look at a child that involves measures of success, that as you were saying are ever changing. But we’re engaged in this ongoing understanding of what it means to improve schools, to strengthen communities, to make that contribution toward broader communities. And I think it involves this historical understanding of how we got the systems we have now. And while we are in those systems, we are agents of the systems and we have a responsibility in helping to dismantle practices and policies that are not equitable, but then replace them with ideas, practices, policies that lead toward equity, like in the moment, in the current time. So, where we exist in this continuum of time between what has happened that brought us where we are. When we say historically underserved students, historically underserved communities, we understand what that means in terms of our service to those same communities in current times with an eye toward what will it mean when we make shifts now for the future.

Honsa: Can you give an example of how students operationalize that definition of equity through their work in L4L?

Craig: Oh, there are lots of examples. I think one example that I’m excited about is a deep dive into each student’s local context. As they examine their particular school district or nonprofit agency or the broader community, there is a requirement in this assignment to make sure they understand historically what’s at play in terms of policies and what has been. They surface that historical dilemma that shows up right now in 2019, and how they intend to contribute to a solution for that dilemma. So it’s not as easy as shifting out one practice for another in order to achieve equity, but instead to say there are complex reasons why we are where we are. Students then tease that apart and say that “here are a series of things that I will do and then recruit other people around me to do in order to face this particular dilemma.” That’s again embedded in history, but will be important to disrupt now.

Honsa: Thinking about this current cohort of aspiring leaders you’re working with, what are one or two educational issues that they have identified as particularly critical to their leadership practice at this time?

Craig: I hear from students in our cohort, but then also from graduates, the idea of what equity means and what leadership for equity means. We’re really looking for an expansive definition of the types of things leaders must do, could do in order to be leaders for equity. But then also how do you measure that impact? It’s one thing to say we don’t want to just rely on test scores, but it’s another thing to say, okay, in that case, what else will we rely on? And we hear students really taking up that effort. What I hear leaders talking about in the cohort is they can sort of diagnose a problem, but then collectively to come up with potential and effective solutions is the work that they’re doing.

Honsa: How representative do you think those challenges are to most aspiring educational leaders across the country in 2019?

Craig: Well, I can’t imagine they’d be very different. I feel like there has been a need all throughout the country to really reckon with our history and what our history has left us with. And, of course, it has a different tone and a landscape anywhere you go. But, I think that what we’re working on would be recognizable to people across the country.

Honsa: What role do you think educational preparation programs can play in helping aspiring leaders navigate those challenges around equity?
Craig: I think that preparation programs have to do, or what L4L is aspiring to do and enacting now, which is to be explicit about the problems that we're seeing. There's no coded language. When we're talking about race and racism, students are really clear that we're talking about how we participate, maybe unknowingly, in racist systems over time, just as being Americans. And then how to try to disrupt them and recruit others into that.

Another is taking this up in their system now with implications about their own leadership in current times. So prep programs should really require leaders to focus on problems that are both within their span of control and then maybe a bit beyond to really understand what the literature is suggesting. If there's something we're reading about, we're getting right back into the field and looking for what shape that's taking, you know, all across the state based on who our students are.

Honsa: Thank you so much, Anthony.

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.
At the request of the 2017 UCEA Executive Committee, this UCEA Guidebook on Retention, Tenure, and Promotion (RTP) was developed by a group of senior and emeriti professors who have spent decades in academia and have been dedicated leaders in the field of educational leadership. In addition, to maintain an intergenerational approach and to honor diversity, we invited UCEA’s Executive Committee members to review or coauthor selected chapters. Thus, The Guidebook presents the readership with the enriching viewpoints of a representative group of professors in our field.

The Guidebook neither supplants nor promotes a certain platform for RTP reviews. Users are encouraged to see this as a “guide” or a “blueprint” explaining what to expect before and while undergoing RTP review processes. Each institution, program, department, college, or unit may have its own set of guidelines that dictate its expectations. Such policies or regulations determine the criteria and procedures that an individual seeking RTP must follow. The Guidebook simply intends to provide extra support that faculty may need to pursue a successful career development path. In addition, advice is made available for senior faculty, chairs, deans, provosts, and so on involved in the RTP process. Contents are the following:

- Editors’ Introduction (Diana G. Pounder, María Luisa González)
- 1: Written Policies and Institutional Norms (Martha McCarthy, Joan Shapiro)
- 2: Preparation for Midtenure Retention Review (Betty Merchant, Gerardo R. López)
- 3: Preparation for Tenure and/or Promotion Review to Associate Professor Rank (Gary M. Crow, Mónica Byrne-Jiménez)
- 4: Managing Uncertainty: Strategies Before, During, and After the Tenure Review (Mary Erina Driscoll)
- 5: Life after Tenure—Preparation for Promotion to the Rank of Professor (Leonard Burrello, Bruce Barnett)
- 6: Advice to those Critical to the Tenure and Promotion Review Process (Paula M. Short)

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.

**Single Sign-On Connection**

The UCEA Networking Tool is seamlessly integrated with individual UCEA user accounts. 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. UCEA community members can browse 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 on specific topical categories. 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 about the files.

**Centralized Calendar of Events**

Members may contribute to a “Community Calendar” to capture dates and deadlines for 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!

www.ucea.org
Coverage of teacher strikes across the United States has dominated national education news over the past 2 years. In February 2018, there was a 2-week-long strike in West Virginia over 1% pay raises and rising health insurance premiums. By the end of the strike, teachers had secured a 5% pay raise, plus the governor guaranteed out-of-pocket health care costs would be frozen for West Virginia’s state insurance program (Cornish, 2019). This inspired other states and cities, with other strikes and walkouts occurring in Colorado, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Arizona, Kentucky, Illinois, and California (Robson, Pennington, & Squire, 2018).

West Virginia teachers walked out again in 2019 for 2 days due to a proposed omnibus comprehensive education reform bill, which ultimately failed. The proposed legislation included teachers’ pay raises and increases for school funding, but also included provisions such as penalties for striking teachers and funding for charter schools—items opposed by many teachers (Cornish, 2019).

Motivating factors for these teacher strikes have varied by location, but include a backlash against school choice and other market-based education reforms as an effort to save public education from privatization; inadequate salaries, working conditions, and school staffing (i.e., nurses, librarians, counselors, etc.; Romero, Swaak, & Fay, 2019); smaller class sizes; special education; standardized testing; and chronic inequitable funding across levels of government (Lombardo & Kamenetz, 2019).

Los Angeles Unified School District English teacher Erin Sopapunta described what the Los Angeles strike meant for her: “To me, this strike isn’t about the pay raise; it’s about the lack of respect for educators. No other career has such high expectations and such little resources. What if doctors had to bring their own scalpels? Or if lawyers had to ask for donations online to get legal pads? People think it’s “bad for the kids” to have a strike, but it’s even more detrimental to have an entire educational system that is held together by the sacrifice and sheer willpower of a mostly female workforce. We should have what we need to do our job, and enough pay to live on, and a manageable number of students, so we can give our students the attention they need and deserve. (as quoted in Educators for Excellence, 2018, para. 12)

Outside of the recent strikes, other external factors have created greater uncertainty around union dynamics with their members. The verdict in the U.S. Supreme Court case Janus v. American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (2018) has played a role in changes unions across sectors are experiencing. Long-term effects of the decision on union power and membership remain mostly unknown. The U.S. Supreme Court decided in a 5-4 vote to overturn Abood v. Detroit Board of Education, 1977, and make it prohibited for unions to charge union fees to nonunion member public employees (Janus v. American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, 2018). Opinions vary on the effects of the Janus decision on union power: some believe it will decrease union power, and others contend it actually may have invigorated unions to strike and take other more aggressive actions on behalf of their members (Marianno, 2019; Marianno & Strunk, 2018; Robson et al., 2018).

Results of these strikes have at the very least elevated the voices and demands of teachers across the United States. The overarching purpose of this Point/Counterpoint is to highlight the voices of teachers and union leaders/members. It explores how perspectives vary across the United States and gives insight into the outcomes of a teacher strike on those who it affects most—the students, teachers, and broader community who make up each school. The contributors to this issue, Keith Eric Benson and Malia Vitousek, provide insight into these issues through personal experience and their perspectives on teacher labor unions and the current education atmosphere.

- Keith Benson, EdD, researches urban schooling and critical pedagogies, urban education reform policy, and school choice within the contemporary urban redevelopment. Further, within a standpoint theory framework, he is interested in eliciting and highlighting the voices of forgotten urban community members impacted by both urban redevelopment and the education reforms that accompany it. As an urban education researcher and activist, he is an active member of local activist civic groups and currently serves as president of the Camden Education Association. He is the author of Gentrification and Education Reform in the Age of #CamdenRising: Public Education and Urban Redevelopment in Camden, NJ (Peter Lang).

- Malia Vitousek, MA, is an early elementary teacher in East Oakland, California. Malia has taught first grade for 3 years in Oakland and East Palo Alto. She has a BA in English and Education from Colorado College and an MA in Education from University of the Pacific, in association with the Aspire Teacher Residency Program. Malia has lived in Oakland for 6 years.

In the first essay, Keith Benson describes his perspective on the latest teacher strikes through experiences and as the president of a teacher union in Camden, New Jersey. He believes teachers have reason to feel optimistic for improved conditions...
and equity given the recent strikes, albeit cautiously, and with careful attention to understanding that demands and needs vary from state to state and district to district. Malia Vitousek provides a detailed account of her experiences as a first-grade teacher going on strike recently in Oakland, California. Her story provides insight into the experiences of her entire school community before, during, and after the strike. She illustrates how different school communities came together to ensure that children attending school during the strike were safe and that teachers, students, and families were well informed.

With Current Wave of Teacher Strikes, Teacher Unions Have Reason To Be (Cautiously) Optimistic

Keith Benson
Camden Education Association, Camden, NJ

When I think about the recent successes of the demonstrations in West Virginia (twice), Arizona, Kentucky, Oklahoma, Colorado, North Carolina, and more recently Los Angeles, Denver, Chicago and Oakland, I feel both a sense of encouragement and caution. For me, examining anything objectively or without bias is an impossibility, as we are all impacted by our prior experiences and base of information we have. That said, though I am a union president of a large local in southern New Jersey, and an affiliate of one of the most powerful state teacher unions in the country, the New Jersey Education Association, I was a Black man living in America and impacted by all the realities it entails long before being elected to my current post. Further, the way I see teachers unions is through the lens of an activist: socialist Black man first, and then as a Camden resident where the average household income is $24,000 and 80% of our children grow up at or below economic poverty levels. Where, without hyperbole, things most Americans take for granted such as a warm meal, access to quality healthcare, a roof over our heads, for too many of my neighbors and everyone in like economically distressed communities, are not givens. Third, I interpret teacher unions through the perspective of someone who, before my presidency, had no interest in teacher unionism, despite being an avid supporter of union ideals: collective struggle for collective progress; for the one to thrive, everyone must thrive. It only was after reading Weiner’s (2012) *The Future of our Schools: Teacher Unions and Social Justice* that I was provided a framework and vocabulary to describe what I viewed as an apparent disconnect from our union leadership and the wishes of the membership. Our local union belonged to the members—not the leadership. Local teachers unions were perfectly positioned to take up social justice causes that can improve lives of all citizens, not just causes that benefit educators. Local teachers unions had to be honest about their failure to address racial issues in both the past and the present. Further, Weiner’s work made me more aware of the broad shortcomings in true teacher union activism and partnership with other noneducators and community members experiencing similar occupational and civic exploitation and marginalization.

That stated, I am encouraged that rank-and-file educators including support staff are beginning to say, essentially, “F*** it, we’ve had enough and aren’t going to wait for the higher ups, whether it be milquetoast lawmakers or acquiescing local leaders, to grow a spine and fight for us.” Rank-and-file union members realize that no fight for professional and democratic liberation or freedom will be directed or initiated by those occupying positions of comfort. To be sure, I am asserting, unequivocally, that one’s place of comfort and one’s willingness and sense of urgency to struggle for genuine and meaningful activism are inversely proportional; that the more comfortable one is, the less impetus one has for upsetting the source of the comfort. The everyday educators and school staff participating in such contemporary demonstrations understand there likely would be very little substantive help coming from national leaders in the American Federation of Teachers and National Education Association, but more likely empty lip service, if that at all. (These two organizations’ early support for Hillary Clinton’s presidential candidacy in 2016, despite widespread concerns from educators, exposed a stark differentiation in values; Karni, 2015; Moser, 2015).

Moreover, before any fight, win or lose, participants must be willing to risk losing something in hopes of gaining something more significant. Here I would suggest that not being part of such a traditionally tightly structured, hierarchical teachers union among red, right-to-work states helped fuel recent educator activism and participation in a way that likely would be discouraged within traditional corporate union mechanics. Such expressions of unity and power by the masses, the educational proletariat, and not a central figure, challenge if not threaten autocratic leaders’ conceptions of their utility. The current wave of educator strikes and civil disobedience illustrates that masses of local educators understand that activated power rests in their own collective unity, not in that of a union president or hierarchical union structure (O’Neal, 2018). Essentially, this current collective of educators were, and still are, tired of being treated with disdain; compensated poorly; taken for granted by lawmakers in their localities; as well as pilloried by national education think tanks, billionaire philanthropists, and education privatizers. And in return, today’s educators throughout the country are willing to risk it all, together, for all to benefit, and that alone is a beautiful thing.

At the same time, my caution “light” flashes in my mind that we properly contextualize what we are witnessing. We ought not rush to generalize these events in both red and blue states, right-to-work and heavily unionized regions in America and take away that for teachers unions to fight for better wages and working conditions, and fairer treatment from politicians, striking and storming state houses is the template for success in our respective resistance efforts. Context, time, and environment matter. In blue New Jersey, for instance, teachers are paid relatively well. Despite paying more toward our health benefits and pensions than ever before, comparatively speaking, New Jersey teachers get paid pretty well, with the median salary at $66,000 and average educator salary at $76,000—both well above the median and average salaries.
of working Americans, including educators. Thus, complaints about salary and healthcare in one of the highest taxed states would come across to our state’s residents as extraordinarily tone deaf. And in Camden where I live and work, where the average teacher salary is $65,000, though we are currently in negotiations for a new contract, us taking to the streets in protest for a higher salary, in the midst of such stark economic poverty, would be not only tone-deaf, but also insensitive to the needs and struggles of our local constituency (Benson, 2017).

This is where voids of teacher union ally-ship are so apparent. Why aren’t teacher unions, writ large, where power is traditionally hierarchical meaningfully standing shoulder to shoulder with movements that impact other marginalized populations like #BlackLivesMatter? Dreamers for DACA? And other loosely organized groups experiencing exploitation in low-wage jobs, folks experiencing housing insecurity as a means to fight for the common good and justice and in the process, change the narrative of greedy, self-serving teachers unions, and expanding our power base in the process?

The supposed fragmentation of interests among advocacy groups weakens all of our standings. The success of future educator-led demonstrations relies on each educator having each other’s backs, and here in New Jersey, and my local, our success will never be absent our unity with our surrounding community. Perhaps what we can learn from these other states and cities where educators are revolting is that our strength depends on our willingness to risk our comfort and unite with others who are experiencing struggle and supporting one another in it, and through it, for the betterment of all—the essence of unionism to begin with.

“The We Stand With Oakland Teachers”
Perspectives on the Recent Strike

Malia Vitousek
Acorn Woodland Elementary, East Oakland, CA

For 7 days in late February, 97% of students in the Oakland Unified School District (OUSD) in California stayed home. For 7 days, 95% of teachers held picket lines in rain and sun. The Oakland teachers’ strike was disruptive to families, students, and schools. The strike also showed the enormous groundswell of community support for Oakland teachers and students. The strike was grueling, confusing, hopeful, and necessary.

I am a first-grade teacher at Acorn Woodland Elementary in East Oakland. We are a small public school with two classrooms per grade. We are a Title I school with nearly all of our students qualifying for free or reduced-price lunch. We have both an inclusion track, servicing many students with special needs, and a bilingual track, where students in kindergarten through second grade are taught primarily in Spanish. I teach a sheltered English inclusion classroom of 27 students. My classroom features diverse races, languages, and abilities, and my students speak six different languages at home. Nearly half of my students have Individualized Education Programs. Our class motto is “We help our classmates to learn.” We work hard, support each other, and learn together.

The picketing began in February, but preparation for the strike started much earlier. The Oakland Education Association (OEA), staffed primarily by volunteers and led by President Keith Brown, began preparing teachers and families for the possibility of a strike at the beginning of the school year. Organized site representatives held meetings to provide initial bargaining updates as well as to hear from teachers about their concerns, questions, and visions for their school. As the school year and contested negotiations continued, the attendance and frequency of union meetings increased. Talk of a strike began to shift from potential to impending.

Leading up to the strike, many concerns were voiced, including increased support for special-needs students, funding for restorative justice practices, and curtailing the expansion of charter schools that drain students and funds from district public schools. As the OEA and OUSD teams continued to meet, four primary concerns emerged: (a) increased student supports (including a reduction in caseload for nurses, counselors, speech therapists, and resource specialists), (b) a moratorium on school closures (which disproportionately affect schools in African American and Latinx communities), (c) a reduction in class size, and (d) a living wage for all teachers. These four issues became the basis for striking and the cornerstone of negotiations.

On the existing OUSD pay scale, teachers are not making enough money to live in Oakland. The Bay Area is exceedingly expensive. The average rent for a two-bedroom apartment in Oakland is $3,336 a month (Rent Jungle, 2019). Oakland is consistently ranked as one of the most expensive cities in the world (Gonzalez, 2018). Yet, teachers in OUSD are paid the least of any district in Alameda County (Xie, 2018). The exorbitant cost of living and stagnant wages led to a massive teacher turnover crisis, with a 22.5% attrition rate in 2016-17 (Kroopf, 2018). Revolving-door teachers disrupt communities and de-stabilize education. In order to retain and develop quality teachers, we need to make a living wage.

By January, the strike loomed. At our school site, our wonderful union representative, Sarah Horwitz, regularly hosted teachers in her classroom at lunch to discuss the implications of a strike and the task ahead of us. We shared hesitations and excitement about the opportunity to stand for our needs and the needs of our students. Still, there were many logistical implications. How can we support the many families who would not be able to provide childcare? How can we ensure that students will still have breakfast and lunch? With the loss of wages, how will teachers still make rent? We found answers to these questions together. We would send a survey to all families determining who could support the strike and who would need assistance. We would set up a solidarity school in partnership with our local public library and partner with local vendors to secure food donations. We would apply for hardship grants and start GoFundMe campaigns to begin to cover our lost wages.

Increasingly, our union meetings took place with Encompass Academy, another small OUSD elementary school with whom we share a campus. There had been a long history of quiet rivalry and discord between the two schools; we have separate administrations, programs, and student bodies. Despite our proximity, there had been no collaboration. As the
strike approached, we met frequently, under the leadership of our separate union representatives, and saw how we could unite to support our shared community during the strike. We would share responsibility for the solidarity school, which students from both schools could attend. We would meet together with all of the families to discuss the justifications and ramifications of the impending strike. Eventually, on the picket line, we would grow closer and become a united front. Like a microcosm of the union, we were reminded that our two schools were more powerful together than apart.

In the days leading up to the strike, I began to prepare my students. It felt antithetical to my mission as a teacher explaining to my bright learners that they should not go to school. To help bridge the cognitive dissonance of telling enthusiastic students to stay home, we read aloud *Harvesting Hope: The Story of Cesar Chavez*, a beautiful book by Kathleen Krull (2003). The book explains, in a way accessible to first graders, how Cesar Chavez recognized that working conditions and pay were not fair for farmworkers, so he organized a necessary strike. I explained that teachers in Oakland also believed that they were not getting fair pay or working conditions to best support students. The book describes that, as the farmworkers marched, the grapes they did not pick spoiled in the field. In a teachers’ strike, there are no grapes spoiling in the field; rather, there are children missing critical days of instruction. A teachers’ strike means fighting for the grapes as well as for the farmworkers.

My students had many insightful questions about the strike and why it had to happen. After answering their questions to the best of my ability (and acknowledging that I did not have many of the answers they sought), I gave students time to write and draw their feelings about the strike. One response came from a student who at the beginning of the year struggled to recognize letters and who would tear his papers rather than struggle to put his thoughts into words. On this day, he wrote in his best phonetic spelling without hesitation: “I feel sad because I want to go to school and I will miss school.” My students worked hard to understand the strike. Many grasped the larger implications of striking as a tool to stand up for change. Still, most of my students told me that they just wanted to continue coming in to our classroom and learning every day.

The strike began on a Thursday. Our organized and energetic union representatives disseminated the daily agenda from OEA. We would picket at our school site in the mornings, 6:30–10:30 a.m. We would then join with the larger union for unified rallies and marches around the city. Finally, each day we would return to our school site and picket again from 1:30–3:30 p.m. In the evenings, our union representatives would attend meetings to keep teachers informed about our bargaining team’s progress and the plan for the following day.

At our school site, we had bright, heartfelt signs depicting our challenges, demands, and insights into our role. We joined voices in chants about our hopes for education and the strength of our union. We marched with teachers, staff, families, and students from both school and from our larger community. We spoke with replacement teachers, encouraging them to stand with the union rather than cross the picket line. We also talked with many families, encouraging them to support teachers by choosing the solidarity school.

The solidarity school was critical to the success of our strike. Organized by our teachers, we created a space for families to feel comfortable leaving their children for the day. Each day we had 15–45 students in the community space at our local library. Students had access to learning games and materials, computers, books, a structured recess, and free food every day. Our solidarity school was staffed primarily by teachers and amazing volunteers from striking OUSD high schools. These incredible high school students chose to spend their days on strike helping elementary students to feel safe and comfortable and to continue learning.

Throughout the strike, the Oakland community powerfully and consistently displayed their support for teachers and students. Community members donated incredible amounts of coffee and food. They brought instruments to join us in song. They brought yoga mats to the picket line and led classes. They supported solidarity schools as alternative childcare providers across the city. They lifted our spirits with honked horns and shouts of support from their passing cars. They offered teacher discounts. They propped up signs in their homes and businesses declaring, “I stand with Oakland Teachers.” The community marched with us. The swell of support was palpable and powerful.

After 7 days of negotiation, the OEA bargaining team came to a tentative agreement with OUSD. The proposed agreement would include an immediate one-student reduction in class size for “highest needs schools” with a promise of a one-student reduction for all classes in 2021 (OEA, 2019). The deal also included a reduction in caseload for many student support positions as well as an 11% pay increase for teachers over the next 4 years. The resolution for issues like school closures and charter schools was more vague. The union and the district agreed to put a 5-month pause on school closure decisions as well as call for the Board of Education to vote on stemming charter school growth.

Although many gains were made, not everyone was pleased with the tentative agreement. Teachers were hoping for more tangible promises regarding school closures and charter schools. Many hoped for transparent changes to the allocation of OUSD funds, like an agreement to spend more on restorative justice and less on the OUSD Police Department. Many feared that although smaller caseloads for support staff were promised, impending budget cuts would slash positions for counselors, education specialists, nurses, and other critical positions. The union members were split on voting whether or not to ratify the agreement, but in the end, the tentative agreement passed with 54% of the union voting to accept the deal and end the strike.

The conversation started by OEA, and by many teachers unions across the country, does not end with the strike. We will continue to fight for public education and the needs of our teachers and students. The strike taught us the power of coming together with our fellow teachers and community members and raising our voices as one. Of course, it is easier to dedicate yourself to the issues when striking is your full-time job. As we return to the classroom, we return to spending 10 hours a day at school, planning lessons, preparing materials, grading, and guiding students. We return to the daily needs of our students, to the ever-shifting demands of educating young
minds. It becomes harder and harder to hold the needs of the union in mind, when the needs of your classroom stand before you each day.

The fight for equity and fair conditions for students and teachers does not end with the strike, but we will need to fight and make a concerted effort to continue the conversation and strive for progress. The national dialogue continues to push forward and highlight the demands placed on teachers and the supports essential for our highest-needs students. We will continue to strive for more in our public schools. In the meantime, my students and I are thrilled to be together again where we belong and where we want to be—in the classroom.
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In February 2019, The Wallace Foundation released *Sustaining a Principal Pipeline* by Leslie M. Anderson and Brenda J. Turnbull of Policy Studies Associates. The report examines how six districts participating in The Wallace Foundation’s Principal Pipeline Initiative (PPI) continued their work after funding expired. The report can be found at wallacefoundation.org.

In 2011, six urban school districts with the support of The Wallace Foundation set out to develop a principal pipeline that could positively impact school outcomes. The districts were Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools, North Carolina; Denver Public Schools, Colorado; Gwinnett County Public Schools, Georgia; Hillsborough County Public Schools, Florida; New York City Department of Education, New York; and Prince George’s County Public Schools, Maryland. The principal pipeline strategy had four interrelated components to cultivate a supply of well prepared and well supported new principals.

1. Adopt standards of practice and performance that would guide principal preparation, hiring, evaluation, and support.
2. Deliver high-quality preservice preparation to high-potential candidates, typically through a combination of in-district programs and partnerships with university preparation programs.
3. Use selective hiring and placement, informed by data on candidates’ demonstrated skills, to match principal candidates to schools.
4. Align on-the-job evaluation and support for novice principals, with an enlarged role for principal supervisors in instructional leadership.

Overall, *Sustaining a Principal Pipeline* updates the story of pipeline implementation and principal perceptions with interview and survey data gathered in 2018. Interviews were conducted with district officials who have responsibilities related to principal development and support, including principal supervisors and key central-office staff. The report assesses continuity and change in district policies and practices and in principal perceptions as of 2018, guided by three research questions:

1. To what extent and in what ways are districts still carrying out each of the four components of the PPI?
2. What changes have they made to their pipelines, and why?
3. What do principals say about their preparation, hiring and placement, evaluation, and support, and how is it similar to or different from key findings that we reported earlier?

The report describes the findings regarding standards, preservice preparation, hiring and placement, support and evaluation, and system supports for a career continuum. Findings are discussed followed by guidelines for creating a sustainable principal pipeline.

### Perceptions of Pipeline Success

Before understanding specific pipeline findings, it is important to discuss overall perceptions of principal pipeline success. Observations from individuals involved in hiring and supporting new principals centered around impressions that new principals were more skilled than previous incoming leaders. Additionally, district leaders in three districts (Charlotte-Mecklenburg, Denver, and New York City) said they have seen improved retention of principals.

### Standards

Similar to previous years, district leaders reported standards have been important in creating and maintaining alignment across the components of the principal pipeline. Principals continue to work on refining the standards as well as extending them to leaders other than current principals. The content standards have evolved over time and exist as living documents within the districts, which allows for continual refinement and adaptation to the context and role. For example, one district has created specific standards relevant in turnaround schools. Additionally, as principals become proficient in existing standards, districts understand they can raise expectations for overall performance.

### Preservice Preparation

In building their principal pipelines, the districts worked to strengthen principal preparation across all types of leadership preparation programs for aspiring principals. They introduced or strengthened their own selective preparation programs for those who appeared close to readiness for a principalship. They also forged or strengthened partnerships with the universities that prepared principal candidates. However, due to the average length of time (6 years) from starting preservice to being appointed a principal, full results were not available in previous reports. Whereas past reports found few differences in preservice preparation, in *Sustaining a Principal Pipeline* enough time elapsed to have a better picture of changes. Overall, all six districts continually worked to improve preparation and focused on in-district programs and partnerships with universities. Notably, they restructured residency programs, and some added special programs for turnaround schools.

Principals involved in the PPI describe different experiences than principals prepared before the initiative. For instance, PPI principals report a greater focus on school improvement and instructional leadership in the content of their preservice program, and also report higher levels of preparedness across...
a number of leadership practices. Districts have put great care into creating strong matches between new principal residents and sitting principals. One district stopped moving aspiring principals out of their home schools for residencies. Districts also developed programs that support the leadership capacities of assistant principals in their district. All of these changes are in line with priorities districts set at the start of the initiative to improve preservice programs.

**Hiring and Placement**

Districts continue to use a two-stage process for principal hiring: acceptance into a hiring pool followed by placement into a principalship. They also continue to require credentialed principal candidates to demonstrate skills as part of the pool admission process by participating in simulations and other practical exercises. One concern districts continue to express is the amount of staff time devoted to selection, but they understand the investment is necessary to make the best match. Within the matching process, districts use Leader Tracking Systems, which provide dashboards summarizing individual and aggregate data on the district’s aspiring and sitting principals and the growing role of principal supervisors. Feedback from principal supervisors is being incorporated into the Learning Tracking System to facilitate better matching.

**Support and Evaluation**

Overall, districts are utilizing all of the previously discussed initiatives within evaluation and support systems. Districts have kept consistent the evaluation and support systems leading novice principals to rate these systems favorably. This consistency is facilitated by principal supervisors, coaches, mentors, and induction programs. First, in terms of principal evaluation, districts are conducting annual high-stakes evaluations of leader performance tied to leader standards. Second, the principal supervisor role continues to be redefined as a facilitator of principal success, and some districts have offered external professional development to support principal supervisors. Third, coaches and mentors reflected on tight budgets and their struggle to defend their jobs even as districts contend those jobs are an essential part of support and evaluation systems. Lastly, districts are continuing to invest in training and induction support for novice principals.

**System Supports for a Career Continuum**

Support and evaluation are not only important for novice principals, but also vital throughout their career continuum. Districts are attempting to address and resolve system-level issues regarding lines of communication and authority. There are significant trends showing positive prospects for the future of support for principals. For example, districts improved placement, and coaches, mentors, and principal supervisors received high ratings. Overall, districts are creating leadership positions aligned with more responsibilities as well as matching better mentor leaders and future leaders within the schools. Succession planning is not limited to filling principalship vacancies. For instance, Charlotte-Mecklenburg provides all central office staff with leadership training. There is also a focus on filtering out conflicting messages and excessive time demands for principals.

**Concluding Thoughts and Advice for a Sustainable Pipeline**

To conclude, the six districts urge other districts to treat principal pipeline development as a process that cannot be reached through shortcuts. The districts offered encouragement in several ways.

1. Pipeline development does not have to be expensive. There are low-cost ways to start and/or sustain a pipeline to initiate change. For example, start with revising and establishing leader standards or mentoring novice principals using experienced leaders in districts.
2. Although these six districts found success with their principal pipeline, the districts caution against replicating these models. This is because the focus should be on considering the local circumstance and priorities while developing a pipeline system.

Overall, the leaders in these six districts are confident their principal pipelines are sustainable, and new leaders indicate there are meaningful strengths in how they were prepared and how they are developed and supported through their principal pipeline. Read *Sustaining a Principal Pipeline* at Wallacefoundation.org.
It was a pleasure to read the UCEA address by President Rodríguez. I must say at the outset that her story resembles mine and that of many others who experienced the Border. At the same time, her speech is full of powerful exhortations that call for action to change the quality of education of all our children, teachers, and school leaders. Her strong encouragement is a call to all of us to engage in meaningful action. Allow me to discuss each of the main sections of her address.

An important caveat needs to be understood at the outset; her main points are moderated by her family history; this is not unusual, since most of our academic work or leadership activity is moderated by previous life experiences, whether consciously or unconsciously. In those stories, she describes the significant challenges people of color have experienced in this country. She begins with her own family; then she goes on to describe how segregation has played a role in how we have responded to those challenges—typically done by confrontation and by pointing out the many inequities we have and still are confronting in this society. While confrontation has “forced” change, she provides a vision for UCEA and each of us to step forward and embrace courage as a necessary ingredient.

President Rodríguez provides a refreshed concept of leadership for us to consider. She terms it “ALMA leadership.” In doing so, she brings important stories to make her case. These stories are quite personal and involve her major points. She talks about a “drawing a line in the sand” concept that comes from a painful experience by her family members, particularly experienced by her mother when she was a teenager. Some of us have experienced and witnessed discrimination in housing, schooling, transportation, and many other impactful experiences; for example, her mother experienced such discrimination but also witnessed a courageous act by an educator who cared for their students—“he drew a line in the sand” when his students were discriminated against publicly. It was a tremendous teaching opportunity to stand up against a discriminating practice that humiliated students of color.

It is not difficult to understand why President Rodríguez is making such a point. Today, we continue to struggle to provide equitable education to those same children who were provided substandard education in the past. I am not suggesting that we have not made any progress, but we still have the “haves and the have-nots” in schools as well as in society. For instance, in most major cities, one can see where most poor children and families live; it is not difficult to analyze the quality of facilities and resources these children experience. At the same time, one may want to examine the opposite side of the city and find that, in general, the quality of facilities and resources are not like those supporting poor and minority children.

The second major point President Rodríguez makes is about faculty having an activist research agenda and a plan of action. She challenges all of us to “rise up in revolution.” Obviously, those terms imply many possibilities, yet my reading of her exhortation is quite literal. Students live in a system that is resistant to change; those systems are oppressive spaces that discriminate against the poor and minority children in this country. President Rodríguez is asking us to assume a collective and shared responsibility to improve schools that serve such students. She is proposing that our scholarship focus on exposing the system’s embedded inequalities. She is asking us to take risks and through such scholarship improve the status quo, particularly for children of poverty and those marginalized. Moreover, she is asking us to use our teaching tools to develop school leaders who will challenge the status quo. Accordingly, it is quite important that we prepare the next generation of school leaders who can create systems of equity for all children. We are being asked to develop ethical leaders who can help create structures in deep partnership with our communities that benefit all children and communities.

Similarly, President Rodríguez is proposing that our service to public schools be focused on challenging the status quo. We need to be intentional and collaborative at the same time to improve a system that is difficult to change. She is implying that a service provided to reinforce the status quo does not fit in our commitment to the public good. She is urging us that our commitment must be to improve schools and to improve access to opportunities for all.

Finally, President Rodríguez presents her conception of activist leadership—ALMA. Alma is a deep concept that comes from the heart (soul). It is not a superficial idea (something that was provided in a workshop on leadership). It is a commitment that develops from experience—a commitment guided by love and social justice to improve the educational system.

According to President Rodríguez, Alma leadership is powered by spirit, passion, and action. All these are critical and interrelated components; in leadership without action, spirit and passion are not enough to lead effectively. However, when spirit, passion, and action combine, the likelihood is that the leaders’ actions will make a difference in the lives of those who have been marginalized in this society.

As President Rodríguez said, “Let your Alma be your guide to continue raising questions ... and never forget that the focus of such actions is—children.” In other words, “draw the line in the sand” to do what is right to improve the status quo in our educational systems.
The Excellence in Educational Leadership Award is for practicing school administrators who have made significant contributions to the improvement of administrator preparation. Each year, the UCEA Executive Committee invites member university faculties to select a distinguished school administrator who has an exemplary record of supporting school administrator preparation efforts. This is an unusual award in that it affords national recognition, but individual universities select the recipients. It provides a unique mechanism for UCEA universities to build good will and recognize the contributions of practitioners to the preparation of junior professionals.

Amanda Bigbee
General Counsel, Keller (TX) Independent School District

As the daughter of a public school administrator, Amanda’s upbringing instilled in her a tremendous passion and enthusiasm for public education. While she felt she was not intended to teach—a week of subbing substantiated that—she decided to support education with a law degree. Fresh out of law school, she worked at a firm with a municipality section. That provided experience representing school districts and educators in litigation in state and federal court as well as in administrative hearings, but her work also included other municipal clients like cities and police officers. She then made her way to a law firm that specialized in what is called “preventative school law.” For 3 years she counseled school districts regarding most all school law matters. At that firm she gained experience in personnel matters, special education, student discipline, First Amendment issues, contract negotiations, open government, and anything else that would affect a public school in Texas. While she enjoyed working with schools across the state, she knew the best and most efficient legal advice would be provided by an attorney who had the opportunity to know and understand a school from the inside. As general counsel for Keller ISD, Amanda enjoys being able to wholly dedicate herself to the legal well-being of the district.

Texas Christian University: Amanda Bigbee, JD, is an essential part of our program team and provides feedback about individual student strengths and needs so that we can help build student knowledge and skills and support students all the way through graduation and program completion. When internal survey data suggested students needed more grounding in guiding the Admission, Review, and Dismissal and Individualized Education Program processes, Dr. Bigbee revised her syllabus to emphasize the leader’s role and responsibilities in not only ensuring appropriate education and safeguarding student rights and opportunity-to-learn, but also working with parents and guardians as full and transparent partners in the special education processes.

Kara Bobroff
Deputy Secretary for Identity, Equity, and Transformation, New Mexico Public Education Department

Ms. Kara Bobroff (Navajo/Lakota) began her career in education as a special education teacher in Albuquerque, New Mexico more than two decades ago after earning her BA and MA in Special Education at the University of New Mexico (UNM). She was a Danforth Scholar and administrative intern through a partnership between the Albuquerque Public Schools and UNM. She earned her Education Specialist Certificate in Educational Leadership from UNM and holds K12 administrative licensure in New Mexico and California. In 2005, after 8 years of leadership in middle schools in Albuquerque; San Rafael, California; and Newcomb, New Mexico, she founded the Native American Community Academy (NACA) in Albuquerque. Ms. Bobroff went on to become the executive director of the NACA Inspired School Network, which has expanded the impact of NACA across New Mexico and into South Dakota, Oklahoma, and Colorado. It is the first network of its kind in the U.S. with its dedication to excellence in Native American-serving schools and communities. Each year she supports 12 educational leaders through the NACA Network and works with schools and educational leaders in nine New Mexico communities, providing a significant contribution to improving opportunities for Native youth, especially those who live in their sovereign nations in rural areas. Ms. Bobroff has received numerous fellowships, awards, and grants from organizations such as the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, the Obama Foundation, the U.S. Department of Education, the Braimayer Foundation, and the United Way. In November 2018, Ms. Bobroff was named to the Education Transition Committee by New Mexico Governor-Elect Michelle Luján-Grisham. In January 2019, Ms. Bobroff was named by the governor to serve as the New Mexico Public Education Department’s Deputy Secretary for Identity, Equity, and Transformation.

University of New Mexico, Santa Fe: Ms. Bobroff supports 12 educational leaders every year (not all are from UNM) through the NACA Inspired Schools Network and its related programming. She supports schools and educational leaders in nine communities in New Mexico. This is a significant contribution to improving educational opportunities for Native youth, especially those who live in their sovereign nations in rural areas.

George L. Duffy III
Executive Director, SCOPE, Smithtown, NY

George L. Duffy III was appointed executive director/CEO of SCOPE Education Services in 2012. Prior to this, Mr. Duffy served as SCOPE’s Deputy Director for Student Services for 6 years. This not-for-profit educational organization serves all of Long Island’s 124 school districts. Mr. Duffy is a retired school superintendent having served in that leadership position at both the Riverhead Central School District and the Seaford Union Free School District. Mr. Duffy spent his early years in education at the Kings Park Central School District, first as a science teacher and chemistry/physics teacher; then as science department chairman at the high school.
level; and finally as assistant principal, middle school principal, and high school principal. Mr. Duffy is a retired member of the New York State Council of School Superintendents, Nassau County Council of School Superintendents, Suffolk County School Superintendents Association, American Association of School Administrators, and New York State School Boards Association. He served as secretary and treasurer of the Suffolk County School Superintendents Association. He has presented at New York State and National Conferences on middle level education. Currently, as executive director of SCOPE Education Services, he represents Long Island as a member of the New York State Study Council and served as President of the National School Development Council. Mr. Duffy is a member of the National Association of Child Care Professionals and in 2009 completed training and recognition to validate early child care programs nationally. Mr. Duffy is an active member on the Board of Directors of the School–Business Partnerships of Long Island. Mr. Duffy holds a BS in Education from Norwich University and an MA in Liberal Studies from SUNY, Stony Brook. He has a Professional Degree in Educational Administration from LIU CW Post College and a Certificate of Studies in Labor Relations from Cornell University.

St. Johns University: Mr. Duffy is a valuable partner in our professional development outreach to school leaders in the region. Many of our doctoral candidates have their work disseminated through the SCOPE journal. SCOPE is also a supporter of our annual Doctoral Research Symposium, and Mr. Duffy serves as a resource and adviser for our programs.

Charles Dupre
Superintendent, Fort Bend Independent School District, Sugar Land, TX

The Fort Bend ISD Board of Trustees appointed Dr. Charles E. Dupre as Superintendent of Schools for the state’s seventh largest school district in April 2013. Dr. Dupre is a Certified Public Accountant. His unique background and real-world experience, consisting of educational administration and financial management, have benefited Fort Bend ISD during times of growth, both currently and in his previous role as associate superintendent and chief financial officer, a position he held for 5 years. In Fort Bend ISD, Dupre built a leadership team that developed the district’s mission statement and led the district in the development of a technology plan, a safety and security plan, and a Facilities Master Plan. In 2013, Dupre joined Fort Bend ISD from Pflugerville ISD, where he served as Superintendent of Schools and was named the Region 13 Superintendent of the Year in 2012. The Texas Association of School Boards also recognized Dupre as one of the top five finalists for Texas Superintendent of the Year. That same year, the Greater Austin Chamber of Commerce named Dupre Superintendent of the Year in recognition of his efforts to improve college- and career-readiness rates through the strategic allocation of resources and innovative instructional programming. Dr. Dupre serves as president of the Equity Center and as an at-large member of the Commissioner’s Texas Association of School Administrators (TASA) Cabinet of Superintendents. He is also the Region 4 Representative on the TASA Executive Committee. He is a member of the TASA 2025 Task Force that is leading development of the organization’s long-range strategic framework designed to define organization achievement for 2025–TASA’s centennial year.

University of Houston: Dr. Dupre has been instrumental in the redesign of the University of Houston MED program. He also serves as an adjunct in our program, teaching students in the Fort Bend ISD cohort.

Jeff Eakins
Superintendent, Hillsborough County (FL) Public Schools

Jeff Eakins is the chief executive of the eighth largest school district in America, serving more than 218,000 students in more than 230 schools and centers from pre-K through adult programs and technical colleges and, as the county’s largest employer, overseeing 24,000 employees. Since graduating from The Ohio State University with a BS in Education and then obtaining an MS in Educational Leadership from Nova Southeastern University, Jeff has been a teacher, assistant principal, principal, director of Title I, general director of federal programs, assistant superintendent, and deputy superintendent. He was named superintendent in July 2015. One of Jeff’s first steps as superintendent involved working with the school board to develop the district’s new vision, “Preparing Students for Life.” The district’s 5-year strategic plan was created to give life to the vision by increasing the high school graduation rate to 90% by 2020. As a result, and in less than 3 years under Jeff’s leadership, Hillsborough County Public Schools already has seen a graduation rate increase of almost 10%. The district has raised the graduation rate across all subgroups. This past summer, the Nation’s Report Card announced that Hillsborough County’s fourth graders tied for first place in reading and math and the eighth graders tied in first place for reading and second place for math. Twenty of the district’s 33 magnet programs have earned national recognition for their exceptional programs.

University of South Florida: Jeff Eakins regards the University of South Florida as a partner and resource in supporting the needs of school leaders, teachers, and students in the nation’s eighth largest school district. He mentors future leaders and supports current administrators by providing advanced graduate programs. Jeff believes in giving students what they need to succeed. He believes that ALL schools and ALL students must be prepared for success. As a result of recent restructuring, a plan has been put in place to provide customized support and resources for the district’s highest needs schools.

Brian G. Gottardy
Superintendent, North East Independent School District, San Antonio, TX

Dr. Gottardy is the superintendent of schools for the North East Independent School District (NEISD). Dr. Gottardy began his career in 1985 as a physical education teacher and coach at John H. Wood Middle School in NEISD. He spent 3 years at Wood before becoming the head coach of Southwest Junior High School in the Southwest ISD. In 1989, Dr. Gottardy was promoted to vice principal at Southwest Junior High School. Two years later, he became the director of Pupil Services, which included being the principal of the Alternative School. In 1993, Dr. Gottardy became the director of transportation for Southwest ISD and continued in that role until January 2000 when he became the executive director of transportation for NEISD. In 2004, Dr.
Gottardy was approved by the Board of Trustees as the associate superintendent for operations. This division consisted of Facility Maintenance & Improvements, School Nutrition Services, Transportation, Safety Department, Construction Management & Engineering, and the North East Police Departments. In 2010, his division was expanded to include Employee Benefits & Risk Management and Accounting & Finance departments. In 2011, the NEISD Board of Trustees voted unanimously to appoint Dr. Gottardy as the superintendent of schools, a position he plans to retire from effective June 30, 2019. At retirement, Dr. Gottardy will have served for 34 years as an educator.

University of Texas at San Antonio: Dr. Gottardy has been an indefatigable supporter of the University of Texas at San Antonio and its leadership preparation programs dating back nearly two decades. He has taught in our principal preparation program, played an instrumental role in the recent redesign of our superintendent certification program, and has been an active participant in our annual Superintendents’ Symposium. Most crucially, Dr. Gottardy has provided his stamp of support for the NEISD–University of Texas at San Antonio principal preparation cohort, an innovative master’s degree and principal certification program delivered entirely in NEISD.

Christina Lutz-Doemling
Director of Curriculum and Assessment, Catasauqua (PA) Area School District

Dr. Lutz-Doemling has served as the director of curriculum and assessment for Catasauqua Area School District (CASD) since 2004. Before serving in this capacity, she was a science teacher and then assistant principal at Whitehall-Coplay Middle School for many years. In her current role, she is the instructional leader for K-12 curriculum in CASD, including all content areas and all grade levels. She identifies professional development needs, works closely with the district administrative team members, and plays a pivotal role in district strategic planning. Dr. Lutz-Doemling has presented at conferences such as the Pennsylvania Association for Supervision and Curriculum as well as the Pennsylvania Educational Technology Expo and Conference. Topics of focus include benchmark assessments, integrating technology into the curriculum, and data-driven analysis and decision-making. Her work has been published in Pennsylvania Educational Leadership. Under Dr. Lutz-Doemling’s leadership, CASD continues to provide high-quality curriculum opportunities and experiences for teachers and students. For example, she secured several grants to provide professional development for teachers around career readiness for students and STEM education initiatives. The Educator in the Workplace grant allowed teachers to visit various companies around the Lehigh Valley. CASD was featured in the local newspaper as the only Valley school district receiving money from the grant. Dr. Lutz-Doemling earned her BS in Biology and her MS in Education at Bucknell University and her EdD in Education Leadership at Lehigh University. She has presented to graduate classes at Wilkes University, DeSales University, and Lehigh University. Dr. Lutz-Doemling currently serves as the long-standing adjunct instructor for a required course in the principal leadership certification program, Curriculum Management for the School Executive.

Lehigh University: Dr. Christina Lutz-Doemling serves as a mentor to aspiring leaders in the Education Leadership program at Lehigh University. She teaches a required curriculum course in the administrative certification program and allows students to intern with her at CASD.

Syndee Malek
Associate Executive Director, Michigan Elementary and Middle School Principals Association

Mrs. Syndee Malek is the associate executive director at the Michigan Elementary and Middle School Principals Association; she plans, provides, and assesses meaningful professional learning experiences for aspiring and practicing K-8 principals and assistant principals across the state. She has extensive experience in the profession, having served as a teacher; elementary principal; central office administrator; independent school district consultant; independent consultant; and trainer and mentor of school and district leaders. Syndee is a possibility thinker, creative problem solver, and passionate educator. She has talent for identifying potential educational leaders and the skills and network to support them as they venture into administrative positions. She is widely connected across the state, assisting educational leaders in a variety of ways to make things happen. Her energy appears endless. Mrs. Malek earned her Eds from Wayne State University in Detroit, Michigan; her MA from Eastern Michigan University in Ypsilanti; and a BS from Central Michigan University in Mt. Pleasant.

Michigan State University: Syndee Malek connects high-quality consultants with learning professionals to create customized, vibrant, and meaningful learning experiences and ongoing support. She teaches, coaches, and mentors aspiring, beginning, and experienced school and district leaders. She builds and sustains a network of learning leaders across the state to learn from, and support, practicing administrators.

Allison Mays
Senior Director of Human Resources, Tuscaloosa County (AL) School System

Dr. Mays is in her 16th year of education and is currently the senior director of human resources for the Tuscaloosa County School System. Prior to her promotion to that position in 2015, she served as a high school principal, assistant principal, and teacher—all with the Tuscaloosa County School System. She holds five degrees from the University of Alabama, including her PhD in Educational Administration and her JD. For the past two summers, Dr. Mays taught graduate-level education administration law courses for the University of Alabama as an adjunct faculty member. She serves on the West Alabama Chamber of Commerce Education Task Force and is active with the Leadership Tuscaloosa Alumni Association. Recently, Dr. Mays was elected vice-president of the Alabama Association of School Personnel Administrators, an affiliate of Alabama’s Council for Leaders of Alabama Schools. Before becoming an educator, Dr. Mays practiced law for 3 years, primarily in the area of school law. While sitting in an IEP meeting as a school board attorney, she realized she liked working with educators more than attorneys, so she returned to the University of Alabama to earn her graduate degree in secondary education. In her current role, Dr. Mays believes that the human resources function of a school system serves to nurture the adult humans
so that they can provide a wonderful educational experience for the little humans.

**University of Alabama:** Dr. Allison Mays is a fervent supporter of the Educational Leadership program at the University of Alabama. Having both a PhD in Educational Leadership and a law degree, she has been called on to teach the required law class for beginning administrators for the past two summers. Dr. Mays has held small group sessions for leadership interns completing semester residency placements, served on admission review committees for leadership candidates, and presented professional development sessions on developing winning résumés and interview tips for more than 70 aspiring school leaders.

**Cesar A. Morales**
**Superintendent, Oxnard (CA) School District**

Dr. Cesar A. Morales is superintendent for growing Oxnard School District, with approximately 17,000 students. He has served the public education system as a high school teacher, middle school special education teacher, middle school counselor, assistant principal, learning director, principal, and assistant superintendent of human resources. He also served as a part-time instructor at Loyola Marymount University in Los Angeles teaching Organizational Management courses in the Educational Administration program. Dr. Morales earned a BA and an MA in Educational Administration from Loyola Marymount University and a doctorate in Education from the University of California, Los Angeles. As a doctoral student, his research interests included resiliency theory, school access and equity, parental involvement, and college-going culture. He is active in the community. Dr. Morales serves as a commissioner on the Ventura County First 5 Commission focused on early childhood development, early literacy, and wraparound services to children up to 5 years old. Dr. Morales is a former mentor in the California Association of Latino Superintendents and Administrators (CALSA) and former Southern California region representative. He recently finished his term as CALSA president. Most recently, Dr. Morales was recognized by EdWeek as being the recipient of the “Leaders to Learn From” Superintendent Award, a national recognition given in Washington, DC.

**Loyola Marymount University:** Dr. Cesar Morales, superintendent of Oxnard School District, is Loyola Marymount University’s nomination for the 2019 UCEA Excellence in Educational Leadership award. The faculty of our School of Education selected Dr. Morales because of his commitment to excellence in education for all children, to social justice, and to the development of educational leaders. He continues to make a meaningful and lasting impact in educational leadership.

**Bryan O’Black**
**Assistant Superintendent, Shaler Area School District (PA)**

Dr. Bryan O’Black is the assistant superintendent of schools for the Shaler Area School District in Glenshaw, Pennsylvania. Located north of the city of Pittsburgh, Shaler Area educates over 4,300 students from the communities of Shaler, Etna, Millvale, and Reserve. In his decade of service as a school administrator, Dr. O’Black served as a technology director and curriculum director, before becoming assistant superintendent. Dr. O’Black is very active in numerous professional organizations and associations and has presented at national, state, and regional conferences. He served as a 2018-19 fellow for the Pennsylvania Educational Policy Leadership Center and is a member of the International Society for Technology in Education, the Tri State Study Council, and the Pennsylvania Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. In 2015, the National School Board Association named him as a “20 to Watch” recipient. Dr. O’Black holds a bachelor’s degree in Education, a master’s in Educational Administration, and an EdD in Educational Leadership from Duquesne University.

**Duquesne University:** Dr. O’Black’s dedication to developing educational leaders is apparent in all that he does. He regularly supports programs and initiatives at his alma mater.

**Rosa M. Peña**
**Director of Leadership Development, Austin (TX) Independent School District**

Rosa M. Peña, director of leadership development for the Austin ISD, served as principal at Zavala and Baldwin Elementary Schools for 15 years prior to moving into a district leadership role. As the director of leadership development, Dr. Peña oversees the Austin ISD Urban Education Leadership Pipeline programs and the recruiting and hiring of administrator positions for the district. Dr. Peña is a diverse thinker with 31 years of urban education experience and expertise in curriculum; instruction; professional learning; and working with special populations, including bilingual, special education, and gifted and talented. She earned a doctorate in School Improvement and a master’s in Educational Administration from Texas State University, as well as a BA from St. Edward’s University. She believes that excellent schools must first have excellent leaders.

**Texas State University:** An outstanding feature of our Master’s in Educational Leadership program at Texas State University is our ability to establish meaningful cohort partnerships with school districts. As the primary district point of contact, Dr. Rosa Peña has been instrumental in working collaboratively with us to create a robust university–district partnership with her school district, Austin ISD. This partnership has afforded us the opportunity to recruit, select, enroll, and teach 24 aspiring school leaders in our principal preparation graduate program.

**Kevin Rogers**
**Superintendent, Lewisville (TX) Independent School District**

Dr. Kevin Rogers began his education career in 1986 as a Lewisville ISD science teacher at Milliken Middle School (now DeLay Middle School) and moved through the ranks as assistant principal at Marcus High School, principal at Arbor Creek Middle School, and then Marcus High School principal, where he served for 8 years. He then served the district in central office positions, where he was the district’s chief operations officer before being named Lewisville ISD interim superintendent. With a passion for serving students, Rogers has invested countless hours in shaping the future of others through his role as a mentor to numerous Lewisville ISD students. Rogers has served as an adjunct professor for the University of North Texas and volunteers his time with several nonprofit organizations. Born in Wichita Falls,
Texas, Rogers was raised in Andrews, Texas and graduated from Fort Stockton High School. He earned his bachelor’s degree from the University of North Texas, master’s degree from Texas Woman’s University, and doctorate from the University of North Texas. Dr. Rogers is a proud husband, father, and grandfather and is grateful for the opportunity to serve as superintendent of Lewisville ISD.

University of North Texas: With a passion for serving students, Dr. Rogers has invested countless hours in shaping the future of others through his role as a mentor to numerous Lewisville ISD students. Rogers has served as an adjunct professor for the University of North Texas, developing and shaping the careers of educational leaders and serving as a model of an extraordinary educational leader through profound district reform efforts, which provide access and equity to historically underserved students.

Aaron C. Spence
Superintendent, Virginia Beach City Public Schools

Dr. Aaron Spence assumed the leadership of Virginia Beach City Public Schools in 2014, where he graduated from high school in 1989. As superintendent, he oversees the operation of 86 schools (serving almost 69,000 students) as well as all administrative support functions for the school division. Spence has led division efforts to systematically address equity and poverty issues and their resulting impact on academic achievement, student engagement, and discipline. In 2018, the Virginia Association of School Superintendents awarded Spence Virginia Superintendent of the Year, citing his strategies as a “textbook example of leadership necessary to make large-scale changes in an organization that produce significant changes and positive results.” As a result of these and other ongoing efforts, Virginia Beach City Public Schools is now 100% accredited, discipline reports showcase a decline in referrals and suspensions, and more students are enrolled in and achieving at higher levels in honors and advanced classes than ever before. He returned to Virginia after having served most recently as superintendent of Moore County Public Schools in North Carolina. Initiatives launched by Spence helped moved Moore County Public Schools up 20 places in state rankings. Before his service in Moore County, Dr. Spence was chief high school officer of the Houston Independent School District, the eighth largest school district in the country. He helped decrease Houston ISD’s dropout rate and increase the graduation rate to an historical high. Dr. Spence began his career in Virginia teaching French and photojournalism. Prior to leaving Virginia, he served as an assistant principal and later as a principal in Henrico County Public Schools. He also served as chief academic officer and director of curriculum and instruction for Chesterfield County Public Schools.

University of Virginia: Dr. Aaron C. Spence is an active, leading member of the University of Virginia’s K12 Advisory Council. Dr. Spence has facilitated recently a multipart series of dialogues specifically focused on the strategies considered most effective to aid superintendents as they lead successfully within several instructional settings, with specific emphasis upon special-needs populations in their districts.

Diane Ullman
Senior Director, District Management Council, Boston, MA

Since 2013, Dr. Diane Ullman has been a senior director at District Management Council, working with consultants to assist superintendents in reform efforts. For over 4 years, she has served as the University of Connecticut’s director of the Advanced Instructional Leadership Academy in Amman, Jordan. Further, she served as the director of the University of Connecticut principal preparation program from 2012–2014. Dr. Ullman has served as a state administrator, superintendent, principal, and special education teacher across multiple states. She earned her PhD in Educational Leadership from the University of Colorado, Boulder.

University of Connecticut: Dr. Ullman has improved and expanded the University of Connecticut’s principal preparation program. She has brought her knowledge and expertise on issues of instructional leadership and data-driven leadership to strengthen the coursework and teaching of aspiring leaders at University of Connecticut. Dr. Ullman also has been a director and instructor for the University of Connecticut Administrator Preparation Program.

Vic Wilson
Executive Director, Council for Leaders in Alabama Schools

Dr. Vic Wilson is the executive director of the Council for Leaders in Alabama Schools (CLAS), which services 10 affiliate organizations and provides professional learning for more than 3,500 instructional leaders in Alabama. Prior to coming to CLAS in 2017, he was the superintendent of Hartselle City Schools. During Wilson’s 26 years of service in the field of education, he has worked with professionals from pre-K through graduate school. Wilson performed numerous roles including principal, assistant principal, teacher, and coach. Throughout Wilson's 18-year administration tenure in public education, he has been active in CLAS, the Alabama Association of Secondary School Principals, School Superintendents of Alabama, American Association of School Administrators, and other professional organizations. In 2014, he was president of the Alabama Association of Secondary School Principals. Wilson has received leadership awards from various organizations including the Alabama Music Educators Association. He was selected 2017 Alabama State Superintendent of the Year. Other prestigious awards include the Lawrence L. Malone Outstanding Principal Award (2009–2010), the Alabama Association of Secondary School Principals G.B. Beasley Leadership Award (2014–2015), and the Samford University Transformational Leadership Academy Award (2015–2019). Dr. Wilson earned his bachelor’s degree in English and History from the University of Alabama in 1992, his master’s degree from Samford University, his EdS in Educational Leadership from the University of Montevallo, and his doctorate in Education from Samford University in 2006. He serves as an adjunct professor at Samford University. His band, The Uncommon Core, has been seen and heard at various educational conferences throughout Alabama.

Auburn University: Dr. Wilson has embraced connecting with Auburn University Educational Leadership faculty and has offered collaborative experiences for Alabama school leaders through this growing partnership. He is changing the landscape of how state organizations such as CLAS and higher education operate to further K-12 initiatives and innovations.
Call for Nominations: 2019 Exemplary Educational Leadership Preparation (EELP) Award

Intent to Apply due Thursday, May 30, 2019
Deadline to Submit Materials: Friday, July 19, 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://3fl71l2qoj4l3y6ep2tpwra.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 Thursday, May 30, 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://3fl71l2qoj4l3y6ep2tpwra.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.**
• **Part II: Course Content**: Please provide syllabi for core courses in the program. Please provide a brief written description of how and by whom syllabi are created (generally) and this assortment of syllabi specifically.

• **Part III: Field Work**: Please provide a narrative that describes/elaborates the field work experience that students encounter. This should reveal (a) key clinical work tasks and/or requirements, (b) all field-based developmental supports (e.g., mentoring/coaching/supervision), (c) key tools/routines/documents that support and systematize the field experience, and (d) any clinical assessments that students complete or that track student development over the course of the clinical experience. **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, July 19, 2019.**

Please email mar5q@virginia.edu or call (434) 297-7896 with questions.

---

### Job Search Resources

Subscribe to the UCEA news feed to get new job postings in your e-mail inbox or RSS reader. Search by date, state, or type of position. The site aggregates in one place all of the jobs posted at the UCEA Ed Leadership Jobs Board, HigherEdJobs, the Chronicle (Vitae) Job Board, UCEA CASTLE, and the AERA Jobs Board.

**Sample Job Search Documents:** [http://www.ucea.org/opportunities/sample-job-search-documents/](http://www.ucea.org/opportunities/sample-job-search-documents/)

**UCEA Educational Leadership Jobs Board:** [https://members.ucea.org/edleadershipjobs](https://members.ucea.org/edleadershipjobs)

**HigherEdJobs:** [https://www.higheredjobs.com](https://www.higheredjobs.com)


Stage-by-stage assistance for graduate students new to the academic job search process. The site includes a plethora of helpful tips and strategies and has been highly acclaimed by past job seekers. Please publicize these resources to your graduate students.

Thank you.

---

### Get to Know the Graduate Student Council:

Call for Award Nominations
2019

Thank you for your commitment to and support of UCEA in advancing the preparation and practice of educational leaders for the benefit of schools and children. In order to recognize those individuals who have made significant contributions toward this goal, we encourage you to nominate individuals for the following awards who you believe deserve recognition for their efforts and excellence within the educational leadership community. You also may access more detailed information on each award by visiting our website.

The following awards have a deadline of Monday, June 3, 2019:

- **Edwin M. Bridges Award**, given by UCEA annually for original, outstanding work in the area of research and/or development that contributes to our knowledge and understanding of how best to prepare and support future generations of educational leaders. [http://www.ucea.org/edwin-m-bridges-award/](http://www.ucea.org/edwin-m-bridges-award/)


- **The Jack A. Culbertson Award**, given to a professor in the first 6 years of his or her career for some outstanding accomplishment. [http://www.ucea.org/the-jack-a-culbertson-award/](http://www.ucea.org/the-jack-a-culbertson-award/)

- **The Master Professor Award**, given to an individual faculty member whose record is so distinguished that UCEA must recognize this individual in a significant and timely manner. [http://www.ucea.org/the-master-professor-award/](http://www.ucea.org/the-master-professor-award/)

- **The Jay D. Scribner Mentoring Award**, given to a educational leadership faculty who have made substantive contribution to the field by mentoring the next generation of students into roles as university research professors, while also recognizing the important role(s) mentors play in supporting and advising junior faculty. [http://www.ucea.org/the-jay-d-scribner-mentoring-a/](http://www.ucea.org/the-jay-d-scribner-mentoring-a/)

Nominations for these awards are welcome from faculty members of UCEA member institutions and partner institutions. Electronic submissions should include

- The candidate’s curriculum vitae;
- A letter addressing the contributions of the nominee relative to one or more of the selection criteria; and
- Support letters from individuals who have been directly mentored by the nominee, and/or individuals who can attest to the nominee’s mentoring strengths, are strongly encouraged.

A UCEA committee appointed by Executive Director Mónica Byrne-Jiménez will review and evaluate the nominees. This committee will reserve the right to present this award to multiple candidates on any given year, or conversely, not to present this award should nominees not fully meet the selection criteria.

**Please send nominations electronically to ucea@virginia.edu**

Questions? Please call UCEA Headquarters at (434) 243-1041 or email us at ucea@virginia.edu
Jackson Scholars and their Mentors gathered in Toronto on Friday, April 5, for a morning of panel presentations, mentoring sessions, feedback, and celebration. After a warm welcome from UCEA Incoming Executive Director Mónica Byrne-Jiménez, the Scholars enjoyed a panel discussion hosted by Co-Associate Director Lisa Bass. The panelists shared their experiences as new, junior, and senior faculty. The panelists included Dr. Adam Kho, University of Southern California; Dr. Angel Miles Nash, Chapman University; Dr. Karen Beard, The Ohio State University; Dr. Darius Prier, Duquesne University; Dr. Mónica Byrne-Jiménez, Indiana University; and Dr. Frank Hernandez, Southern Methodist University.

Following the panel discussion, Scholars participated in breakout table sessions on writing cover letters and CVs, collaboration, publishing, and crafting a research agenda. At the sessions, Mentors provided feedback and shared tips of the trade cultivated through years of experience.

After discussing upcoming events such as the Graduate Student Webinar Series and the Information Age Publishing Yearbook, it was time to celebrate. Some of our amazing Scholars have reached important milestones, and the group took the time to cheer them on and send positive vibes. Scholars Sajjīd Budhwani, Jeffrie Mallory, Eyra Perez, Angelica Sleiman, Yang Jiang, Maricela Guzman, and Bryan Duarte defended their dissertations in the spring or are preparing to defend in the summer or fall. Congratulations went out to Angelica Sleiman, who is lecturing at the University of San Diego, and Bryan Duarte, who is now an Assistant Professor of Education Policy at Miami University. Well done, Scholars!

Toronto proved the to be the perfect host for a productive and enjoyable mentoring workshop. The long lines at immigration and customs could not take away from the experience. A great time was had by all. We are looking forward to UCEA 2019 and hope New Orleans is ready for the Jackson Scholars Network.

David L. Clark Seminar 2019 Participants

This past April, 42 graduate students and 14 mentor faculty members descended upon the Toronto Convention Centre in Toronto, Ontario to participate in the 40th annual David L. Clark National Graduate Student Research Seminar in Educational Administration, sponsored by UCEA, Divisions A & L of the American Educational Research Association, and SAGE Publications. During the 2-day seminar, Clark Scholars heard from an array of panelists about life as a faculty member, presented their research during poster sessions, and participated in small group discussions. You can learn more about the Clark Seminar at http://www.ucea.org/grad-student-focus/david-clark-seminar/.
Call for Nominations: 2019-21 Jackson Scholars & Mentors
Deadline: May 31, 2019

The UCEA Barbara L. Jackson Scholars Program Advisory Committee is calling for nominees for mentors and scholars for the 2019-21 Jackson Scholars cohort (a 2-year term). This program, which has over 300 alumni, develops future faculty of color with high promise and ability for the field of educational leadership and policy.

SCHOLARS
Nominators are encouraged to nominate doctoral students completing the 2nd year of their programs.

In the structured mentoring program feature, scholars are matched with experienced faculty mentors who provide guidance in professional development, a model for students to reference when assuming mentor roles, and opportunities for networking. Mentors may also serve as a sounding board for scholars as they navigate the phases of dissertation development, a research agenda, and publication in preparation for their entry into higher education.

In the networking program feature, nominating UCEA institutions provide registration, travel, lodging, and meal funding for scholars to attend two UCEA annual conventions and two AERA annual meetings where the scholars engage in networking with guidance from mentors.

The institutional benefits of participation in the Jackson Scholars Network include possible increased graduation rates for Jackson Scholars and greater success in being hired as a result of the mentoring and training.

Who can nominate: Deans and Plenum Session Representatives (PSRs) of a UCEA member institution (no self-nominations).

MENTORS
Nominators of mentors are encouraged to consider colleagues who could mentor doctoral students of color during the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th years of their programs.

For the structured mentoring program feature, through ongoing media communications and face-to-face visits during the networking program features (see below), mentors will provide guidance in professional development, a model for students to reference when assuming mentor roles, and opportunities for networking. Mentors also may serve as sounding boards for scholars as they develop their dissertations, research agendas, and publications in preparation for entering the field of higher education.

For the networking program feature, institutions nominating mentors provide registration, travel, lodging, and meal funding for mentors to attend two UCEA annual conventions and two AERA annual meetings where they will (a) guide their scholars to engage in networking and (b) attend their scholars’ second-year presentations for which they also provide pre- and postpresentation support.

Who can nominate: UCEA member institution faculty and faculty of non-UCEA member institutions may nominate (self-nominations accepted).

THE PROCEDURE
Part I:
Review the Memorandum of Understanding with both a department head and with the nominee.

The Memorandum of Understanding for Scholars is available at http://www.ucea.org/graduate-student-development-home/jackson-scholars-program/2019-call-nominations-scholars/


The institution should be able to cover the costs defined therein, and the nominee should be available and willing to attend the networking events discussed. In some cases, as a result of the preliminary discussions of the Memorandum of Understanding with the department head and the nominee, the nominee may choose to assume some of the costs of the program.

Part II:
To proceed with formally nominating a candidate and declaring financial responsibility, kindly navigate to the following link:


Nominations must be received by May 31, 2019. Please email ucea@virginia.edu or call (434) 243-1041 with questions.
Where y’at: Validating subaltern forms of leadership and learning with/in and outside of schools

The UCEA Graduate Student Summit (GSS) is an annual pre-conference event organized by the UCEA Graduate Student Council. 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 cost of registering for the UCEA Convention is a separate $35 fee, and registration for both the UCEA Convention and the GSS is required for presenting during the GSS. http://www.ucea.org/conference/registration

Now in its eighth year, the UCEA GSS has grown each year as it has become recognized by UCEA faculty members and graduate students as a valuable developmental experience for aspiring educational leadership faculty. The purpose of the 2019 UCEA Graduate Student Summit is to provide graduate students a space to engage in authentic dialogue about their scholarly work. This summit will offer opportunities to meet and network with graduate students and faculty, to present your work and receive feedback on your research.

- Paper sessions: Share your research and receive constructive feedback.
- Ignite! sessions: Share your research and/or ideas for research projects and receive constructive feedback.
- Roundtable sessions: Share your research and/or ideas for research projects and receive constructive feedback.
- Mentor feedback sessions for paper, Ignite!, and roundtable presenters: Get direct feedback from distinguished faculty on a work that you would like to publish, a proposal, or your dissertation research plan.
- Networking sessions: 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: Make connections with others sharing similar life experiences in graduate schools across the globe.
- Developmental workshops for graduate students: 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.

If you have questions at any time, please feel free to email the UCEA Graduate Student Council at uceagradconnexion@gmail.com.

Grad Student Column & Blog: Submissions Welcome

Two elements of the UCEA website are focused on issues and information relevant to the graduate students of UCEA. The Graduate Student Column typically features scholarship written by graduate students at UCEA member institutions. Column entries explore a variety of topics and allow the authors to present developing research and to the UCEA graduate student community. The Graduate Student Blog is a more discussion-oriented format encouraging conversation between graduate students via posts and comments. Topics addressed in the blog include discussion and links to educational leadership and educational policy news relevant to graduate students, as well as updates and information about ways graduate students can be more involved in UCEA. Graduate students are invited to send in contributions for both the Graduate Student Column and the Graduate Student Blog. To find out more, please e-mail ucea@virginia.edu.

www.ucea.org/graduate-student-blog/
The 33rd Annual UCEA Convention

Where y’at: Validating subaltern forms of leadership and learning with/in and outside of schools

Nov. 20-24, 2019

Hilton New Orleans Riverside, New Orleans, LA

The 33rd Annual UCEA Convention will be held November 20-24, 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).

The 33rd Annual UCEA Convention theme, “Where y’at: Validating subaltern forms of leadership and learning with/in 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.

The convention features a variety of session types. Paper sessions are intended for reporting research results or analyzing issues of policy and practice in an abbreviated form. Ignite! presentations stimulate informal, lively discussions using a cluster of four to five 5-minute presentations. Symposia examine specific policy, research or practice issues from several perspectives, contribute significantly to the knowledge base, and allow for dialogue and discussion. International Community-Building Sessions have participants to be from multiple countries and focus on critical issues of leadership practice, development, or research from multiple international perspectives. Innovative Sessions and Mini-Workshops use web-based projects, films, and technology to increase interaction and participation. Critical Conversations and Networking Sessions stimulate informal, lively discussions around a series of provocative questions or research in process. Post Convention Work Sessions and Workshops provide both 2- and 4-hour sessions for scholars of similar interest. The UCEA Film Festival is a series of 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. The UCEA International Summit takes place during convention sessions as well. See www.ucea.org.

Important dates:
- May 7: Proposal submission window closed
- June 2: Reviews due 11:59 p.m. EST
- June 3: Convention registration opens
- June 28: Notification of proposal acceptance/rejection
- September 3: Early Bird Registration ends 11:59 p.m. EST
- October 8: Regular Registration ends 11:59 p.m. EST
- November 7: Late Registration ends 11:59 p.m. EST
- November 8: On-Site Registration begins
- November 20-21: Graduate Student Summit and Plenum
- November 21-24: Annual Convention

www.ucea.org
### The 33rd Annual UCEA Convention
New Orleans, LA, Nov. 20-24, 2019

**REGISTRATION**

http://www.ucea.org/conference/registration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registrant</th>
<th>Advance (ends Sept. 3, 11:59 pm EST)</th>
<th>Regular (ends Oct. 8, 11:59 pm EST)</th>
<th>Late (ends Nov. 7, 11:59 pm EST)</th>
<th>On site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UCEA Member Faculty</td>
<td>$240</td>
<td>$280</td>
<td>$320</td>
<td>$360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-UCEA Faculty</td>
<td>$285</td>
<td>$320</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCEA Member Graduate Student</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$140</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-UCEA Graduate Student</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$125</td>
<td>$165</td>
<td>$175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCEA Member Postdoctoral Researcher</td>
<td>$240</td>
<td>$280</td>
<td>$320</td>
<td>$390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-UCEA Postdoctoral Researcher</td>
<td>$285</td>
<td>$320</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practitioner</td>
<td>$285</td>
<td>$320</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibitor</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td>$60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BELMAS</td>
<td>$240</td>
<td>$280</td>
<td>$320</td>
<td>$360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Member/K-12 Student/Other Designation</td>
<td>Please contact UCEA Headquarters for registration details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Student Summit*</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td>$35</td>
<td>$35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In addition to applicable Graduate Student registration rate listed above*

If you are a community member, K-12 student, or other designation, please contact UCEA Headquarters regarding registration details.

Graduate Student Summit (Nov. 20 and 21) will be an additional $35 after cost of registration.

If you are a BELMAS member, please email UCEA at uceaconvention@gmail.com for your discount code.

We encourage all potential attendees to register early to avoid rate increases AND ensure that your name badge is ready at registration. Registrant Type will be added to name badge, so be sure to select the correct Registrant Type during registration. For all attendees who register on site (starting November 8, 2019), we cannot guarantee that your name badge will be ready upon arrival due to processing; however, UCEA will get it to you promptly.

It is the policy of UCEA that all persons in attendance at the 2019 UCEA Annual Convention, including participants who plan to attend one or more sessions, are required to register. Registration is not transferable.

**International Scholars**

In keeping with UCEA’s longstanding tradition of an international focus and collaboration with aligned organizations worldwide, we welcome international attendees to the 2019 Annual UCEA Convention. If you require a letter of invitation to travel to the UCEA Convention, please e-mail your request by October 15, 2019, to uceaconvention@gmail.com
Room rates: Single/Double $169

http://www.ucea.org/conference/hotel-reservations-2

We encourage you to make your reservation early, as space is tight. All reservations must be made by October 28, 2019 in order to receive rates listed above. For the UCEA room rates, please use the online passkey to make your reservations online, or call (504) 561-0500.

It’s all about location in New Orleans, and the Hilton New Orleans Riverside places you at the center of it all. Nestled against the banks of the Mississippi, guests can watch the ships come sailing in or dive into the city life just steps away. Grab a beignet, listen to live jazz, ride a streetcar, or hop into a parade, you never know what you’ll experience in the vibrant culture and excitement of New Orleans just outside our front door.

Need a roommate? UCEA provides separate forums for Convention and Graduate Student Summit attendees to submit room share requests to the larger UCEA faculty and graduate student communities. It is important that you read the terms of use/disclaimer before proceeding to a Room Share Forum. Please note that by using these forums, you are agreeing to the terms of use/disclaimer. Also, make sure the dates you listed for arrival and departure are present and accurate. The room sharing forum list is currently organized by gender, then arrival and departure dates to make scanning for a potential roommate easier.

For more information on the hotel and Houston, please see

http://www.ucea.org/conference/location-2
2019 UCEA Calendar

May
30 Intent to apply for EELP Award due
31 Letters of Intent to Host UCEA due
31 Deadline, Jackson Scholars/Mentors nominations

June
1 New UCEA Executive Director takes office
2 Reviews due, UCEA Convention proposals
3 Deadline, UCEA 2019 awards nominations
3 UCEA Convention registration opens (Early Bird)
28 Notification of Convention proposal acceptance or rejection

July
8-11 Women Leading Education Conference, Nottingham, UK  www.nottingham.ac.uk/conference/wle
12-14 BELMAS conference, Leicestershire, UK  www.belmas.org.uk/Annual-Conference-2019
19 EELP Award nomination materials due
31 Proposals to host UCEA due
31 UCEA Film Festival 2019 submissions due  www.ucea.org

September
3 Last day of Early Bird Registration, UCEA Convention

October
8 Last day of Regular Registration, UCEA Convention
30 Deadline to upload advance copy of accepted UCEA 2019 Convention and Graduate Student Summit papers  www.ucea.org

November
7 Last day of Late Registration, UCEA Convention
8 On-site registration begins, UCEA Convention
20-21 UCEA Graduate Student Summit, New Orleans, LA  www.ucea.org
21-24 UCEA Convention, New Orleans, LA  www.ucea.org
Contributing to the UCEA Review

The UCEA Review is published three times a year (winter, summer, fall) and distributed as a membership benefit by the UCEA. If you have ideas concerning substantive feature articles, interviews, innovative programs, or point/counterpoints, UCEA Review section editors would be happy to hear from you. UCEA Review deadlines: April 1, August 1, December 15

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

Features Editors:
Juan Manuel Niño
University of Texas at San Antonio
juan.nino@utsa.edu

Miriam Ezzani
University of North Texas
miriam.ezzani@unt.edu

Interview Editor:
Alyson Honsa
University of Washington
ahonsa@uw.edu

Point/Counterpoint Editor:
Johanna Hanley
University of Georgia
johanna.hanley@uga.edu

Innovative Programs Editor:
Grace J. Liang
Kansas State University
gliang15@ksu.edu

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

UCEA Headquarters Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michelle D. Young</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mónica Byrne-Jiménez</td>
<td>Incoming Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Dexter</td>
<td>Headquarters Associate Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael O’Malley</td>
<td>Associate Director of Publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Bass</td>
<td>Associate Director of Graduate Student Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollie Mackey</td>
<td>Associate Director of Graduate Student Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jayson Richardson</td>
<td>Associate Director of Program Centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Nash</td>
<td>Associate Director of Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward J. Fuller</td>
<td>Associate Director for Policy &amp; Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Wright, CPA</td>
<td>Financial Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer E. Cook</td>
<td>Publications &amp; Communications Editor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karl Gildner</td>
<td>Project &amp; Events Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcy Reedy</td>
<td>Project Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pei-Ling Lee</td>
<td>Webmaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie McGuire</td>
<td>Senior Administrative Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis Clement</td>
<td>Research Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Reynolds</td>
<td>Graduate Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angel Miles Nash</td>
<td>Graduate Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan VanGronigen</td>
<td>Graduate Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gopal Midha</td>
<td>Graduate Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Richardson</td>
<td>Graduate Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maggie Thornton</td>
<td>Graduate Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Moraguez</td>
<td>Graduate Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trevor Doiron</td>
<td>Undergraduate Assistant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

www.ucea.org