



Learning & Teaching in Educational Leadership



Division A • American Educational Research Association • Fall 2007 • Vol. 15, No. 2

What’s in a Name (Change)?

Tricia Browne-Ferrigno, LTEL-SIG Chair
University of Kentucky tricia.ferrigno@uky.edu

This issue of our SIG newsletter has a new front-page header that reads *Learning and Teaching in Educational Leadership* rather than *Teaching in Educational Administration*. This change represents the culmination of efforts by **Ruth Silverberg** (College of Staten Island, CUNY) and **Robert Kottkamp** (Hofstra University) and a nearly unanimous vote of support for their proposal by our membership. This newsletter is our first official publication to display our new name. As your newly elected chair, I focus my first message on issues related to our adoption of a new name.

In their article published in the inaugural issue of the *Journal of Research in Educational Leadership*, Silverberg and Kottkamp (2006) highlighted their formal proposal to the SIG membership. Even if you read it prior to casting your vote last spring, I encourage you to read their words again carefully. Notice that our colleagues presented 12 reasons for the change, each beginning with the word **because** in bold font for added emphasis. Although these statements are insightful, even passionate, justifications for change, our colleagues intended them to be guidelines for our transformation, collectively as SIG members and individually as leadership educators. If it is true that a “name contains a characterological message of paramount importance” (La Rouzic, 1994, p. 3), then this year marks the commencement of transformation. I am compelled to ask, how has changing our name changed us?

Silverberg and Kottkamp (2006) assert in their proposal that a shift “in language, thought, and mental models about leadership education” (p. 2) is necessary because “learning—student learning—is the core of the educational enterprise” (p. 3). Transforming language and thought into reality, however, requires us to behave differently, to become learners with our students rather

than simply teachers who disseminate our knowledge and share our wisdom. What do we know about learning theory and how to apply learner-centered principles in our instructional practices (e.g., APA Work Group, 1997; National Research Council, 1999)? About preparing new educational leaders able to practice learner-centered leadership in our schools and districts (Danzig, Borman, Jones, & Wright, 2007)?

Likewise, Silverberg and Kottkamp (2006) assert that we must model our new emphasis on learning by being “deep learners in each other’s company” willing to uncover and examine critically “our tacit assumptions, mental models, and theories-in-use” (p. 3). Our colleagues caution us that this type of learning “requires us to overcome the tension of our whole acculturation pulling our behaviors back toward the safe and comfortable known” (p. 3). As professors, we often work

Continued on page 2

IN THIS ISSUE

What’s in a Name (Change)?	page 1
Response to Richard Elmore	page 3
Letter to the Editor	page 4
Collaboration for Program Improvement	page 5
Research Highlights—Evaluating Leadership Preparation Programs	page 7
Book Review	page 9
Update on the UCEA/LTEL-SIG (TEA-SIG) Taskforce	page 11

LTEL-SIG Executive Committee, 2007–8

Chair	Tricia Browne-Ferrigno, <i>University of Kentucky</i>
Program Chair	Edie Rusch, <i>University of Nevada-Las Vegas</i>
Co-Program Chair	Diane Ricciardi, <i>Clemson University</i>
Treasurer	Kathleen Jorissen, <i>Western Carolina University</i>
Secretary	Sandra Harris, <i>Lamar University</i>
Newsletter Editor	Miles Bryant, <i>University of Nebraska-Lincoln</i>
Newsletter Assoc. Editor	Allison M. Borden, <i>University of New Mexico</i>
Past President	Terry Orr, <i>Bank Street College</i>
Member at Large	Gini Doolittle, <i>Rowan University</i>
Member at Large	Donald Hackmann, <i>University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign</i>
Member at Large	Judy A. Alston, <i>Widener University</i>
Graduate Student Representative	Daniel Reyes-Guerra, <i>Florida Atlantic University</i>
Website Editor	Scott Bauer, <i>George Mason University</i>

What's in a Name (Change)?

Continued from page 1

in isolation, perhaps collaborating only with colleagues at other institutions who share our beliefs about leadership preparation. As members of a SIG that now lists learning as its primary focus, how do we create a risk-safe professional environment that supports our admitting we lack knowledge and skills as leadership educators and scholars? In essence, how do we model what we espouse?

A theme woven throughout the Silverberg-Kottkamp proposal is democracy that “empowers colleagues and students to voice publicly what they and we believe” (p.5). Practicing democracy is not easy in our fast-paced 21st century society. By voting to change our name, did we likewise vote to change how we function as an organization? If the response is yes, then in what ways does this change influence the work done by the SIG Executive Committee? To what extent do members want to be actively engaged in decision making?

By voting to change our name, did we likewise commit to becoming active participants in policy development by making “radical public statements of what we believe about the purpose and possibilities of education in the United States of America” (p. 4)? Last spring we voted to accept recommended changes to our By-Laws, which included modifications to our Purpose (see lines 24 through 39). The words *advocate* and *advocacy* do not appear in our current By-Laws. By voting to change our name based on the Silverberg-Kottkamp proposal, did we

add a new element to our SIG purpose? We need to answer this question because AERA is requiring all SIGs to review their By-Laws this year. As the immediate Past Chair, **Margaret Terry Orr** (Bank Street College of Education) is responsible for convening a committee to review and propose amendments to the SIG membership. She and the committee will need guidance from our membership.

We began to build the foundation for our democratic transformation in 2006-2007 by adding a Graduate Student Representative to serve as a non-voting advisory member on our Executive Committee and as the SIG liaison to the AERA Graduate Council. The 2007-2008 representative of graduate-student members is **Daniel Reyes-Guerra** (Florida Atlantic University) whose charge is to assure that “students’ voices” (Silverberg & Kottkamp, 2006, p. 4) are heard in the governance of our SIG. Likewise, **Scott Bauer** (George Mason University) has agreed to assume responsibility as our “Web content manager” to assure that information is regularly updated. [A quick scan of our current Web site explains why AERA requested each Division and SIG to designate a member to oversee this task.] Daniel, as only the second person to serve in his role, and Scott, as the first to serve in his, have considerable influence on the conceptualization of these responsibilities. What guidance can the membership provide them?

My first message as Chair includes many questions and no specific action plan. I believe that if we are to become

Continued on page 10

Response to Richard Elmore

Miles Bryant, Professor of Educational Administration
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Annaleah Morrow, Graduate Student in Educational Administration
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Is it to be believed that after a century and more of fulfilling managerial and leadership roles in schools that educational administration is a profession with no practice? Richard Elmore claimed as much. How can this be? Do not educational administrators show up in their buildings and offices and enact their organizational roles? Do they not attend meetings, answer requests, make lists, visit classes, evaluate teachers, speak with parents? Are these collective enactments so incoherent, discordant, so idiosyncratic to the individual, that there is nothing about these administrative behaviors that can be said to constitute a professional practice?

How do the practitioners of the schools understand a claim that states, “You have no body of practice as a profession?” This essentially was the claim made by Richard Elmore at last year’s UCEA meeting in San Antonio, TX. In his address, Elmore claimed that there was no core practice based on empirical evidence that one could use as the basis for instruction and preparation. His extended metaphor for making these claims was drawn from medical education and in particular the practice in medical education of training through medical rounds.

We have pondered Elmore’s message as perhaps have others who heard his address or read his remarks in the last issue of this newsletter. We thought it appropriate to respond to his observations.

First, we have to question the claim that there is no body of practice. The actions and behaviors of educational administrators in the schools of the nation are similar from place to place. Many have observed that American schools are more alike than they are dissimilar. We argue that this commonality holds true for educational leaders and that there is a body of shared practices and behaviors. Like doctors, educational leaders perform a multitude of professional tasks. They plan, they network, they organize, they make budgets, they represent their institutions to a larger environment, they hire and fire, they try to improve and plan change. Regardless of the school in question, it is possible to observe educational leaders carrying out these organizational functions. Most importantly, educational leaders constantly make

decisions about the lives of other human beings—just as doctors do.

Need educational leaders and the professors who provide preparation programs rely on the findings of empirical research to the same degree as do medical doctors? Just how much of a science should and can education be? We would argue that educators preparing to be administrators should not be taught according to some detailed algorithm developed in random trials but in recognition of the complexity of their future roles as leaders who make decisions having uncertain impacts on the lives of others. Unfortunately, there are very few universal truths that administrators can learn that help them make these complicated decisions. Occasionally, one may stumble on an elegant, parsimonious set of factors that reduce a decision to a scientific finding that seems to apply in most situations. Yet there are not too many of these in the complicated world of schools. It is this complicated, mutable world of schools that resists the codification of practice common to medical education. Instead, the preparation of educational leaders needs to prepare people to recognize that there are unknown solutions to difficult problems and that these solutions need to be discovered and invented in practice, not prior to practice.

Elmore’s article and his descriptions of his own practice as a university professor do suggest an idea that may prove to be a significant addition to the pedagogy of preparing administrators for their complicated jobs—the idea of medical rounds. The idea that a preparation program should, in its advanced stages, place trainees in practical situations where they must experience the real is one that Elmore would take further than the typical practica and internship experiences we currently employ. Difficult to implement in some ways, expanding the exposure of trainees to a variety of settings would enrich their knowledge of practice in helpful ways. Not all preparation programs could provide a rich array of locations in which trainees could rotate. But certainly for larger population centers, having trainees experience work in schools could be significant. Furthermore, the logistics of such of an approach almost demands a partnership with practicing administrators in school settings.

Letter to the Editor

Dear Editor:

In the spring issue of [the] TEA-SIG [newsletter] there are two relatively long feature articles that again raise questions about the status of TEA as a profession. Both Elmore's article, "Education: A Profession in Search of a Practice" and Black and Bathon's, "Selected Findings from the Indiana Principal Preparation Mapping Study" are indicators of a dour future for TEA. Elmore states that there is an "absence of a core set of practices around which to organize a body of knowledge that defines a profession" because education is not grounded in a "body of knowledge that defines a profession" it results in "education as a profession without a practice." He sees medical rounds used as one of the seminal experiences in the education of medical doctors as a model "to change in a fundamental way the practice of educational leadership." The underlying assumption is the current education and training of administrators is resulting in "leaders who exercise no controls over whatever practice exists in their organization nor do they have a practice that defines their field."

Unfortunately, students of educational administration (or educational leadership) do not have the underpinning of three years or more of in-depth coursework in anatomy, physiology, pharmacology, patient care and much more. This foundation of coursework precedes rounds conducted by a group often made up of a fourth year resident, interns, students, physicians, and faculty who at times make the group involved in bedside teaching and learning (the central purpose of rounds) difficult for the patient to accept. Speculate on the learning and contributions to learning that a rounds member who has only gone through two General Motors two-week courses in transmissions and tune-ups could make to medical rounds. This lack of a foundation of common learning is a crucial missing component of Elmore's approach. This core of common learning culminating in rounds creates the very basis for establishing admission to the profession and excluding the unqualified. From a counter point of view, there were no candidates that were refused admission to the 17 educational administration programs in the Indiana survey.

Black and Baton report on the "Indiana Principal Preparation Mapping Study." Mapping appears to be the traditional surveying of departments of educational administration in Indiana to determine the status of students and graduates. Though this term "mapping" has a "with it" sound, it appears to be an old fashioned survey

of students, their programs, and their placement. The initial findings from this Indiana survey could have come from the voyage of the Beagle:

They overproduce. There were 435 administrative licenses granted in 2005 in Indiana. There were about 3000 employed administrators. One could speculate that there were thousands of administration students in the pipeline of the 17 state administrator training programs. The number of students was not given.

There is infinite variability among students. Indiana administrator education programs accept all candidates. There are few minorities. About half of program candidates are women. One could assume that there are students with a wide range of interests, capabilities, and aptitudes in the 17 programs.

The fittest survive. One has to speculate that with about 3000 total administrator positions in the state of Indiana and with perhaps a 10 percent annual attrition rate, most students and graduates are not going to find administrative positions in Indiana school systems. The reader does not know on what basis the few who are selected for administrative positions in Indiana each year are selected.

Half of the Indiana faculty is adjunct and 20% are full time tenure track professors. Most program candidates find their own program internships. Educational administration programs are probably a cash cow to the 17 Indiana colleges and universities.

Though there will be additional findings of the Indiana survey published in the future, both of these articles point to the field's inability to deal with its central problem: the lack of focus on teaching, learning, and most importantly, elementary and secondary student learning outcomes or achievement in education. That is the central problem facing those that educate school administrators. The solutions in the spring 2007 issue of the TEA [newsletter] are more like Andy Hardy's appeal, "Hey gang, let's put on a play in Pop's barn. I'll print up the tickets" rather than creating a serious theater program.

The criterion measure of teaching in educational administration has always been the significant or substantial improvement of the learning outcomes of achievement of the elementary and/or secondary students under the jurisdiction of the administrators they are

Continued on page 10

Collaboration for Program Improvement

Robert Watson

Missouri State University

Jennifer Friend

University of Missouri-Kansas City

Introduction

Institutions of higher education, operating within the same region to offer certification programs for educational leadership, are typically in competition to enroll a limited number of candidates. In Missouri, there are 17 such principal preparatory programs, each graduating future school- and district-level administrators who must successfully complete the School Leadership Licensure Assessment to become certified principals in the state.

Approximately three years ago, a group of professors in Missouri began a future planning discussion at a board meeting of the Missouri Professors of Educational Administration (MPEA). As the professors evaluated the work of prior years, they soon realized that not much was happening. The MPEA members would meet to hear about current projects, to encourage new membership and to elect officers for the next year, or to invite a representative from the state department to give a report on the status of leadership in Missouri. It was at this time that a new president of the MPEA took office and challenged the board members to engage in long-range planning and to provide leadership at the state and national level for school leadership programs.

Planning Stage

The MPEA Board of Directors had been made up of seven members, each elected for a three-year term. In the developing stages, the Board decided that more representation on the board was needed in order to be effective. A constitutional change was voted on to increase the board from seven to a nine-member board. It was during this time that the board became proactive in planning and holding each other responsible to become involved at the state and national levels. Several of the board members accepted the charge through active roles in NCPEA, SCREA, and AERA. This involvement led to new knowledge brought into planning meetings, which served as the basis for creating four long-range projects designed to impact the leadership preparation program in the state of Missouri.

In order for the development of the projects to occur, it was important that the right people be invited to the MPEA planning meetings. The president invited Missouri's Director of Elementary and Secondary Education to attend and provide feedback for the three-year planning. Out of these early meetings came four very important initiatives that are making a difference in leadership preparation programs in the state. These projects are: (a) the Higher Education Evaluation Committee (HEEC), (b) the Administrator Mentoring Program (AMP), (c) the Backward Mapping project, and (d) a comprehensive and continuous evaluation program for the MPEA efforts.

In order to effectively plan and implement the four projects, the MPEA board members needed to meet more frequently. Board of Directors meetings are now held seven times during the year, in addition to sub-committee meetings where individual board members are responsible for planning, facilitating, and bringing the results back to the board for full discussion and support. Each of the projects needed to have at least one board member to serve on the sub-committee. During the planning stage, the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education requested the MPEA to submit a grant proposal to the state for support of these projects. With the successful addition of financial support from the state level, the MPEA could really begin to implement the plans. Having the right players at the table for the development and implementation was an important lesson learned during the planning process.

Implementation Stage

Higher Education Evaluation Committee

The Development of the HEEC program began with an invitation to each of the 17 universities in the state to send a representative to a meeting to discuss the educational administration preparatory programs in the state. Four of the board members volunteered to chair the first meetings of the HEEC and report back. The Missouri Commissioner of Education had also visited with the

Continued on page 6

Collaboration for Program Improvement

Continued from page 5

officers of MPEA and suggested the HEEC work on recruitment and professional development of adjunct professors, induction into the leadership programs, and support of effective school leaders so that the outcome would enhance the overall learning of all students.

The agenda for HEEC monthly meetings are collaborative in nature and provide information to institutional representations that encourage attendance at future meetings and involvement in the improvement planning process. Early implementation involved inviting experts who had worked with planning and implementation of a state-wide initiative to assist in the research design. Ground rules were set with the vision that the HEEC members were on a journey to develop quality leaders. Individuals from all the private and public institutions continue to attend the meetings, with an average of 15 universities present for past three years. In the framing stage it is evident how important it is to respect one another, to encourage participation, and to reframe negative perceptions that may be held regarding various preparation programs around the state.

Administrator Mentoring Program and Backward Mapping

A new statute from the certification department was implemented in Missouri in 2005 for a statewide mentoring program (AMP) of new school leaders. New school-level administrators must engage in two years of mentoring support, and beginning district superintendents engage in one year of mentoring. The MPEA is a driving force for the AMP, along with the Regional Professional Development Centers (RPDC). The mentoring process continues to expand as the success of the program is communicated by participants through the program evaluation.

The Backward Mapping project examines educational administration preparation program effectiveness through interview responses from practicing school leaders. Currently the project has three years of data collected to support findings and recommendations to Missouri's colleges and universities regarding educational administration preparation. Examination of coursework, curriculum, and field experiences to ensure the knowledge, dispositions, and performance skills has been articulated as important elements of successful preparation programs.

An electronic mailing list was used to invite different universities to send representatives to become involved

with the MPEA-sponsored projects. When the board chose to invite and encourage representation from each of the universities, there was an increase of attendance at the committee level meetings and at the MPEA Fall and Spring Conferences.

Outcome Stage

The outcome stage has proven to be a true celebration of the three-year efforts to plan, develop and implement the projects. The HEEC chairpersons were invited to make annual presentations to the State Board of Education during this period of time. The presentations have provided feedback into what was happening with the various institutions of higher learning in regards to preparation of new school leaders. A celebration was held at the spring conference of MPEA, and the group continues to welcome new members who want to become involved in the projects. During the three years, all institutions have remained at the table and provided valuable input into the recommendations that were presented at the State Board of Education meetings. A 65% voting approval by institutions in attendance at HEEC meetings is required for any proposals related to educational leadership preparatory programs. The recommendations that were approved by the HEEC and presented to the state board in 2007 include:

- Adoption of the Educational Leaders Constituent Council (ELCC) National Standards
- Creation of a professional development program for faculty and adjunct professors
- Recruitment and retention of faculty from diverse backgrounds and from diverse settings
- Development of criteria for qualifications and evaluation of adjunct professors
- Recommendations for program admission requirements for masters and educational specialist level students
- Recommendations for internship / field experience requirements
- Strategies for evaluating principals' impact on student achievement
- Determining critical attributes of quality school leadership preparation programs
- Participation in the national alumni survey, created by UCLEA/TEA-SIG, of Missouri educational administration preparatory program graduates in year 3

We celebrate several accomplishments in Missouri at this time, including the emergence of Missouri as a leader at the national level with regard to statewide efforts to

Continued on page 10

Research Highlights— UCEA/LTEL-SIG Taskforce on Evaluating Leadership Preparation Programs

Margaret Terry Orr, Bank Street College

The taskforce's research has yielded important findings about leadership preparation programs, as higher education institutions, providers of leadership education and preparation, and as producers of graduates and alumni who become school leaders. Below is a summary of highlights drawn from various studies.

First, as higher education institutions, we have found that we are a sizable and expanding field:

- In 2003, there were 472 masters degree programs nationwide, granting 15,720 degrees.
- 1993-2003, Master's degree programs increased by 16 percent and the number of master's degrees granted by 90 percent.
- Degree production shifted by institutional type over the ten-year period: Research universities in producing master's, specialist, and doctoral degrees declining dramatically, while comprehensive colleges and universities showing over a four-fold increase in the share.
- Degree production fluctuates widely among states, unrelated to school population estimates.

Second, there are several common features to our program operations, which are best illustrated by findings from an Indiana study:

- Most programs are licensure only or licensure and degree programs.
- All are based on state leadership standards
- Masters degrees vary from 36-42 credits, 14 months to 60 months.
- Most Indiana programs are cohort based and most applicants are admitted (with a common GPA of 3.0).
- Most programs in Indiana have a fixed curriculum, with the most common courses being educational leadership, school law, the principalship, curriculum, school-community relations, and the internship or practicum.
- Instructional practices in Indiana vary most widely with problem-based learning, case studies, and extended class discussion consistently used in half the courses; and half the programs are off-site or through distance learning.
- Internship practices vary widely, with most internships required as a separate program experience. About 1/3 of

the programs have district relationships for internship placement and internship hours average 100-150, with a range from 60-300.

- In Indiana, the majority are adjuncts or split time faculty, with few faculty who are tenure-line full time leadership preparation faculty.
- Assessment at program completion consists primarily of grades, portfolio (without clear assessments) and, for 60% of the programs, SLLA assessment.

Third, survey results on Taskforce members' programs show similar variability on internship attributes, but more instructional leadership focus and student centered practices. Typically, these programs had been recently redesigned to align with new state and federal standards and leadership effectiveness research. As a result, according to alumni feedback, these programs:

- Are very selective on prior teaching experience and leadership experience.
- Deliver a good to strong program based on ratings on focus, content, student-centered instructional practices, internships, competent faculty and positive students relationships.
- Graduates rated their learning highest in learning vision and ethics, organizational learning, and how to lead learning.

Fourth, two statewide studies of graduate outcomes (Indiana and Texas) yield similar findings on graduate career outcomes. The taskforce follow-up survey of graduates, used in a few programs, provides some insights into program influences.

- In Indiana, there is wide disparity in programs' productivity: Three programs produce half of the degrees in the state; five programs produce only 2 percent, and most advance to leadership positions locally.
- Across all studies, we find that about half the program completers advance to a leadership position within the first two years. These rates increase to about 60-70 percent over five years post-graduation and then plateau. In Texas, the average rate to advancement is 2.0

Continued on page 12

American Educational Research Association
Learning and Teaching in Educational Leadership Special Interest Group
Distinguished Researcher Award

The Learning and Teaching in Educational Leadership Special Interest Group (LTEL-SIG) is pleased to invite nominations for the Distinguished Researcher Award. This award is given biennially (in even-numbered years) to recognize a distinguished record of excellence in research related to teaching and learning in Educational Leadership and Administration. The recipient will receive recognition in the form of a monetary award in the amount of \$300 and a plaque, which will be presented during the LTEL-SIG annual business meeting at the American Educational Research Association annual meeting.

Criteria for the Distinguished Researcher Award are as follows:

1. The recipient must be a current or former member of the LTEL-SIG (formerly TEA-SIG).
2. The recipient's research must be aligned with the LTEL-SIG purposes, which are as follows:

LTEL-SIG brings together professors of educational leadership and administration, discipline specialists, educational theorists, curriculum developers, instructional technology specialists, learning specialists, educational researchers, classroom experts, practitioners, policy makers, and others concerned with Learning and Teaching in Educational Leadership. The LTEL-SIG provides a forum for:

 - A managed conversation on issues related to learning and teaching in Educational Leadership and Administration.
 - The integration of theoretical quantitative and qualitative studies of learning and teaching in Educational Leadership.
 - Discussion of investigations conducted in real educational settings, including investigations involving application of technology to learning and instruction.
 - Exploration of innovative methodologies.
 - Analysis of the implications of research and practice for learning and teaching in Educational Leadership.
 - Assessment of the relationship of learning and teaching in Educational Leadership to policy development at local, state, and national levels.
3. The body of research for which the individual is nominated must represent significant contributions to the research, policy, and/or practice, which have had a sustained impact on teaching and learning in educational leadership and administration.

Nominations shall include: (a) a cover letter, noting why the candidate is uniquely qualified to receive the award; and (b) a copy of the candidate's most recent curriculum vita. Information should be forwarded by electronic mail to:

Dr. Donald Hackmann, Associate Professor
Department of Educational Organization and Leadership
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
dghack@uiuc.edu

Deadline for nominations is March 1, 2008. Questions may be directed to Don Hackmann at 217-333-0230 or *dghack@uiuc.edu*

Book Review

Sandra L. Harris¹

Director, Center for Doctoral Studies in Educational Leadership
Lamar University

The Handbook of Doctoral Programs in Educational Leadership: Issues and Challenges

Editors: Carol A. Mullen, Theodore B. Creighton,
Frederick L. Dembowski, & Sandra L. Harris.

Houston, TX: The NCPEA Press/Rice University-QOOP, Inc., 2007. 205 pp.

Across the United States and in other countries, educators are revising and refining leadership programs. New doctoral programs are also being implemented. In Texas, alone, there are 16 Ed.D. and 5 Ph.D. programs in educational leadership (<http://www.thecb.state.tx.us>). At least 10 of these programs are less than 10 years old. Additionally, two other Texas universities have applications pending with the Coordinating Board to begin new doctoral programs. Despite well-publicized criticism of leadership and administration programs by Levine (2005), there is a growing body of evidence that scholar-practitioner doctoral programs result in improved practice. In fact, Harris (2005) and Mullen (2005), as well as others, have documented the transforming nature of these programs resulting in leadership paradigm changes in the personal and professional lives of students.

The editors of *The Handbook of Doctoral Programs in Educational Leadership: Issues and Challenges* saw the need to further the national dialogue of school leadership and school improvement in program-related doctoral issues. Therefore, the goal of this handbook is to advance understanding in areas that relate to doctoral educational leadership and administration. The seventeen chapters written by 28 professors of educational leadership programs across the country are divided into three sections: Development and administration of doctoral programs, perspectives on the dissertation, and lessons learned in the delivery of doctoral programs.

Section 1: Development and Administration of Doctoral Programs

Chapter I, written by Fred Dembowski, provides an empirical description of doctoral programs in educational leadership. In the next chapter, Joe Donaldson and George Petersen use neo-institutional theory as a means to explore

not only the level of commonality in implementation of cohorts, but also the processes by which cohorts have become such a popular model in leadership preparation. Chapter III provides a narrative reflection on the first two years of a new doctoral program by Sandra Harris. Following this, Beverly Irby and Fred Lunenburg review some of the main concerns about leadership preparation programs, present the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) standards and relate them to doctoral programs in general.

Finally, they make recommendations for a profession-based accrediting process. In Chapter V, Dembowski describes two innovations that have been developed and implemented in a collaborative doctoral program in Louisiana. These innovations are the Action Research Practicum and the Qualifying Paper.

Section II: Perspectives on the Dissertation

This section begins with a chapter that describes a conceptual framework for doctoral program research written by Dale Johnson, Danna Beaty, and Tod Farmer. The framework presents a way to view doctoral inquiry complexities in a logical and integrated format. In Chapter VII, Mack Hines discusses the moral implications of the dissertation experience for the field of educational leadership.

Chapter VIII by Margaret Grogan, Joe Donaldson, and Juanita Simmons presents an approach to weave action research throughout an Ed.D. program so that students experience the application of action research methods in the field, thus learning how theory relates with practice. Janice Fauske then reviews the socio-political context of academia and how trends in research methodology influence scholarly work. She synthesizes her own experience as a qualitative researcher and dissertation advisor focusing on writing qualitative studies. In the

¹ drsandy@flash.net or Sandra.harris@lamar.edu;

This book is an NCPEA Connections E-Book available at <http://cnx.org/lenses/cnxorg/books>.

What's in a Name (Change)?

Continued from page 2

what Silverberg and Kottkamp (2006) envision, then we—the members of the Learning and Teaching in Educational Leadership SIG—must engage in dialogue about how we can achieve our new goals. I close with another question, where do we begin our work? I look forward to hearing from you (tricia.ferrigno@uky.edu).

References

APA Work Group of the Board of Educational Affairs. (1997, November). *Learner-centered psychological principals: A framework*

for school reform and redesign. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Danzig, A. B., Borman, K. M., Jones, B. A., & Wright, W. F. (Eds.). (2007). *Learner-centered leadership: Research, policy, and practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Le Rouzic, P. (1994). *The name book* (rev. ed.). Fairfield, IA: Sunstar.

National Research Council. (1999). *How people learn: Bridging research and practice*. Washington, DC: Author.

Silverberg, R. P., & Knttkamp, R. B. (2006, Spring). Language matters. *Journal of Research in Leadership Education*, 1(1). Available at <http://www.ucea.org/JRLE/pdf/vol1/issue1/Kottkamp.pdf>

Letter to the Editor

Continued from page 4

teaching. The measurement of these outcomes is always complex and challenging for administrators since they must be effectuated through teachers and other administrators and they require supplies, equipment, and other resources. The distinguishing characteristic of “leadership” is the achievement of children in significant or substantial ways. All else is “administration.”

Since the great majority of students in educational administration are teachers, I'll suggest two projects that would benefit every student in educational administration. They might change the tone and purpose of [the] TEA [SIG].

Project 1. Improve the educational achievement of two to five students under your classroom jurisdiction in some substantial or significant way.

Project 2. Improve the educational achievement of students in three different classrooms not under your jurisdiction in some significant or substantial way.

Each of these projects could result in acts of educational leadership—the significant improvement of student learning. They both require the creation of ideas about student learning (both curriculum and instructional ideas) that could result in improved student achievement. Their execution requires all of the important and trivial administrative work (from finding resources to the careful reading of labor contracts) necessary to the process of improving student learning.

Sincerely,

William H. Streich, Ph.D.
Educational Consultant
Farmington, CT

Collaboration for Program Improvement

Continued from page 6

improve educational leadership preparatory programs. Due to recommendations from the HEEC, Missouri has increased the cut scores for certification through successful completion of the School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA) and Superintendent Licensure Assessment (SLA). Missouri continues to have one of the highest pass rates for the SLLA and the SLA in the United States.

Missouri is one of three states that have adopted the UCEA/TEA-SIG graduate follow-up survey to provide

additional data to inform program improvement. The HEEC continues to provide a structure for the collaboration and design efforts of all 17 preparatory program institutions who meet on a monthly basis to address program improvement. There is still room at the table for others to join in and continue with the development of quality leaders. The MPEA remains dedicated to a clear vision for the future, a vision realized through the collaborative support and continued efforts to improve the achievement of all students in Missouri through the preparation of quality school and district leaders.

Update on the UCEA/LTEL-SIG (TEA-SIG) Taskforce on Evaluating Leadership Preparation Programs

Margaret Terry Orr

Bank Street College (Taskforce Co-chair)

The Taskforce met for a three-hour work group meeting at the 2007 AERA Conference in Chicago, to review current research efforts and its organization and purpose, now that it is in its sixth year. We continue to be a large and diverse group, drawing members from public and private institutions across the country, many of whom are currently replicating some portion of the taskforce's research efforts. The current research builds on and extends the Taskforce's priorities:

- a) support state program associations in self-study, as is being done in Indiana (William Black, University of South Florida), Missouri (Robert Watson, Missouri State University, and Jennifer Friend), New Jersey (Gini Doolittle) and Utah (Diana Pounder, University of Utah), and is being initiated in Texas (Julia Ballenger, Stephen F. Austin State University);
- b) continue to compile and analyze state data sources on graduates, their career outcomes, and their schools' performance, as is being done in Texas (Ed Fuller and Michelle Young, University of Texas); and
- c) refine and encourage use of a follow up survey of graduates and alumni, and a parallel survey of teachers about their principals (Terry Orr and Diana Pounder).

The Taskforce is currently co-chaired by Terry Orr (Bank Street College) and Diana Pounder (University of Utah). Jennifer Friend (University of Missouri-Kansas City) is the recording secretary, and Steve Jacobson (University at

Buffalo) is the UCEA-liaison and Tricia Browne-Ferrigno (University of Kentucky) is the LTEL-SIG-liaison. We agreed to continue to meet to support current research efforts, and to use the professional association affiliation to disseminate the research findings and methodology. The Taskforce will continue to meet at UCEA and AERA for workgroup sessions on current research. UCEA has agreed to host the Taskforce's work on its website, where reports, publications and methodological resources are now available. At its upcoming convention, UCEA is sponsoring three sessions to report out the Taskforce's work and highlight methodology for replication.

In June, 2007, Terry Orr presented an integrated summary of the Taskforce's findings to the National Policy Board for Educational Administration, entitled *The Impact of Leadership Preparation: Lessons from the UCEA/TEA-SIG Taskforce and Related Research*. Finally, Taskforce members continue to seek funding to support and extend more widely its work, by submitting federal and foundation proposals this summer, and are preparing journal articles for publication to disseminate our results more widely.

LTEL-SIG members who are interested in participating in our work group sessions or replicating our current research work should contact Terry Orr (*morrr@bnkst.edu*) or Diana Pounder (*Diana.pounder@ed.utah.edu*).

From the Editors...

We are looking for ideas and suggestions for the Spring issue of the LTEL-SIG newsletter. If you have material you think would be appropriate for the SIG audience, please contact Allison Borden at **aborden@unm.edu**

Join the LTEL-SIG!

Strengthen our ability to engage in professional development, reflection and dialogue. All it takes is \$10.00. Please contact Sandra Harris at **Sandra.harris@lamar.edu**

Or visit www.aera.net and click on SIG Memberships on the **Member Welcome** page.

Visit our sponsor's web site
www.eyeducation.com

Research Highlights—Evaluating Leadership Preparation Programs

Continued from page 7

years to an initial school leadership position and 4.0 years to principalship. In Texas (as elsewhere), the advancement rate within two years to school leader ranges by institution type (44-66%).

- Graduate survey feedback shows key program influences:
 - Content, challenge, reflection, instructional practices, faculty and internship are all related to the extent of graduate learning.
 - Internship experiences are most positively related to career intentions and advancement.
- Across data sources, there are gender and racial/ethnic differences. In Texas, men are more likely than women to advance (70% vs. 55%) and become a principal (39% vs. 27%) within seven years. Nonwhites are more likely than whites to transition within seven years (64% vs. 59%), but are less likely to become principals (25% vs. 34%).
- Longitudinal statewide data analysis for all Texas schools shows that high-poverty schools were more likely than other schools to have principals who initially failed the principal certification examination.

Book Review

Continued from page 9

next chapter, Marilyn Grady and Sharon Hoffman discuss the importance of effective doctoral advising through the proposal and dissertation processes.

Section III: Lessons Learned in the Delivery of Doctoral Programs

In Chapter XI, James McNamara, Rafael Lara-Alecio, Beverly Irby, and John Hoyle provide a commentary on companion dissertations. Next, Betty Alford discusses salient program design and delivery practices in a 10-year old program. Then, Janet Tareilo, a recent doctoral graduate, reports the experiences of her cohort in successfully completing their studies. Chapter XIV by Carol Mullen describes the role of a doctoral supervisor in valuing interdependence as a mentor. Building on the theme of mentorship, Ted Creighton, David Parks, and Linda Creighton discuss the importance of mentoring doctoral students through completion of the degree. The final chapter by Phillip Young emphasizes attraction and

Sources

- Baker, B., Orr, M. T. & Young, M. D. (2007). Academic Drift, Institutional Production and Professional Distribution of Graduate Degrees in Educational Administration. *Educational Administration Quarterly*.43 (5)
- Black, W., Bathon, J., & Pointdexter, B. (2007). Looking in the Mirror to Improve Practice: A Study of Administrative Licensure and Master's Degree Programs in the State of Indiana. A report prepared under a grant from the Indiana Department of Education Center for School Improvement and Performance. Indianapolis: Indiana University.
- Friend, J., Watson, R., & Waddle, J. (2006, November). *Looking in the mirror to improve practice: Discussing statewide leadership preparation studies*. Symposium conducted at the Annual Convention of the University Council for Educational Administration, San Antonio, TX.
- Fuller, E. & Orr, M. T. (November 2006). Texas Leadership Preparation Programs and Their Graduates' Employment Transitions and Retention: A Trend Comparison of Institutional Outcomes, 1995-2005 Annual convention of the University Council for Educational Administration. San Antonio, TX.
- Orr, M. T. & Pounder, D. (2006). *UCEA/TEA-SIG Taskforce on Evaluating Leadership Preparation Programs. Report: Six Years Later*. NY: Bank Street College.
- Orr, M. T., Silverberg, R. & B. LeTendre (2006, April). Comparing leadership development From pipeline to preparation to advancement: A study of multiple institutions' leadership preparation programs. 2006 Annual Conference of the American Educational Research Association. San Francisco, California, April 10, 2006.

selection of applicants for a doctoral program in educational leadership.

Conclusion

The Handbook of Doctoral Programs in Educational Leadership: Issues and Challenges begins a much-needed conversation on the important issue of doctoral leadership programs. It reveals processes that prepare leaders for today's rapidly changing environment with discussions that include action research, collaborative research, cohort delivery models, critical inquiry skills development, and effective mentoring. Educators in new programs, as well as those in well-established programs, will find its chapters helpful.

References

- Harris, S. (Ed.). (2005). *Changing mindsets of educational leaders to improve schools: Voices of doctoral students*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.
- Mullen, C.A. (2005). *Fire and ice: Igniting and channeling passion in new qualitative researchers*. New York: Peter Lang.

2007 Outstanding Dissertation Competition

In keeping with its mission, the Learning and Teaching in Educational Leadership Special Interest Group (LTEL-SIG) invites nominees to submit dissertations for its Annual Dissertation Award. Nominations are invited for dissertations that deal with research, evaluation, and scholarship in educational leadership preparation and development, and the impact of preparation on leadership practice. We encourage theory-based research on strategies and program models for leadership preparation, as well as policy studies on state and national leadership standards assessment and credentialing.

This award is intended to recognize outstanding dissertation research appropriate to the work and purpose of the LTEL-SIG. Studies embracing both traditional and alternative conceptualizations and methodologies are welcomed. The LTEL-SIG brings together discipline specialists, educational theorists, curriculum developers, educational researchers, classroom experts, practitioners, policy makers, and others concerned with teaching in Educational Leadership and provides a forum for a managed conversation on issues related to teaching and learning in Educational Leadership, especially:

- Assessment of the relationship of teaching and learning in educational leadership to policy development at local, state, and national levels and a managed conversation on issues
- The integration of theoretical quantitative and qualitative studies of teaching and learning in educational leadership
- Discussion of investigations conducted in real educational settings, including investigations involving application of technology to learning and instruction
- Exploration of innovative methodologies; and
- Analysis of the implications of research and practice for teaching and learning in educational leadership

The Committee will consider work completed and formally accepted by the entrant's dissertation committee between January 1, 2006 and December 31, 2007.

Submission Guidelines

1. General requirements for submissions:
 - a. Nominator must be a LTEL SIG member.
 - b. Dissertations submitted for consideration must adhere to LTEL-SIG goals, mission, and purpose.
2. The nominator must send nomination letter by January 23, 2008, to Dissertation Award Chairman, Dr. Gini Doolittle (doolittle@rowan.edu). The letter must explain how the dissertation aligns with the LTEL-SIG purposes.
3. The nominee must submit an abstract (maximum of five pages) and a pdf file containing the entire dissertation no later than January 23, 2008. Because the dissertation awards committee uses a process of blind review, all personal references must be removed from these documents.
4. A dissertation awards committee, consisting of a minimum of one member of the LTEL-SIG Executive Board and other LTEL-SIG members, will review the submissions. The Committee will utilize a rubric to evaluate the abstracts based upon the evaluation criteria listed below. After reviewing and scoring the abstracts, the Committee will select no more than three finalists. The dissertations that accompany these abstracts then will be forwarded to the Committee for full review.
5. The winner will be announced at the annual meeting of the LTEL-SIG. Both the author and the nominator will be invited to attend the annual meeting.
6. The Outstanding Dissertation recipient will receive a certificate, and a cash award of \$250.

Evaluation Criteria

1. Alignment with the goals and purposes of the LTEL-SIG.
2. Significance and clarity of problem and investigation.
3. Adequacy of conceptualization and development of research questions.
4. Quality of review of relevant theoretical and research literature.
5. Appropriateness and rigor of research design and methodology.
6. Clarity of reporting findings/results.
7. Appropriateness of interpretation for theory, policy, practices, and further research.
8. Quality and clarity of writing evidenced in the abstract and in the complete dissertation (for finalists only).

New ideas...Practical approaches...

LEAD WITH ME:

A Principal's Guide to Teacher Leadership

Gayle Moller and Anita Pankake

Western Carolina Univ. and Univ. of Texas—Pan American

2006, 232 pp. paper 7025-8 \$34.95

Explains the skills needed by teacher leaders and suggests ways principals can provide opportunities for teachers to learn these skills. Demonstrates specific actions principals can take to create the conditions under which teacher leadership can thrive. Topics include—

- Ushering in a New View of Leading and Learning
- Distributing Power and Authority
- Creating a Context of Support for Teacher Leaders
- Sustaining Teacher Leading and Learning

COUNTDOWN TO THE PRINCIPALSHIP:

A Resource Guide for Beginning Principals

O'Rourke, Provenzano, Bellamy, and Ballek

2007, 248 pp. paper 7031-2 \$39.95

Displays tools and templates for planning, organizing, and monitoring a beginning principal's daily tasks. The templates can also be downloaded from Eye On Education's web site and they include—

- letter of introduction to your staff • planning calendar
- homework policy • letter to community partners • staff meeting agenda • data analysis handout • planning for student-parent orientation • and many more

SMART, FAST, EFFICIENT:

The New Principal's Guide to Success

Leanna Stohr Isaacson

Stetson University

2006, 242 pp. paper 7016-9 \$34.95

For a newly appointed principal or assistant principal, this book describes the skills and talents necessary to meet the demands on today's school leaders. It provides step-by-step details about what to do, when to do it, and how to do it.

Each chapter includes—

- Survival Tips (practical, savvy advice)
- When Do I Begin? (to help new principals plan and schedule)
- practical advice based on the realities of school leadership
- and more

THE ADMINISTRATOR'S GUIDE TO SCHOOL-COMMUNITY RELATIONS

Second Edition

George E. Pawlas

University of Central Florida

2005, 336 pp. paper 7005-3 \$39.95

Offers practical tips and illustrated examples of handy ideas for—

- preparing successful newsletters, memos and other forms of written communication
- improving relationships with faculty, staff, and students
- using the media
- enhancing parent and family involvement
- working with other members of the community and local businesses
- dealing with crisis situations

INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION:

Applying Tools and Concepts, Second Edition

Sally J. Zepeda, University of Georgia

2007, 384 pp. hardcover 7041-X \$74.95

The new edition of this successful text provides a large set of tools and strategies to help supervisors work effectively with teachers. The revisions include—

- new details on how instructional leaders implement ELCC standards
- expanded coverage of informal classroom observations with additional tools
- new material on dealing with marginal teachers and professional development

TRANSFORMING SCHOOL LEADERSHIP WITH ISLLC AND ELCC

Neil J. Shipman, J. Allen Queen & Henry A. Peel

Univ. of North Carolina, UNC Charlotte and East Carolina Univ.

2007, 208 pp. paper 7034-7 \$34.95

Authoritative and practical, this book provides knowledge and tools to help principals-in-training apply the ISLLC and ELCC standards. Each chapter contains a research-based discussion along with suggested activities, assignments and case studies.

THE INSTRUCTIONAL LEADER'S GUIDE TO INFORMAL CLASSROOM OBSERVATIONS

Sally J. Zepeda, University of Georgia

2006, 132 pp. paper 7010-X \$29.95

This short and practical book is for principals, assistant principals, department chairs, teacher leaders, and other instructional leaders. It showcases 23 school-tested tools to help leaders succeed in their classroom walk-throughs and other informal classroom observations. It also provides tools to help leaders engage teachers in discussion and reflection.

WHAT GREAT PRINCIPALS DO DIFFERENTLY:

15 Things that Matter Most

Todd Whitaker, Indiana State University

2002, 130 pp. paper 647-0 \$29.95

This best selling book blends school-centered studies with the author's experiences working with hundreds of administrators. It reveals the 15 qualities and practices of great principals which elevate them above the rest. Topics include—

- Its People, Not Programs • Standardized Testing • Base Every Decision on Your Best Teachers • Make It Cool to Care • Set Expectations at the Start of the Year

STANDARDS FOR INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION:

Enhancing Teaching and Learning

Edited by Stephen P. Gordon, Texas State University

2006, 150 pp. paper 7011-8 \$29.95

The standards in this book will enhance teaching and learning. The list of the book's contributors reads like a "Who's Who" in the field of instructional supervision. These standards are specific yet flexible, and each set includes professional development activities.

Textbooks for your courses...from Eye On Education

THE PRINCIPAL'S PURPOSE: A Practical Guide to Moral and Ethical School Leadership

Leanna Stohr Isaacson, *Stetson University*
2007, 200 pp. paper 7048-7 \$34.95

Filled with "Survival Tips" to help school leaders triumph over ethical and moral dilemmas. Each chapter is organized in a practical way—When Do I Begin? What Should I Do? How Should I Do It?

SCHOOL-COMMUNITY RELATIONS, 2nd Edition

Douglas J. Fiore, *Virginia Commonwealth University*
2006, 320 pp. hardcover 7022-3 \$74.95

This practical textbook covers school-community relations at both the district and school levels. It demonstrates how to—

- collect and analyze data on public perceptions
- prepare a school-community relations plan
- work effectively with parents and other key members of the school's "external" publics
- open up to their "internal" publics—students, teachers, clerical staff, etc.
- improve relations with the media
- plan for crisis situations

MONEY AND SCHOOLS, 3rd Edition

David C. Thompson and R. Craig Wood
Kansas State University and University of Florida
2005, 410 pp. hardcover 7003-7 \$74.95

Authors David C. Thompson and R. Craig Wood are award-winning scholars of school finance who also served as public school administrators. Their new third edition places school finance in the context of both the NCLB legislation and the ISLLC standards. Topics include—

- Schools, Values, and Money • A Policy Perspective
- Accountability and Professionalism • Basic Funding Structures
- Legal Liability • Budgeting for Personnel • Budgeting for Instruction • Budgeting for Student Activities • Budgeting for Capital Outlay, Maintenance, and Operations • Budgeting for Transportation and Food Service

HUMAN RESOURCES ADMINISTRATION: A School-Based Perspective, 3rd Edition

Richard E. Smith, *Seattle Pacific University*
2005, 375 pp. hardcover 684-5 \$74.95

This textbook provides easy-to-read lists, sample forms, and summary charts. Each chapter in the new third edition opens with the ISLLC standards covered in that chapter. Topics include—

- Strategic Human Resources Planning • Recruitment
- Selection • Orientation and Induction • Supervision and Evaluation • Assisting the Marginal Teacher • Staff Development
- Collective Bargaining • Legal Issues

SCHOOL LEADER INTERNSHIP: Developing, Monitoring, and Evaluating Your Leadership Experience Second Edition

Gary Martin, William Wright, Arnold Danzig
Richard A. Flanary and Fred Brown

Northern Arizona Univ., Ariz. State Univ., NASSP and NAESP
2005, 164 pp. paper 7009-6 \$39.95

Included in the second edition are new activities covering ISLLC, NCATE, ELCC, NAESP, NASSP, NCLB, and IDEIA standards. You and your interns select from a large list of suggested experiences and activities in such areas as—

- Staff Development
- Student Evaluation
- Parent Involvement
- Transportation
- Technology
- Finance
- Student Discipline
- and more.

Joining the author team for this edition are Richard A. Flanary, Director of NASSP's Dept. of Prof. Development Services, and Fred Brown, NAESP's Assoc. Exec. Director of Professional Services. The Foreword was written by Vincent L. Ferrandino and Gerald Tirozzi, Executive Directors of the NASSP and NAESP.

INTRODUCTION TO EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION: Standards, Theories, and Practice

Douglas J. Fiore

Virginia Commonwealth University

2004, 320 pp. hardcover 663-2 \$74.95

This comprehensive textbook presents theories and concepts in the context of the ISLLC standards. It reveals the real world of practicing school administrators. Topics include—

- Leading Others Through a Common Purpose
- Nurturing the Instructional Program
- Balancing Management and Leadership
- Making Decisions in the Education Arena
- Governance of Schools in a Legal and Political Context

Free examination copies are available. Photocopy these pages and circle the text(s) you'd like to examine:

Name _____

School _____

Address _____

City _____

State _____ Zip code _____

Phone # _____

E-mail _____

Course title and number _____

Book(s) currently used _____

Annual enrollment _____

Course title and number _____

Book(s) currently used _____

Annual enrollment _____



6 Depot Way West

Larchmont, NY, 10538

Phone: (888) 299-5350 Fax: (914) 833-0761

www.eyoneducation.com



Feature Article...

What's in a Name (Change)?

Tricia Browne Ferrigno

University of Kentucky

First Class Mail
U.S. Postage
PAID
White Plains, NY
Permit No. 5063

Teaching in Educational Administration Newsletter
c/o Eye On Education
6 Depot Way West
Larchmont, NY 10538

