Welcome to the first issue of the Leadership for School Improvement newsletter for the 2016-17 academic year!

The very first SIG newsletter was published in March 2014, and each year since we have circulated one issue in the fall, prior to the UCEA Convention, and one in the spring, prior to the AERA Annual Meeting. Our SIG would not be able to provide this service to its members without the expertise and hard work of our newsletter editor, Pamela Angelle and her two co-editors, Lee Flood and Alison Wilson. On behalf of the Executive Committee, I’d like to thank Pam, Lee, and Alison for all of their work in developing and editing this issue of the newsletter.

In this issue, you will find information about our annual business meeting, the graduate student column on work/school/life balance, a list of recent publications from members, job announcements, and calls for manuscripts. This issue also contains a tribute to the late Sam Stringfield, Professor and Educational Leadership Coordinator from the University of Cincinnati and an LSI SIG member. Sam, who passed away in August, was a preeminent scholar in the field of school effectiveness and school improvement. His contributions will continue to benefit children through the many scholars influenced by his work.

At our annual business meeting, held during the AERA Annual Meeting, the former SIG chair, Jennifer Clayton, facilitated an informative and engaging panel discussion on the intersection of legislation, policy, and school leadership practices. The panel included Amanda Beaumont, Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions; Maria Ferguson, Executive Director, Center on Education Policy at The George Washington University; and Dr. Sito Narcisse, Associate Superintendent Area 3, Prince George’s County, MD. The panelists provided a behind-the-scenes look at the negotiations involved in passing ESSA, the need for educators to be involved in developing education policy, and the ways school
leaders can leverage policies to improve learning opportunities for students. On behalf of all LSI SIG members, I would like to thank Jennifer and the panelists for providing this opportunity to discuss legislation, policy, and school leadership.

At this meeting, Elizabeth Leisy Stosich was awarded the 2015 Dissertation of the Year Award. Elizabeth’s dissertation, Learning to Teach to the Common Core State Standards: Examining the Role of Teachers’ Collaboration, Principals’ Leadership, and Professional Development, was written as three separate but related articles instead of the traditional five chapter dissertation format. The executive summary of her dissertation can be found beginning on page 3. Details about the 2016 Dissertation of the Year Award can be found on page 11.

Prior to the start of the annual meeting, Lee Flood and Alison Wilson, who serve as our graduate student representatives as well as newsletter co-editors, hosted our inaugural graduate student mixer. The mixer was held to engage more graduate students in SIG activities. If you have any ideas for engaging more graduate students and practitioners in SIG activities, please share them with any of the SIG Executive Committee members. If you would like to find out more about the SIG’s activities, please attend our business meetings at UCEA and AERA. Our next business meeting will be held during UCEA on November 19 from 7:00 am to 7:50 am at the Detroit Marriott at the Renaissance Center: Floor 5 - Nicolet A.

Last, I’d like to thank the other members of the Executive Committee for their dedication and hard work in support of the mission of our SIG. They are Jennifer Clayton (Immediate Past Chairperson), Angela Urick (Program Chairperson), Kristin Huggins (Secretary/Treasurer), and Rebecca Thessin (Dissertation Award Committee Chairperson).

Kind regards,
Hans Klar
Standards-based reforms are designed to influence the technical core of schooling—teaching and learning—by providing explicit guidance about what students should know and be able to do (Elmore, 2004; Payne, 2008). The Common Core State Standards (CCSS) raise the bar for student learning even higher than previous state standards by emphasizing more cognitively demanding expectations for K-12 students in English language arts and mathematics (Porter, McMaken, Hwant, & Yang, 2011). Moreover, newly adopted state assessments hold all students accountable for meeting these same high standards. To support students in meeting new and higher standards, teachers must interpret the implications of standards for their instructional practice and revise their practice to meet these new goals. However, teachers are likely to view standards as similar to their current practice (Cohen, 1990; Spillane, Reiser, & Gomez, 2006), respond only to aspects congruent with existing practice and beliefs (Coburn, 2001; Gallucci, 2003; Spillane, 2000), or adopt standards superficially (Coburn, 2008).

Scholars argue that previous standards failed to produce widespread improvements in teaching and learning because teachers had few opportunities to fully understand the ideas behind standards and their implications for practice (Cohen & Ball, 1999; Cohen & Hill, 2001; Spillane, 2004).

In this study, I examine teachers’ opportunities for learning about the CCSS in three high-poverty urban elementary schools: Bay, Park, and Sunnyside Elementary (pseudonyms). Specifically, I aim to understand and explain how teachers learn about the CCSS through the lens of their existing beliefs and practice, collaboration with colleagues, formal professional development experiences, and the direction of the principal. Scholars find that standards-based accountability policies typically lead to limited changes in teachers’ practice and beliefs (Coburn, 2001, 2008; Cohen, 1990; Spillane, 2004) and that this problem is particularly pronounced in urban schools (Payne, 2008). My findings, however, suggest that inquiry-oriented collaborative practices can support teachers in changing their beliefs about students, including deficit views of low-performing and low income students, and experimenting with instructional practices that more closely align with standards. Furthermore, I find that principals can play an essential role in framing the challenge presented by standards in ways that encourage the intensive and collaborative learning necessary for teachers to align their practice with new and higher standards. Given the essential role of principals in organizing a collective response to standards, I argue that professional development may be more likely to lead to widespread changes in teachers’ practice in high-poverty schools when it
includes both job-embedded opportunities for learning about standards and direct support for principals to leverage professional development opportunities as part of a school-wide improvement strategy.

**Research Design**

I conducted a comparative case study of educators in three high-poverty schools in a large urban district in the Northeastern United States over the course of one year (January-December 2013). I take a social learning perspective, assuming that teachers actively make sense of messages about the CCSS in the context of their school environment and in collaboration with colleagues (Little, 2012). Although their experiences are not generalizable, close examination of teachers’ experiences has the potential to contribute to theory about how teachers learn about standards (Yin, 2009).

I purposefully selected (Seidman, 2006) high-poverty schools (≥75% low income) (Aud et al., 2010) that served similar student populations, had demonstrated success in supporting student learning, and were in their third year of participating in Common Core Innovation Network (CCIN) professional development (PD). More than 95% of students at each school were Black or Latino and more than 80% of students received free or reduced-priced lunch. All three schools had demonstrated average or above average student performance on previous state standards in comparison with schools serving similar student populations; the past performance of these schools suggested that they had the potential to productively respond to new and more ambitious standards. In addition, educators in these three schools volunteered to be early adopters of the CCSS and participate in the CCIN, a district-initiated network designed to assist their efforts to teach to the new standards.

Data collection focused on in-depth interviews with 3 principals, 26 teachers, and 6 CCIN leaders and observations of faculty and teacher team meetings, PD sessions, and classroom practice. In total, I conducted 54 interviews and observed approximately 10 hours of meetings, 27 hours of PD, and 15 hours of classroom practice. In addition, I analyzed documents related to school goals, PD, teachers’ instructional planning, and student work. I engaged in the analytic techniques of coding, creating matrices, and writing memos. I began by using Dedoose qualitative software to code interview and observation data for teachers’ opportunities to learn about standards, teachers’ enactment of standards-aligned practices, and principals’ leadership practices. In the next stage of analysis, I used matrices to examine cross-case patterns (Miles & Huberman, 1994). To support the construct validity of my findings, I used multiple data collection methods (interviews, observations, and document analysis) and sources (principals, assistant principal, and teachers) and triangulated patterns across these sources (Maxwell, 2012).

**Findings and Discussion**

In the following sections I present the findings from the three chapters of my dissertation. Each chapter explores a distinct dimension of teachers’ opportunities to learn about the CCSS and
their implications for practice, including inquiry-oriented collaboration with colleagues, principals’ leadership, and professional development designed to enhance school capacity for teaching to the CCSS.

**From Sharing to Joint Inquiry: Teachers’ Collective Learning about the CCSS**

I use a cognitive framework to understand how teachers engage in “learning,” “interpretation,” or “sensemaking” about policy (Coburn, 2005; Spillane, Reiser, & Reimer, 2002) and how teachers' understanding of and actions related to standards are influenced by their prior knowledge, beliefs, and the social context within which they work (Coburn, 2004, 2005; Cohen & Ball, 1999; Spillane et al., 2006; Weick, 1995). Recent research suggests that teachers are unlikely to make changes to practice without extensive opportunities for learning about standards with colleagues (Coburn, 2008; Spillane, 2004). What remain unknown are the collaborative practices that support teachers in learning to teach to new standards. I argue that collaborative practices that encourage joint examination of instruction and student learning against standards support teachers in noticing and attending to differences between their current practice and standards.

I found that most teachers shared instructional ideas and resources with colleagues in ways that made their practice public. Yet they still protected their individual autonomy over instruction and limited the influence of their colleagues. Teachers who engaged in more superficial collaboration with colleagues adopted new practices and resources in ways that reinforced rather than challenged their existing beliefs about what was appropriate for their low-income students. They were observed and described simplifying complex problems, assigning tasks that required merely recall of information, and matching low-level questions and texts to lower performing students.

In contrast, all teachers at Bay Elementary and a small group of teachers at Park Elementary engaged in what I call *joint inquiry*, working with colleagues to investigate their instruction and students’ work and determine the changes they would need to make to support students in meeting standards. These collegial interactions combined the collective action described by Little (1990) as “joint work” with an orientation towards improving instructional practice. Specifically, these teachers analyzed standards-based curricular materials, developed curricular units, engaged in inquiry team protocols, conducted ongoing revisions of curricular plans, and observed and critiqued each other’s practice.

Teachers who engaged in joint inquiry described viewing the new standards as similar to their current practice initially; however, they reported that engaging with colleagues in close analysis of curriculum, instruction, and student work led them to view the new standards as requiring, as one said, “a really different way of teaching.” Recognizing this, in turn, seemed to encourage teachers to experiment with new standards-based curricular resources and approaches. During classroom observations, these teachers carried out instruction aligned with the goals of the CCSS; they asked questions and assigned tasks that required students to use
evidence from text to support their ideas, build procedural fluency in mathematics, and justify their mathematical reasoning. Collegial relationships among teachers, the use of protocols to structure collaboration, and strong principal leadership were essential to a school environment that encouraged teachers to engage in joint inquiry.

**Principals Frame the Challenge of the CCSS**

I bring together research on principals’ leadership practice (e.g., Louis, Leithwood, Wahlstrom, & Anderson, 2010; Robinson, Lloyd, & Rowe, 2008) and frame analysis (Goffman, 1974) to examine how principals define or frame the challenge presented by the CCSS as they exercise leadership and how the frames they invoke support or constrain teachers’ learning and action in response to new standards. As principals interpret the problem posed by new standards for their work and the work of teachers and students in their schools, they locate responsibility for this problem and authorize particular responses to the problem as part of the framing process (Benford & Snow, 2000). Although the framing process often happens unconsciously (Anagnostopoulos & Rutledge, 2007; Coburn, 2006), leaders can deliberately use framing to set the direction of the work of their organization (Edmondson, 2003) in ways that support continuous improvement in instruction and student learning.

Similar to prior research in the fields of education and management, I find that the principals’ framing differed in the degree to which they interpreted the CCSS as representing a learning challenge that required teachers to rethink and revise their instructional practice or an execution challenge that required them to carry out principals’ directives (Coburn, 2005; Edmondson, 2003; Goldsworthy, Supovitz, & Riggan, 2013). Additionally, I find that principals differed in the extent to which they characterized the challenge of the CCSS as one that was grounded in particular pedagogical approaches or in teaching and learning more comprehensively. In my analysis, I illustrate the connections between principals’ framing and teachers’ instruction using Cohen and Ball’s (1999) framework for understanding instruction as a function of the interactions among teachers’ pedagogical and content knowledge, the use of educational materials, and students’ understanding, experiences, and engagement in the learning process.

My findings suggest that an execution frame may be appropriate for bringing about isolated changes to educational materials or instructional time, whereas a learning frame is more appropriate when encouraging significant changes in the ways that teachers and students engage with educational content. The principal at Sunnyside sought to minimize uncertainty by setting clear expectations for the pedagogical approaches she expected all teachers to execute. The principal at Park expected all teachers to execute particular pedagogical approaches but also encouraged teachers to engage in collaborative planning and inquiry to support them in learning to teach to standards. The principal at Bay focused primarily on creating opportunities for collaborative learning about standards, including opportunities for execution-as-learning or learning that was embedded in teachers’ core work of instructional planning. I argue that teachers may be more likely to revise their practice to align with the goals of standards when
principals characterize the challenge presented by new standards as one that requires new learning about instruction and then provide substantial support for this learning, rather than focusing exclusively on teachers’ use of specific pedagogical practices or curricular resources.

**Professional Development that Builds Capacity for Meeting Ambitious Standards**

I extend research on how schools can use professional development to enhance teacher and school capacity (e.g., Borko, Elliott, & Uchiyama, 2002; Newmann, King, & Youngs, 2000) by analyzing the CCIN, a professional development initiative that was expressly designed to build schoolwide capacity for teaching to the CCSS, and the experiences of educators who participated in the network. There is a rich literature on the features of effective PD (e.g., Borko, 2004; Darling-Hammond et al., 2009) and the essential elements of school capacity for improving teaching and learning (e.g., Bryk, Sebring, Allensworth, Easton, & Luppescu, 2010). By contrast, there is limited research on how to build school capacity (see King & Bouchard, 2011 as an exception), including how to design professional development that enhances both the capacity of teachers and their schools for meeting the expectations of new and higher standards.

A close analysis of the theory behind the CCIN’s approach can help to identify whether and how this approach works and how it can be revised to better meet the challenge of promoting widespread improvement in high-poverty schools (Weiss, 1995). According to the CCIN’s theory of change, if a small group of teachers from each school 1) learns how to design curricular units aligned with the CCSS, 2) engages in collaborative inquiry practices for analyzing and improving these units and the work of their students that results, and 3) develops leadership skills for facilitating this collaborative work, they will develop a deep understanding of how to teach to new standards and engage in the collaborative practices that will support ongoing learning about standards. These teachers, in turn, would be expected to act as leaders back at their school by sharing their expertise about curricular planning, instructional approaches, and collaborative inquiry practices. In this way, the CCIN was designed to improve the capacity of participating schools to meet the CCSS by enhancing teachers’ knowledge and skills in teaching to the CCSS, the collaborative practices of teachers’ professional community, and teacher leadership.

My findings suggest that the CCIN leaders overestimated the power of collaborative inquiry for supporting teachers in learning to meet the new standards and underestimated the challenge of developing deep instructional expertise and strong professional community in schools with limited initial capacity. Educators relied primarily on school-based support from CCIN leaders, rather than teacher leaders, to learn new approaches for teaching and collaboration. Teachers described school-based support from network leaders as the most beneficial for learning how to teach to the new standards, including learning how to plan instruction aligned with the new standards and to engage in collaborative inquiry about standards. In contrast, teachers who participated in network PD were not viewed as “leaders” or as particularly knowledgeable about teaching to the CCSS by colleagues. These teachers shared information and resources
with colleagues. However, the limited understanding of how to meet the new standards among teachers who participated in network PD constrained their ability to support their colleagues. Instead, job-embedded professional development from CCIN enhanced teacher capacity and professional community at the Park and Bay Elementary, but the benefits of this support were limited to the teachers in a team and the faculty with a principal who requested it. When PD providers respond to requests for intervention rather than initiating support, they may miss opportunities for building capacity in those schools that need this support the most. I argue that PD that is designed to build capacity in high-poverty schools must address deeply rooted challenges posed by weak instructional knowledge among teachers, strongly held norms of autonomy and egalitarianism that cause some teachers to repel efforts to build professional community, and ineffective instructional leadership from principals. This represents an immense task for any PD intervention. However, comprehensive, school-based intervention is necessary for teachers and leaders in high-poverty schools to increase their capacity to respond effectively to new and higher standards (Elmore, 2004; Johnson, 2009).

**Implications**
The major shift in expectations for student learning outlined in the CCSS demands a comparable shift in teachers’ instruction. However, two decades of research on standards reform have taught us that teachers are likely to view standards as similar to their current practice (Cohen, 1990; Spillane et al., 2006) or adopt those aspects of standards that conform to existing practice and beliefs (Coburn, 2001; Spillane, 2004), leading to minimal changes in instruction and, ultimately, student learning. My findings suggest that comprehensive and job embedded support for teachers’ learning about standards and their implications for practice can assist teachers in high-poverty schools in adopting practices that more closely align with the goals of new and higher standards. Schools and districts can foster meaningful learning about standards among teachers by making substantial investments in teachers’ collaborative practices, instructional capacity, and the ability of principals to lead collective learning.
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The Leadership for School Improvement (LSI) SIG invites submissions of Ph.D. and Ed.D. dissertations successfully completed between December 1, 2015 and November 30, 2016 for the 2016 Dissertation of the Year Award. The award winner will be presented with a check for $500 at the LSI SIG business meeting at the 2017 AERA Annual Meeting in San Antonio, Texas.

**Submission Procedures:**

**Step 1:** An executive summary of the dissertation should be submitted in electronic form to the Dissertation of the Year Award Chairperson, Dr. Rebecca Thessin, at rthessin@gwu.edu by December 15, 2016.

The executive summary should succinctly address the study’s purpose, research methods, findings, and implications for research and practice.

The executive summary should be a maximum of 10 double-spaced pages, excluding references, and adhere to APA 6th edition formatting.

The executive summary should not identify the author or the institution where the dissertation was completed.

**Step 2:** An email verifying successful completion of the dissertation should be sent by the dissertation chair to the Dissertation of the Year Award Chairperson, Dr. Rebecca Thessin, at rthessin@gwu.edu.

**Step 3:** Finalists will be invited to submit their complete dissertations in electronic form to the chairperson of the Awards Committee for final review.

**Step 4:** Finalists will receive notification of the results by February 15, 2017. The Committee reserves the right to forego selection of a recipient if no entries are deemed suitable for the award.

**Step 5:** The award recipient is invited to attend the 2017 Business Meeting of the Leadership for School Improvement SIG, where the award will be formally presented.

**Evaluation Criteria:**

To be considered for the LSI SIG Dissertation of the Year Award, dissertations must:

- Be submitted by a LSI SIG member or a student of a LSI SIG member
- Align with the LSI SIG mission *(see below)*
- Seek to address significant research question(s) situated within the context of school leadership and school improvement
- Have a clearly articulated and appropriate conceptual framework
- Use rigorous and appropriate research methods
- Relate significant findings
- Discuss the contribution of the findings to research and practice
- Be well-written
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I am probably the least qualified person to offer any advice on work/school/life balance, as I have certainly not mastered such a thing. This is precisely why I embraced the challenge of addressing the topic in such a public way, in addition to the fact that it is very timely for me personally. I am expecting my first child in a matter of weeks, so the idea of achieving a sense of balance has weighed heavily on me over the past several months. Although I realize that not everybody is in this particular situation, we all have our own version of “life stuff” that competes with (and is sometimes or often consumed by) work and school stuff, particularly in graduate school. I don’t pretend to be an expert on work/school/life balance, but taking the opportunity to reflect on it seems like a worthwhile step in my quest for self-improvement. I should probably note that my tendency is let the work and school stuff take over, so that I’m scrambling to find the time and energy for life stuff, so this is the perspective that I’m coming from. I know that everybody has their different variation on this, so even if you don’t find my musings particularly helpful, hopefully you will at the very least find yourself reflecting on your own journey and thinking about how you might realize some of your goals in this area.

When I started thinking about how to approach the topic of work/school/life balance, I immediately thought about all of my shortcomings in this area. I then concluded that not only was this counterproductive, but I was not giving myself enough credit for the real efforts that I have made to achieve a better sense of balance. I identified three things that I have found beneficial in making the most of my time and improving the quality of my work/school/life activities:

1. Protect Your Time

I admit that I stole this one from someone I admire. This probably sounds obvious, but when you’re at work, it’s really easy to get distracted by work! For example, I have found that when I am working on a manuscript, it can be tempting to glance over at my inbox every time my computer makes the “you’ve got mail” sound. And of course I need to immediately respond to half of those emails and delete the ones that aren’t relevant so that things don’t get too cluttered, right? My point is that one small aspect of school or work can really derail my concentration on important projects if I let it. Not only does the quality of my work suffer, but I am less efficient with the time I have dedicated to school or work and then feel the need to give up my personal time to do more work! Consequently, one of my goals is to be more protective of my time and learn to disconnect for a bit. This involves setting aside meaningful time to accomplish the projects that are most important to me instead of letting smaller tasks constantly disrupt my time and concentration.

Protecting my personal time is also a priority. I have started leaving my phone in another room – or leaving it behind completely – so that I am fully engaged in what I’m doing, whether it’s dinner, a movie, or a good conversation. Setting this boundary has made the life stuff more enjoyable for me because I’m more present in the moment and not distracted by a mile-long to-do list.
2. Figure Out “Your System”

It took me years to figure out that despite the convenience of technology, my Outlook email calendar just wasn’t working for me. I never developed a good system for entering all of my deadlines, creating reminders, and just generally tracking my activity each week. I actually discovered “my system” unintentionally. Last Christmas, I was given a traditional planner. You know, the paper/pencil kind with a monthly and weekly view. I carry this thing everywhere, and I am a much better person for it. It makes me feel more organized, and I actually am more organized…prior commitments don’t sneak up on me and I find myself feeling much more prepared for the week as I look at my handwritten reminders. I also find myself scheduling personal time, which might seem sad, but it has helped me be more intentional about carving out space for myself, and for spending time with family and friends. This is not an advertisement for traditional planners. My point is that for whatever reason, it works for me even though it might seem cumbersome or inconvenient to others. It’s worth figuring out what works for you, and that might mean trying a few different ways of getting organized before you (perhaps accidentally) find the right one.

I frequently have to remind myself that school/work stuff shouldn’t be the only thing driving my time and mental energy. It’s okay to take a break sometimes…it tends to make everything more enjoyable.

I do not mean to suggest that I have mastered any of these concepts, but I am making an effort to be more aware and intentional in these areas. I think that’s an important first step in achieving a better work/school/life balance. It helps to acknowledge the things that are getting in the way but also to celebrate those things that seem to be working. As graduate students, it’s also important for us to support and learn from one another because we share a lot of the same challenges and pressures. I would love to get your feedback on how we might accomplish this as a SIG!

3. Don’t Feel Bad

Finally – and this is the one I’m really working on lately – don’t feel bad for having a life. Allow yourself to enjoy your personal time. I have found that constantly focusing on a to-do list just interferes with the quality of my life stuff and doesn’t make me any more productive.
The Leadership for School Improvement SIG Business Meeting at AERA this past April allowed for a convening highlighting our business items and a panel to discuss the impact of the ESSA Legislation on school improvement. Our panelists included Maria Ferguson, Executive Director of the Center on Education Policy at The George Washington University, Dr. Sito Narcisse, Associate Superintendent Area 3 Prince George’s County, Maryland, and Amanda Beaumont, Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

The discussion allowed for an exploration of the intersection of policy, legislation, and practice and how these entities impact one another. Ms. Beaumont provided extensive background on the negotiations and passing of the ESSA legislation package, including the hopes of those crafting the legislation about the flexibility it will provide states and school systems. Ms. Ferguson discussed the impact of ESSA and other policies and the need for educators to be part of the policy development and evaluation discussion. Finally, Dr. Narcisse provided the perspective of school district leaders who are charged with implementing policy and how they leverage policies to improve learning for all children. The panel was well-received by LSI members and the panelists reported enjoying the conversations and seeking more opportunities to engage across legislation, policy, and practice.

Follow us on Twitter

The Leadership for School Improvement SIG is now on Twitter.

Follow @LSI_AERA_SIG
AERA 2016 Business Meeting Minutes

Board Members Present: Kristina Hesbol (past chair), Jennifer Clayton (chair), Hans Klar (program chair), Angela Urick (secretary/treasurer), Kristen Huggins (dissertation award chair), Lee Flood (newsletter/graduate student representative), Alison Wilson (newsletter/graduate student representative)

Attendance: 30 Members

6:20: Welcome (Jennifer Clayton)
Jennifer called the meeting to order at 6:20 and thanked everyone for coming.

6:25: Panel Discussion (Jennifer Clayton)
Jennifer Clayton organized and facilitated a panel on policies related to leadership for school improvement. See end of minutes for flyer.

Panelists included Dr. Sito Narcisse, Associate Superintendent of Prince Georges County Public Schools, Maria Voles Ferguson, Executive Director of Center on Education Policy, and Amanda Beaumont, Senior Education Counsel for Ranking Member. Panelists provided insight into current challenges and successes of school improvement as well as information surrounding the newly enacted Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

7:05: Reports and Announcements

AERA Program Report (Hans Klar)

Hans reported that we received 25 submissions and hosted one symposium, two paper sessions and one roundtable. Hans thanked the reviewers, chairs and discussants. See end of minutes for full program report.

Membership and Financial Reports (Angela Urick)

Angela reported that we have a current balance of $4,477.68 and 210 members. See end of minutes for full financial and membership report.

Newsletter Report (Lee Flood)

Lee reported that an issue of the newsletter was distributed before the AERA meeting. It included an interview with Linda Lambert, information about the dissertation of the year award and more. In graduate student representative news, Lee announced that Alison Wilson organized the first annual graduate student mixer before the business meeting. Lee and Alison will continue to discuss ideas for increased graduate student participation.

Other Announcements (Jennifer Clayton)
Jennifer thanked Pam Angelle for her continued work as newsletter editor and coordination of graduate students, Lee and Alison.

Jennifer asked members to please sign up to review for the 2017 annual meeting.

**7:10: Dissertation of the Year Award Finalists** (Kristin Huggins)
Erin Anderson, University of Virginia (Advisor: Pam Tucker)
John Fillippi, University of Illinois (Advisor: Don Hackmann)
Elizabeth Leisy Stosich, Harvard University (Advisor: Susan Moore Johnson)

Kristin Huggins announced Dr. Stosich as the winner of the dissertation of the year award. Dr. Stosich discussed her dissertation research.

**7:25: Transition to new LSI SIG Executive Committee Officers** (Jennifer Clayton)

Jennifer expressed her appreciation for the executive committee and announced the new roles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2015-16 LSI SIG Executive Committee</th>
<th>2016-17 LSI SIG Executive Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chairperson:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Chairperson:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Clayton, The George</td>
<td>Hans Klar, Clemson University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Immediate Past Chairperson:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Immediate Past Chairperson:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristina Hesbol, University of</td>
<td>Jennifer Clayton, The George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver</td>
<td>Washington University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Chairperson:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Program Chairperson:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hans Klar, Clemson University</td>
<td>Angela Urick, University of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secretary/Treasurer:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Secretary/Treasurer:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Urick, University of</td>
<td>Kristin Huggins, University of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Washington, Vancouver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Dissertation Award Committee</td>
<td>**Dissertation Award Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairperson:**</td>
<td>Chairperson:**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristin Huggins, University of</td>
<td>Rebecca Thessin, The George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, Vancouver</td>
<td>Washington University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Business meeting ended at 7:30.
In August of this year, Professor Sam Stringfield passed away. Sam was a world renowned scholar whose work on educational strategies for at-risk children had a significant impact on the field. Sam was the author of over 170 articles, books, and book chapters. In addition to his scholarly output, Sam served on the New Board of School Commissioners of the Baltimore City Public Schools, was the founding editor of the Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk (JESPAR), held a number of positions in the American Educational Research Association (AERA), and served on the board for a number of highly-regarded journals. Rather than trying to concisely sum up the life of such an influential and well-respected scholar and colleague, we have invited some of those that knew Sam best to offer their thoughts and memories on him.

**Bert Creemers, Professor Emeritus and Honorary Professor, University of Gronigen**

The educational effectiveness and school improvement community is shocked by the unexpected and sudden passing away of Sam Stringfield. Sam has played an important role in the development and organization of the field and he was one the leading figures. I have known him for more than 30 years. We met each other in the Invisible College, an informal group of researchers in the field of teaching and teacher quality organized by Jerry Brophy before the annual meetings of the AERA. We found out that he had similar interests in research in teaching and how to improve its quality and which topics should be addressed. Sam expressed his view on the research on the quality of teaching and teacher improvement at several occasions and stressed the importance of the contribution of teaching on students learning and outcomes.

When the the International Congress for School Effectiveness and Improvement (ICSEI) was established he was involved in the further development and took the initiative for the international annual meetings in the United States which were very successful and helped to promote the ICSEI internationally. He was a very active member of the editorial board of the journal School Effectiveness and School Improvement and promoted the relation between the journal and the ICSEI organization.

The Louisiana School Effectiveness Study (with Charles Teddlie) was a good example of a combination of quantitative and qualitative research in effectiveness and pointed at the important issues in effectiveness and improvement which are guiding theory and practice like the stability and change in school effects, the conditions at different levels of the educational system, the processes and especially the outcomes for different groups of students. Sam was interested in finding out the differences in educational systems in establishing effective outcomes and, together with Charles Teddlie, he was involved in the first
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international comparative study in effectiveness which resulted in a large agenda for future research. Sam was not restricted to research only but was convinced that education and definitely educational effectiveness could and should improve but liked to prove this in a project in Wales where the ideas about schools as "high reliability organizations" were introduced successfully.

In my view Sam’s work shows that there are many changes in the research agenda for educational effectiveness but the focus is always the quality of the learning processes and the way that is carried out by teachers as we agreed in the Invisible College.

We will miss Sam deeply not only as an excellent academic and researcher but also as a good colleague and friend but his work will continued by those who are inspired by the ideas.

Karen Seashore (Louis), Regents Professor; Robert Holmes Beck Chair of Ideas in Education, University of Minnesota

I met Sam when we were both young scholars who were less concerned with tenure and publications and more with how to use research to have an impact on schools, teachers, and kids. We both modified our positions and moved into more traditional faculty roles in early mid-career. I felt a lot of kinship with him on this route because we believed that applied research, done in new ways, could make a difference. On our own paths, both of us achieved something along those lines that we can be proud of — but Sam was the institution builder. His dedication to the International Congress for School Effectiveness and School Improvement (which he drew me into at some point in the distant past) and later with his hopes that he could, as an administrator in higher education, make changes in preparation that would increase equitable outcomes are clear examples in which he put his energy where he thought he could create something permanent. And, of course, how can we forget JESPAR, a legacy that lives on and that is testimony to his dogged commitment to building things that he thought were important. By the way, I think that I told him early on that the journal had almost no chance of success... (wrong!). And I knew him well as a feisty friend and engaged scholar. He actually read my dissertation this year (I had to provide him with a copy of the book because it has been out of print for over 30 years) and he said he loved it! We often disagreed, and never had any difficulty in any of the conversations that ensued as a consequence. I learned so much from him.... What a guy. Curious and caring and loyal. It is a terrible loss.

Bob Wimpelberg, Professor, University of Houston

We were fortunate to hire Sam as a junior faculty colleague at Tulane University in the early 1980s. Together with his Carolina buddy, Charles Teddlie (on faculty at the University of New Orleans at the time), Sam proceeded to invent the ambitious Louisiana School Effectiveness Study (LSES). It was about as complex a research undertaking as one could find in those days:
multi-year, multi-phase, multi-level (student, teacher, school), with mixed-methods analysis.

That said, it’s not Sam Stringfield the research designer who comes to mind today.

One afternoon, we were conducting an LSES debriefing at a New Orleans elementary school. Sam stood up to report on a teacher interview. He started to walk through the categories of analysis in our interview protocol when he stopped abruptly. “Gang, before I do the data parsing, I have to tell you what Ms. Brooks said at the end of our conversation. She took me by the arm and pleaded, ‘Doctor, whatever you do with this research, don’t make our babies look dumb.’”

In the multivariate research world of “school effects” – as in just about everything Sam touched – he managed to humanize what we were doing.

Louise Stoll, Professor of Professional Learning, University College London
The field of school effectiveness and school improvement is much the poorer for the loss of Sam Springfield. His contribution was enormous and profound, and his deep passion for making a difference to children at risk through improving schools and school systems shone brightly. He will be sorely missed by his many friends and colleagues in the international community.

Amanda Datnow, Professor and Associate Dean, University of California - San Diego
The field of school improvement experienced a major loss with the passing of Sam Stringfield. Sam’s intellectual curiosity and commitment to improving education for underserved students led him to assume a variety of roles of the course of his career, including teacher, researcher, school board member, editor, and leader. The wealth of knowledge he gained through these experiences and his visits to schools across the globe is readily evident in his insightful writing about the possibilities and challenges of school improvement. Sam thoroughly enjoyed mentoring junior scholars. I was fortunate to be one of those individuals. Sam prided himself in creating opportunities for his mentees and, as he said, “stepping out of the way” so that we could chart our own paths. He delighted in his mentees’ successes and is well known for his generosity of spirit. He was a true gentleman, scholar, and friend, and he will be sorely missed.
Send In Your News!

Please send Emerging Scholars abstracts, call for manuscripts, conference announcements, reading lists, or publications you would like to have considered for publication in LSI Newsletter to:

Lee D. Flood, Co-Editor LSI Newsletter
lflood@vols.utk.edu

Alison Wilson, Co-Editor LSI Newsletter
alisonwilson@ou.edu

*Please be sure to make any submissions in Microsoft Word format ONLY.

Recent Publications from Members


Journal of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies (JELPS) ISSN#: 2473-2826

Call for Articles

Journal of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies (JELPS) ISSN#: 2473-2826 is currently accepting manuscripts.

Journal of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies (JELPS) ISSN#: 2473-2826 is an open access online peer review electronic journal dedicated to establish a global network and platform among researchers, policymakers, educators and school leaders to provide readers with an enhanced awareness of strategies and policies for improving school success and student achievement through effective leadership.

JELPS seeks manuscripts to help share best practices and policies in four leadership domains: Instructional Leadership, Talent Management, Organizational Systems, Culture and Climate. JELPS welcomes articles based on practice and research with an explicit educational leadership or component that examines the function of school leaders from a variety of perspectives including but not limited to, those based on quantitative, qualitative, mixed method empirical analyses, action research, and ethnographic perspectives as well as those that view educational leadership from philosophical, historical, policy, and/ or legal points of view.

Manuscripts should be sent to Dr. Yavuz, Editor, Journal of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies for initial review at yavuzo1@southernct.edu.
For the details for call for articles, please visit https://go.southernct.edu/jelps/index.php
The *NCMLE Journal* is a blind, peer reviewed journal which focuses on many different areas. A publication that is shared nationwide, the *NCMLE Journal* provides a proactive forum for information and debate within the fields of education and school transformation. Inviting a critical perspective, the *NCMLE Journal* is a multi-media venue for scholars and practitioners who wish to broaden the discourse of middle grades education by challenging conventional wisdom. The *NCMLE Journal* seeks pieces/submissions that explore themes of education, innovation, social justice, student achievement, and school strengthening/transformation.

The *NCMLE Journal* provides a forum for debate within the field of middle grades education. Inviting a critical perspective, the *NCMLE Journal* is a peer-reviewed, multi-media venue for scholars and practitioners who wish to broaden the discourse of middle grades education by challenging conventional wisdom. The *NCMLE Journal* seeks submissions that explore the following themes: Democratic Education, Innovation, Social Justice, School Transformation, and Best Practices/Positively Impacting Student Achievement.

Types of Submission:

1. **Essays** pose opinion, positing or discussing theory, and/or offering critique (under 3000 words, excluding references).

2. **Research and Inquiry** are reports of original research that represent any paradigm or methodology. The *NCMLE Journal* prioritizes inquiry that involves middle grades students in at least one of the following ways: as participants, consultants or co-researchers (under 7500 words, excluding references).

3. **Practitioner Perspectives** are accounts of teacher and/or student practice (under 3000 words, excluding references).

The *NCMLE Journal* is published each year in January and July! Make plans to submit today!
Open Positions

University of Tennessee, Knoxville
College of Education, Health and Human Sciences
Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies

The College of Education, Health, and Human Sciences at The University of Tennessee is seeking applicants for an Assistant Professor to join the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies in August 2017. We are looking for energetic, promising scholars with the training and expertise to contribute to leadership preparation programs. The Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies offers graduate programs at the master’s, education specialist, and doctoral levels. The Department is an active member of the University Council for Educational Administration, and its licensure programs are NCATE approved. To guide prospective candidates, and our consideration of applicants, the faculty has identified required qualifications for the position and desired qualifications, both of which are listed below. We expect applicants to speak to these in their cover letter. In addition, the application materials should include a current curriculum vitae and the names and contact information for three (3) references who are able to speak specifically to your qualifications for the position.

Required qualifications include:
- A doctorate in Educational Administration, Educational Leadership, or a related field with a strong content background in educational administration. Candidate must possess the doctoral degree by June 2017
- Evidence of a strong potential for scholarly productivity and publication in the field of educational administration
- Evidence of K-12 leadership experience
- Evidence of a strong potential for teaching excellence in graduate level leadership preparation programs
- Demonstrated ability to interact with diverse audiences
- A willingness to plan and deliver instruction both in face-to-face classroom formats and via technology and the internet

Preferred qualifications include:
- Experience teaching graduate level courses
- Experience as a principal
- Potential to secure external funding through grants
- Experience with distance learning methodologies
- Strong commitment to the mission of the university and the department.

Duties and responsibilities include:
- Maintaining a scholarly research agenda
- Supporting the graduate programs in Educational Leadership and Policy Studies through teaching and advising
- Participating in professional associations at the local, state, regional, and national/international levels
- Service to the department, college, university, and other educational organizations
- Collaborating with college and department faculty and staff and with school districts and school administrators.

Application Process: Applications and inquiries should be directed to: Dr. Mary Lynne Derrington Chair, Search Committee 318 Bailey Education Complex The University of Tennessee Knoxville, TN 37966-3430 (865) 974-4041 Review of applications will begin January 11, 2017, and continue until the position is filled.
Assistant/Associate Professor
Educational Leadership

**Deadline:** November 01, 2016

**Anticipated Start Date:** August 2017 (Fall 2017 Semester)

**Type:** Assistant Professor, tenure track

**Salary:** Commensurate to education and experience

**Employment Type:** Full-time

**Description:** The successful candidate will join a graduate program in educational leadership with innovative degree and licensure programs at the Masters, Specialist, and Doctorate degree levels. The successful candidate will have the opportunity to collaborate on the future direction of these exciting initiatives. Major responsibilities include: (1) scholarly productivity and publication through top tier peer reviewed journals; (2) development and delivery of online courses; (3) cultivating external funding to support research and innovative programming; (4) representing the University of Arkansas and presenting scholarly work at national conferences; (5) building and maintaining strong relationships with our K-12 and higher education partners; (6) mentoring doctoral students; and (7) providing service to the university, college, department, and the PK-12 community.

**Required Qualifications:**
- Earned doctorate from an accredited major university in a field related to Educational Leadership
- Experience working directly with K-12 schools
- Scholarly accomplishment or potential consistent with appointment as an assistant or associate professor at a research university
- Record of successful teaching at the graduate level

**Desired Qualifications:**
- Experience with program and course development
- Successful student mentoring at all levels, and specifically as a dissertation advisor
- Ability to supervise students during internship experiences
- Experience working directly with K-12 schools
- Prior experience as a public school administrator
- Demonstrated promise in obtaining external funding
- Experience teaching online
- Commitment to collaboration and working with a team that shares ideas, plans together, and strives to regularly assess and use what we learn to improve how we serve our stakeholders through our research, teaching and service.

The University of Arkansas is located in Fayetteville (heart of the Ozark Mountains), part of the Northwest Arkansas metropolitan area. Northwest Arkansas ([https://youtu.be/j9ihImu88OQ](https://youtu.be/j9ihImu88OQ)) is one of the fastest-growing areas in the nation and has a population of over 500,000. Northwest Arkansas features a strong local economy, good highway and commercial air access, award-winning PK-12 schools, comprehensive healthcare, extensive cultural programs, and outstanding outdoor recreation opportunities. Fayetteville, AR is consistently recognized by multiple rankings as one of the best places to live in the country.

**Special Instructions:** For a complete position announcement and information regarding how to apply, visit [http://jobs.uark.edu/postings/16067](http://jobs.uark.edu/postings/16067). Review of applications will begin immediately. To be considered for the position, applicants should submit an application online at the link above. Completed applications received by November 1, 2016 will be assured full consideration. Late applications will be reviewed as necessary to fill the position.

For more information please contact:

Ms. Laurie Brigham
Curriculum and Instruction Department
The College of Education and Human Sciences is seeking a dynamic leader for the department of Educational Administration. This is a strong department with robust enrollments in the graduate programs, and faculty members who are committed to excellence in teaching, doctoral advising, scholarship and research. We are looking for someone who will sustain a positive and productive work environment and who will work with department personnel in pursuit of a shared vision for the future of the department. It is essential that the incumbent have skills in promoting positive and collaborative interactions both within and outside of the department, and for building relationships with faculty, other department chairs, and stake holders. The successful candidate must have excellent verbal and written communication skills, and skills in managing the departmental budget and other resources, advocating for departmental interests, and supervising faculty and staff. Excellence in teaching and doctoral advising, and a record of research and scholarship in P-12 School Leadership is required. For more information about the department, please see http://cehs.unl.edu/edad.

Review of applicants will begin October 21, 2016 and continue until the position is filled.

**How to Apply:** To view details of the position and make application, go to http://employment.unl.edu. Search for requisition number F_160210. Click on “Apply to this job”. Complete the application and attach the following documents; 1) letter of application that includes a description of qualifications and fit with the position; 2) curriculum vitae; 3) a statement of leadership philosophy (attach using the Other Document link); and 4) contact information (mailing address, phone number and email address) for three professional references who can speak to the candidate’s abilities to carry out the responsibilities of the job.

Inquiries should be directed to:
Richard Bischoff, Ph.D.
Gwendolyn A. Newkirk Professor of Leadership in Child, Youth and Family Studies
Department Chair, Child, Youth and Family Studies
135 Mabel Lee Hall
PO Box 880236
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Lincoln, NE 68588-0236
Email: edad.chair@unl.edu

The University of Nebraska-Lincoln is committed to a pluralistic campus community through affirmative action, equal opportunity, work-life balance, and dual careers. See http://www.unl.edu/equity/notice-nondiscrimination.
New in Leadership from IAP

Gender, Media, and Organization: Challenging Mis(s)Representations of Women Leaders and Managers
Edited by: Carole Elliott, University of Roehampton
Valerie Stead, Lancaster University, UK
Sharon Mavin, University of Roehampton
Jannine Williams, University of Bradford, UK
PB ISBN: 9781681235325

Urban Educational Leadership for Social Justice: International Perspectives
Edited by: Jeffrey S. Brooks, Monash University
Melanie C. Brooks, University of Idaho
PB ISBN: 9781681231761

Educational Leadership and Organizational Management: Linking Theories to Practice
By: Victor C.X. Wang, Florida Atlantic University
Bernice Bain, Southern New Hampshire University
John Hope, University of Auckland
Catherine A. Hansman, Cleveland State University
PB ISBN: 9781681235127

Shifting to Fit: The Politics of Black and White Identity in School Leadership
By: Carol A. Mullen, Virginia Tech
Kim Robertson
PB ISBN: 9781623966614

Building and Maintaining Collaborative Communities: Schools, University, and Community Organizations
Edited by: Judith J. Slater, Florida International University
Ruth Ravid, National Louis University
R. Martin Reardon, East Carolina University
PB ISBN: 9781681234670

Leading Schools in Challenging Times: Eye to the Future
Edited by: Bruce Anthony Jones, University of Houston
Anthony Rolle, University of Houston
PB ISBN: 9781681233673

Working (With/out) the System: Educational Leadership, Micropolitics and Social Justice
Edited by: James Ryan, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
Denise E. Armstrong, Brock University
PB ISBN: 9781681232249

Challenges and Opportunities of Educational Leadership Research and Practice: The State of the Field and Its Multiple Futures
Edited by: Alex J. Bowers, Teachers College, Columbia University
Alan R. Shoho, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Bruce G. Barnett, University of Texas at San Antonio
PB ISBN: 9781681232744

Better Principals, Better Schools: What Star Principals Know, Believe, and Do
Edited by: Delia Stafford, Haberman Educational Foundation
Valerie Hill-Jackson, Texas A&M University
PB ISBN: 9781681233642

Edited by: M.C. Kate Esposito, California State University Dominguez Hills
Anthony H. Normore, California State University Dominguez Hills
PB ISBN: 9781681231075