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Dr. Angela Urick, University of Oklahoma

Coming into the chair position, over these last three years on the executive council, I have witnessed the growth of LSI under previous chairs. We now have a newsletter which includes SIG business, member news and feature articles. We expanded our leadership to incorporate graduate students. We are beginning a book series to support and publish SIG member research.

These last three years, I have served alongside prominent leadership for school improvement scholars who have dedicated themselves to the progress of this group—Hans Klar, Jennifer Clayton, Kristina Hesbol and Shelby Cosner. I hope to continue this momentum.

This upcoming year, we want to sustain these initiatives from previous years, and grow in our communication and opportunities offered to you. We hope you participate in our events throughout this year at UCEA and AERA. You can keep up with what’s going on through our listserv emails and newsletter.

New this year, we are adding a listserv for graduate student members and hope to grow a network and system of supports for them. We are updating our website to centralize all SIG information.

Finally, we welcome you to contribute to our programming and communication by submitting content to our newsletters, inquiring about editing a volume in our book series, or sharing your new ideas with us.

We welcome new leadership to the executive council. David DeMatthews, University of Texas El Paso, was elected as the Dissertation of the Year chair. He will remain on the executive council over the next few years and move up through positions.

Pam Angelle, University of Tennessee, outgoing newsletter editor, is now our book series editor with a first volume expected Fall 2018. Alison Wilson, University of Oklahoma, and Lee Flood, University of Tennessee, outgoing newsletter editorial assistants, will shift their focus solely to graduate student connections as representatives.

Doug Wieczorek, Iowa State University, has transitioned into the newsletter editor role, with two graduate students, as editorial assistants, Brandon Clark and Amber Graeber, Iowa State University. Our SIG continues to grow because of their dedication and new ideas.

In addition to new leadership, our SIG is fortunate to have a structure which allows elected and ad hoc executive committee members to serve for multiple years.

This provides sustainability for current initiatives and continuity in new efforts. Kristin Huggins, AERA Program Chair, and Rebecca Thessin, Secretary/Treasurer, along with our past chair, Hans Klar, give direction which keep us moving forward. We are lucky to have the involvement of our immediate past chair, Hans, to offer his wealth of SIG knowledge and history. I look forward to the leadership of Kristin after my term, then Rebecca.
Further, when it comes to continuous leadership, I wanted to give a special thank you to Pam Angelle. I had the pleasure of working with her as a newsletter co-editor when I first joined the SIG. Pam is a big reason why we have the newsletter, and now a book series. She has brought new ideas into reality for our group. We would not have grown over these last few years without her support.

Our next event is a business meeting at UCEA in Denver, CO, this November. Please join us for a light breakfast and great conversation. We would love to have your input and involvement.

In Joyful Service,

Angela Urick, University of Oklahoma
Chairperson, LSI SIG
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Collaborative teacher inquiry is a learning process that is often conceptualized as involving teacher teams in the investigation of their own practice. Emerging research suggests that collaborative teacher inquiry can be enhanced through engagement in reflection, and more specifically critical reflection that challenges the learner to examine the consequences of current practices and explore alternatives while confronting her or his own biases and assumptions (Ash & Clayton, 2009; Brookfield, 2009; Closs & Antonello, 2011; Harvey, Coulson, Mackaway, & Winchester-Seeto, 2010; Leijen, Valtna, Leijen, & Pedaste, 2011; Mezirow, 1994; Smith, 2011). This is not surprising given that reflection and critical reflection have been found to support teacher learning more generally (Berghoff, Blackwell, & Wisehart, 2011; Cruickshank, Kennedy, Williams, Holton, & Fay, 1981; Harvey et al., 2010; Zhao, 2012).

However, little is known about how the execution of a collaborative inquiry framework may advance or limit teacher reflection. This is particularly concerning given the importance of teacher learning as an antecedent to the kinds of robust changes in instructional practice that are likely necessary for school-wide improvement and the recent emphasis on and support for more authentic and embedded forms of teacher learning (Darling-Hammond, 2006; Tyack & Cuban, 1995; Spillane & Jennings, 1997). To address this and related questions, I drew from constructivist (Dewey, 1910), situated (Lave & Wegner, 1991), and transformative learning (Mezirow, 1991) theories that encourage learning from situated, authentic, and social perspectives to conduct a qualitative multi-case study that examined teacher teams across two school districts implementing a collaborative inquiry process as a means for promoting teacher learning. Specifically, this research examined whether and how enactment of collaborative inquiry and teacher conversational routines influenced reflection, while also investigating the teacher learning experiences and outcomes generated.

Study’s Purpose
The purpose of this study is to better understand how enactment methods, including tools, protocols and teacher talk might shape and advance reflection within the context of collaborative inquiry and the impact of reflection on teacher learning. The following questions emerge from my understanding of the gaps in literature specific to reflection within the collaborative teacher inquiry process:

1. How does the enactment of components within a collaborative inquiry process influence whether or how teachers reflect about their prior instructional practices?

2. What conversational routines among collaborative teacher inquiry teams promote or limit reflection?

3. In what ways does engagement in different levels of reflective dialogue during collaborative inquiry impact teacher learning and instructional outcomes?
Significance of Study
Teacher learning is an important precursor to improved instructional practices; changes and improvements in instruction are more likely to occur when teachers engage in critical reflection and learning activities that are collaborative, ongoing, and occurring in the context of their own classrooms (Brand & Moore, 2011; Brookfield, 2009; Closs & Antonello, 2011; Elmore, 2000; Garet, Porter, Desimone, Birman, & Yoon, 2001; Leijen, Valtna, Leijen, & Pedaste, 2011; Lucas, 2012; Mezirow, 1994; Smith, 2011; Wilson & Berne, 1999). Existing research on reflection has pointed to certain conditions and activities that promote critical reflection (Garcia, Sanchez, & Escudero, 2006; Harrison, Lawson, Wortley, 2005; Lin, Hong, Yang, & Lee, 2013). However, empirical studies that offer insight into the methods for promoting reflection, specifically within the context of collaborative teacher inquiry, are lacking. A better understanding of how to promote reflection among teacher groups engaging in the inquiry process, will advance teacher learning and address the knowledge gaps in the existing literature related to how collaborative inquiry and teachers’ conversations influence reflection. My study aims to contribute to the limited but growing knowledge base dedicated to understanding reflection and collaborative teacher inquiry, providing key considerations to those responsible for designing and facilitating professional learning experiences for teachers. By examining methods for advancing reflection within teacher teams, schools and educational leaders will be better prepared to promote teacher learning that fosters improvements and moral considerations in instructional practices.

Research Design
I conducted a multiple case method and a cross-case comparison to determine commonalities and differences across four cases from two different schools (Cresswell, 1998; Merriam, 1998). The collective multiple case methods (Stake, 1995) utilized attempt to describe and compare team experiences in order to provide insight into an issue (Creswell, 2005), the aim being to identify themes in the data that may lead to the development of a hypothesized repeatable framework for a collaborative inquiry model that promotes critical reflection and teacher learning. This study focused on collaborative inquiry teams from two different elementary school districts. The school districts were selected because both had schools that claimed to implement a rigorous collaborative inquiry framework. Studying multiple teams from two different schools and districts provided me with a broader perspective, allowing me to compare similarities and differences across settings (Stake, 2006). To increase the validity and the generalizability of my results, there were certain team criteria that remained constant. All cases were made up of elementary grade level teams, underwent formal and ongoing training in collaborative inquiry, met at least once per week, focused their inquiry on literacy instruction, and their collaborative inquiry process included the following components: problem identification, developing a shared vision, planning for action, analysis, and making practice public. It was important to keep team conditions as constant as possible so that differences related to critical reflection could not be attributed to factors that were outside of my study.

The primary technique for collecting data for this study was through semi-structured interviews with 17 teacher participants and 2 principals, observations of team meetings (3 observations of each team), collection of team documents and artifacts, and survey data collected from each teacher. To ensure reliability and validity of the data, three types of triangulation were used: data source triangulation, methodological triangulation, and member checking (Stake, 1995). During data analysis, all interviews and observation field notes were transcribed and each data source was coded for themes. There were certain factors that were informed by my conceptual framework that I was attending to as I collected and coded my data. As suggested by Miles and Huberman (1994), a visual display was created to show the evolving conceptual framework of the factors and relationships present within the data.

Conceptual Framework Model
My conceptual framework (see Figure 1) includes the five components of collaborative inquiry and features of conversational routines that received attention in this study. My study focused on how the enactment of these five components and teachers’ conversational routines influence reflection levels, teacher learning, and instructional outcomes associated with critical reflection.
Findings and Discussion
Findings from this study both support and extend prior research. My findings are consistent with earlier studies that have suggested that critical reflection is rare and underutilized by teacher teams (Hagevik, Aydeniz, & Rowell, 2012; Orland-Barak, 2007; Sung, Chang, Yu, & Chang, 2009). For the teachers in this study, looking back on prior instructional practices with a critical lens was not something that happened naturally and only occurred on teams where specific routines and tools were in place in order to prompt consideration of past practices during components of the inquiry process. Attempting to characterize levels of reflection proved challenging, but reflection can be an avenue for professional growth and continuous learning from experience. Teacher’s reflective abilities can develop over time and measuring reflection can be helpful in understanding and developing teachers’ reflective capacities (Kayapinar & Erkus, 2009). As such, making sense of different levels of teacher reflection is worth more consideration and investigation. My findings suggest that while reflection is difficult to quantify, how components of collaborative teacher inquiry are enacted has consequences for teacher reflection, learning and instructional outcomes.

Enactment of collaborative inquiry and the influence on teacher reflection. The enactment of components within a collaborative inquiry process is of consequence to whether and how teachers reflect. Five key findings are revealed in this section. First, presenting student learning data through the use of a visual display comparing classroom data during the problem identification and analysis components of collaborative inquiry promoted pedagogical reflection of prior practices. Second, when identifying a problem, pedagogical reflection on prior instructional practices was promoted when the problem was connected to an identified instructional problem and student learning problem, versus just a student learning problem. Third, whether and how teams utilized student learning data was found to influence reflection during all five focal components of collaborative inquiry. The use of student learning data elicited evidence-based decisions and instructional considerations about what to teach and to whom, but alone did not promote reflection on prior instructional practices. Further, a lack of student learning data to support conclusions during analysis was found to limit reflection. Fourth, pedagogical reflection was promoted when teachers engaged in joint lesson planning while planning for action. Last, protocols with guiding questions that prompted teachers to consider changes to practice promoted pedagogical reflection during problem identification, planning for action, analysis, and making practice
public. However, limitations with regard to these protocols existed as critical reflection was not cultivated during the collaborative inquiry process.

Conversational routines that promote or limit reflection. Three key findings are revealed in this section. Critical reflection did not occur during observed teacher conversations, but certain conversational routines were found to promote or limit reflection levels achieved by teacher teams. First, conversational routines that created an opportunity for reflection included an increased use of revising questions. Second, conversations that turned attention toward students or other external factors and away from teaching were found to limit reflection. Third, normalizing statements that were not followed by revising questions limited the opportunity for reflection. Additionally, when teachers are comfortable speaking their minds and feel their contributions are valued, higher levels of pedagogical reflection are achieved. As such, trust is a factor that promotes open dialogue and deeper levels of reflection and should be attended to through structured reflection opportunities and activities. These findings point to elements for consideration as collaborative teacher inquiry cycles are planned and implemented.

Impact on teacher learning and instructional outcomes. Three key findings related to research question three and the impact of reflection on teacher learning and instructional outcomes reveal the importance of engaging in reflection that considers the efficacy of past practice. First, when teams engaged in pedagogical reflection, teachers experienced transformative learning and gained content and pedagogical knowledge. Second, pedagogical reflection that led to transformative learning also led to changes in teachers’ practices. Third, technical reflection limited teacher learning and instructional outcomes, but promoted knowledge of students. The knowledge of students was used for planning that emphasized student groupings and interventions. Overall, collaborative inquiry processes at Deerbrook tended to encourage teacher learning about content and pedagogy while collaborative inquiry processes at Lyndale encouraged teacher knowledge of students. These differences in how collaborative inquiry processes oriented teacher learning impacted instructional outcomes. Additionally, non-reflective and technical levels of reflection limited the opportunity for teachers to learn from and make changes to teacher practices that could be linked to social, ethical, or political consequences.

Implications of the Study
Findings from my study have implications for school leaders, teachers, and future researchers. These implications are presented in the following section.

Principals. Building leaders often have a large role in designing, planning, and facilitating learning opportunities for teachers. As such, principals need to be informed about how the enactment of collaborative inquiry components and conversational routines of teachers influence reflection and teacher learning as they design collaborative inquiry learning experiences. These study findings have implications for principals to design collaborative learning experiences that offer more systematic support for teacher reflection. Those responsible for selecting and encouraging collaborative inquiry models in schools will need to think beyond the adoption of a particular process, but should also think carefully about how collaborative inquiry components are enacted if reflection and critical reflection are to be encouraged. Principals must recognize that how collaborative teacher inquiry is enacted has important consequences for the types of knowledge generated and the instructional outcomes that follow. My findings offer specific guidance for those planning to implement collaborative inquiry regarding the development of protocols that should be utilized during each component of the process.

While systematic supports are recommended, principals must also carefully consider how these supports may constrain opportunities for critical reflection if not attended to and promoted both as part of the school culture and within collaborative inquiry in order to carry over into classroom teaching experiences Critical issues should not be addressed merely through a prompt on a protocol during one facet of school life, but instead should be immersed and discussed through school-wide efforts as a means of promoting awareness and action. Critical issues are present in all demographics; however, if teachers and students are not directly impacted by socio-cultural prejudices, their lack of
awareness and attention to these issues may unintentionally perpetuate and contribute to inequitable societal norms. As such, it is especially important for school leaders to expand efforts to increase awareness and action related to critical issues across the school, the broader school community, and on collaborative inquiry teams.

**Teachers.** Teachers engaging in collaborative teacher inquiry should consider four important factors that will influence their reflective capacity and learning. First, teachers need practice and experience making their practice public. Second, using student data and making student learning visible across classrooms are important but not enough to encourage pedagogical learning. Looking at data across a grade level must also be followed with conversations about how teachers are instructing their students. Third, teachers need to be aware of how conversational routines influence the team’s ability to reflect on past practice. Of importance is how teachers frame a problem when reflecting on an instructional experience. If a teacher in the group is turning a conversation away from teaching, others in the group need to turn the conversation back through the use of revising questions. Last, it is important for teachers to increase the capacity to reflect critically and carry this over into their collaborative inquiry work. Whether in a school where critical issues are obvious or where teachers have to look deeper, questioning current practices and creating an awareness of how one’s teaching actions can perpetuate certain socio-cultural norms are necessary activities in a school system that promotes the development of responsible citizens.

**Future Research.** I offer three recommendations for future related research. First, it would be beneficial to study teams that engaged in critical reflection during collaborative teacher inquiry. Since critical reflection has been found to be so rare, it would be useful for researchers to consider issues and limitations of how the collaborative inquiry process may prevent critical discussions from happening and explore how critical reflection can be fostered within that setting. Second, this study did not address how teacher reflection within collaborative teacher inquiry impacts student achievement outcomes. Future research that considers the influence on student learning is needed to better understand the value of promoting reflection and critical reflection within collaborative teacher inquiry. Finally, the lack of emphasis on critical reflection within collaborative inquiry suggests implications for future research on the factors that may be influencing critical reflection within the broader profession of education.

**Conclusion**

Collaborative teacher inquiry as a professional learning model has the potential to influence teacher learning and instructional outcomes. Variations in how collaborative inquiry models orient teachers toward learning and instruction matter to reflection. The findings from this study demonstrate how the enactment of components, including tools used within collaborative inquiry, is of consequence to reflection and influences teacher learning and instructional outcomes. Findings from this study suggest that higher levels of reflection that consider past practice and the social, ethical and political consequences of teaching actions are rare and need to be supported systemically. These findings, paired with what we know from existing research, suggest that reflection influences teacher learning and subsequent instructional outcomes.
Call for Dissertation of the Year Award, 2017

The Leadership for School Improvement (LSI) SIG invites submissions of Ph.D. and Ed.D. dissertations successfully completed between December 1, 2016 and November 30, 2017 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 2018 AERA Annual Meeting in New York, New York.

Submission Procedures:

Step 1: An executive summary of the dissertation should be submitted in electronic form to the Dissertation of the Year Award Chair, Dr. David DeMatthews, at dedematthews@utep.edu by January 1, 2018.
- 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 chairperson to the Dissertation of the Year Award Chair, Dr. David DeMatthews, at dedematthews@utep.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, 2018. 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 2018 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:

1. Be submitted by a LSI SIG member, a student of a LSI SIG member, or a graduate student LSI SIG member
2. Align with the LSI SIG mission (see below)
3. Seek to address significant research question(s) situated within the context of school leadership and school improvement
4. Have a clearly articulated and appropriate conceptual framework
5. Use rigorous and appropriate research methods
6. Relate significant findings
7. Discuss the contribution of the findings to research and practice
8. Be well written.
Making the Most Out of Your Conference Experience

Alison Wilson
University of Oklahoma

Conferences provide important opportunities to share and get feedback on research-in-progress, gain presentation experience, get inspired, and learn from the work of accomplished scholars and graduate student peers. By attending conferences, you are also afforded invaluable networking opportunities with scholars outside of your institution and with fellow emerging scholars.

By establishing a supportive peer and mentor network, you have access to research and career advice, potential collaborators, and references for future jobs. The following sections provide tips – gleaned partly from my own experience but particularly from scholars and mentors much wiser than I – on how to make the most of your conference experience.

Tip #1: Plan ahead
Conferences provide an ideal opportunity to meet with scholars who are typically out of reach geographically, so look at the conference program in advance to find out who is participating and identify people you are interested in meeting. You might also consider reaching out through email to set up meetings in advance and begin preparing questions. This will allow you to organize your time between conference sessions and ensure that a faculty member’s time is well spent.

Another great way to plan for conferences is to identify opportunities to meet with journal editors. Some conferences will provide roundtable sessions where you can learn and ask questions about the journal’s scope, submission requirements, and editorial process. You can learn more about journals you are already familiar with and discover new ones that might be a good fit for your current or future work. Be prepared to talk about your research and ask relevant questions.

One of the first pieces of advice that I was given when I started attending conferences was to have my “elevator pitch” ready. There are numerous situations in which you might be asked about your work, whether at casual dinners or at conference sessions, so be prepared to talk about your research interests and current projects in a succinct way. Even if you are still in the early phase of your academic program, it is a good idea to start identifying areas of interest or work that you admire, as this could lead to opportunities to further refine your ideas and possibly even find a mentor or future collaborator.

Finally, the size of some conferences can be intimidating and the number of session options can be overwhelming. As a starting point, talk to your mentor or a knowledgeable peer about recommendations for SIG or division events to focus on based on your interests. If you find that sessions that interest you overlap, coordinate with a fellow student who shares your interests and split up so that you can share notes or ideas from each session.

Tip #2: Get involved
Graduate student teams such as the UCEA Graduate Student Council and AERA Division A Graduate Student Committee work hard to provide development opportunities for graduate student conference attendees, from guidance on the publishing process to presentation sessions and faculty mentorship.
The Graduate Student Summit at UCEA, for example, provides an opportunity to share your work with peers while honing your presentation skills and receiving detailed feedback from an accomplished scholar. This is a great way to get presentation experience and feedback in a supportive setting. Moreover, you can develop relationships with other graduate student attendees who will become your network of support, or cohort, when you are working on your dissertation and looking for jobs.

Attending receptions is another great way to start making connections and chat with people you might want to follow up with later. You might also consider getting involved with smaller groups of people who share your research interests, such as a SIG. SIG events can provide a more personal setting for building relationships because of their smaller size and participants’ aligned interests.

**Tip #3: Be assertive**

Lastly (and this can be challenging for an introvert like me), be proactive in reaching out to people. Ask a mentor to introduce you to people as you attend conference and social events. While it can be tempting to meet up with people you already know, particularly when conferences provide a rare opportunity to see peers and mentors from other institutions, try to carve out some time to grab dinner, coffee, or drinks with new acquaintances as well.

Don’t be afraid to reach out to scholars that you admire. It might seem intimidating to contact the accomplished individuals who fill your reference lists, but the piece of advice I have consistently received in interviews with respected scholars is to be assertive in building these connections. The key is to be respectful and knowledgeable about their work.

Conferences provide a multitude of opportunities for emerging scholars to develop their interests and expertise, which can sometimes be overwhelming. Hopefully these tips will be useful for making the most out of your conference experiences. I am indebted to my mentor for much of this guidance, and I am still working on following my own advice in some of these areas. As always, we welcome your feedback about what you would like to see in the graduate student column, so please reach out and let us know how we can support you!
Practitioner Perspectives

School Leaders Respond to Racism

Amber Graeber and Brandon Clark
Iowa State University

Many journalists, scholars, and practitioners have written about the rise of overt racism in public spaces since the 2016 U.S. presidential election. Journalist Alexis Okeowo wrote an intriguing analysis of increased hate speech and hate crimes titled “Hate on the Rise after Trump’s Election” published in The New Yorker in the fall of 2016. The Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC) regularly updates its “Hate Watch” and “Hate Map” spaces on its web site to track some of the actions by hate groups across the country. National coverage of the white supremacy rallies in Charlottesville, Virginia, as well as increased regional and local attention to similar acts of overt racism creates challenges for school leaders in both K-12 and higher education settings.

We wanted to learn how K-12 school leaders navigate these challenges and work to contest racism in differing educational contexts. We conducted separate interviews with a rural high school principal and an urban district’s director of middle schools in the State of Iowa. We spoke with Mr. Bill Messerole, Principal of Creston High School, and Mr. Corey Harris, Director of Middle Schools, Des Moines Public Schools, and asked them to describe how they address racism and promote social justice in their schools and community.

A School Leader’s Experience – Reflect, Learn, and Grow as a Community

Recently, five white, rural high school students appeared in a photograph taken off Creston school grounds wearing white hoods, burning a cross, waving a Confederate flag, and holding a firearm. The image spread quickly across social media, and a quiet, small town of just over 7,000 people became nationally known for all the wrong reasons.

Creston Public Schools serve approximately 1,400 students in their K-12 system and 89% of the student population are white. Nothing prepared Creston High School Head Principal Bill Messerole for this news. Messerole has 15 years of experience as a school administrator, and has served as the high school principal in Creston, Iowa for six years. He realized he needed to respond promptly, reflect on the situation, and plan for the subsequent healing and growth of his school community.

Immediately after Messerole became aware of the photograph he identified several immediate, short-term actions: 1) identify the students, 2) contact parents/guardians, 3) remove students from the school setting during the investigation, 4) communicate with students and staff, and 5) reach out to the district superintendent. Unfortunately, the district superintendent, who is also the spokesperson for the school district, was unavailable on personal leave. Messerole sensed an increased level of urgency to simultaneously address the community’s concerns in terms of public relations, while also initiating a thorough school-based investigation of the incident.
The media arrived at the school campus within one hour of Messerole learning about the existence of the photograph. Messerole believed it was important to be transparent and honor all media requests and address the situation in person. However, the steady stream of phone calls, emails, and reporters on campus made it difficult for him to be present and visible to address the immediate needs of his school community. He sent an email to all teachers and asked them to create time in their classrooms to discuss the photograph. If students sought out additional support, the guidance counselor was available to meet with them as well. In the days following the release of the photograph, Messerole personally reached out to students in the community. He met with minoritized students individually as well as within his student leadership team. Messerole explained, “In addition, we also had to consider what was going on with the students who were in the picture because they are our kids too. We weren’t going to just toss them aside because we knew we were going to have to work with those kids and those families in the process of coming back to school. ... a lot of our outreach with student and families revolved around bringing an understanding that we can’t change what happened – however, we have kids coming back ... what’s that going to look like?”

Messerole shared that he focused on developing a shared accountability among the stakeholders in the community and working to take appropriate actions necessary to bring the community together. He stated, “Number one, we owned it. We said, ‘These are our kids. We have to do something because this should never happen.’ And we are going to do something.” He expressed his commitment to long-term solutions to heal the school community and create a more equity-focused environment. In the weeks since the posting of the photographs, Messerole made many connections with experts, stakeholders, and formed community-based partnerships with organizations such as the NAACP, a local rabbi, the Drake University’s Bob Ray Center, and Iowa’s Department of Education to help his students, faculty, and staff learn from the experience. Messerole has identified a consulting firm to work with staff around the concept of implicit bias. He believes strongly that to improve his school community, he must craft a long-term action plan and he is determined to do it well.

Messerole took a broad approach to addressing racism in his school, he explained, “You know, we must begin with the end in mind. We know where we want to go. We want to end up with a sustainable program infused into our curriculum where we know specifically what we are teaching and where throughout ... We want to be very deliberate and we think we have the people and the resources to help us make that happen.” Ultimately, Messerole’s goals include infusing diversity instruction and experiences into the 6-12 curriculum, as well as ongoing implicit bias training for his administrative team and teachers, to better prepare Creston graduates for the diverse world in which we live.

**A District Leader’s Perspective – Talking Race and Taking Action**

We also met with Mr. Corey Harris, the Director of Middle Schools for Des Moines Public Schools, a mid-sized urban district that serves approximately 34,000 students, of which 40% are white and 60% are students of color. Harris shared the long-term outlook taken by Messerole regarding equity-focused leadership. Harris said he has not personally led a school community through such a publicly scrutinized racial event like Principal Messerole, but he understands Messerole’s position in the community and the complex responsibilities leaders face in those circumstances. Harris, a strong believer in restorative practices, argued that the long-term goal is to develop healing within the school community to help all students affected by the event learn and grow to be better people and citizens, including the students in the photograph.

We sought the perspective of a central office administrator and asked Harris to share this thoughts on how school leaders can address racism in their schools. Harris suggested starting from a moral place. He recommended prompting conversations among staff by asking questions such as, “Who do we need students to be when they leave us?” and
then reflecting on the school or district’s mission and vision. He also advised leaders to be aware of passive reflection without action, and challenged leaders to interrogate the organization’s mission and vision to understand whether or not it reflects an equity-driven culture. Harris also included the community at large, and pushed leaders to encourage stakeholders’ awareness of how student actions are influenced by formal and informal learning environments and societal contexts. For example, Harris posed the question, “What is it in our behaviors, in our mascots, in how we name streets, in who we honor and recognize in our community? What messages do those things – intentionally or unintentionally reinforce? When we start to think about that, then we have to confront the question – how surprised should we really be when we see this behavior exhibited by our young people?” Harris urged school leaders to confront the evidence we find when asking these critical questions and make shifts that aim to decrease the likelihood that students will display or verbalize racist or discriminatory behaviors towards one another.

Harris thrives on equity-driven action. He is most proud of a program he implemented in the Des Moines Public Schools called “Leadershift.” Harris noticed that school leaders were uncomfortable when talking about race and equity, so in 2016-17 he started a teacher leadership group to process issues of race and equity. Harris said, “We don’t have a culture as Americans to talk about race . . . [Leadershift] peers – teacher to teacher, they are far more likely to engage in authentic conversations with each other than they are with their supervisor.” The teacher group meets weekly to discuss issues of race and equity, engage in self-care, lead learning opportunities in their respective buildings, and participate in book studies. He hopes the peer to peer approach will develop teachers’ cultural competency in the district’s middle schools and ultimately improve relationships among diverse groups of students and teachers.

**Conclusion**

We highlighted two leaders’ responses to one critical incident of overt racism that occurred, however, research on leaders and schools have identified the embedded nature of systemic racism and oppression within educational institutions and contexts. Confronting various types of covert and overt manifestations of racism is a continual process for the school leader. In a 2012 article, Sonya Douglas-Horsford argued, “Indeed, we have a strong sense of what social injustice in U.S. education is and its long-term implications . . . But our understanding of what social justice in education looks like, and more specifically, what social justice leadership looks like, is still limited” (p. 12). The interviews conducted with Mr. Messerole and Mr. Harris provided examples of how school leaders are ultimately responsible to contest overt acts of racism and implement socially just leadership practices within their schools and community. In both interviews these two school leaders: (1) positioned the learning, growth, and well-being of all students at the center of their leadership and advocacy, (2) provided professional development opportunities for their staff to enhance their critical consciousness and social justice capacities, and (3) engaged with educational and community stakeholders in order strengthen the climate and culture within their schools (Theoharis, 2007). It is clear that overt acts of racism ripple across all schools and communities no matter where they occur, and school leaders should proactively engage with their students, teachers, and communities to confront all types of racism as part of their school’s mission.

**References**


The 2017 Leadership for School Improvement Special Interest Group (LSI SIG) Annual Business Meeting was held Friday, April 28 at the AERA Annual Meeting in San Antonio, Texas. In addition to announcing the annual Dissertation of the Year Award, and providing members with updates related to the business of the SIG, the SIG Executive Committee typically organizes a panel to discuss important school improvement issues at the business meeting.

The 2017 panel discussion, *International Perspectives on Leadership for School Improvement*, featured Helen Goode from the University of Melbourne, Ross Notman from the University of Otago, and Charles Slater from California State University Long Beach. These three scholars shared their experiences conducting research as part of one or more international research networks, including the International Successful School Principalship Project ([https://www.uv.uio.no/ils/english/research/projects/isspp/](https://www.uv.uio.no/ils/english/research/projects/isspp/)) and the International School Leadership Development Network ([https://isldn.weebly.com](https://isldn.weebly.com)). In particular, Helen, Ross and Charles discussed:

• The main challenges school leaders encounter when leading school improvement efforts in the contexts where they conduct research;

• The main strategies that successful school leaders employ to lead school improvement efforts in response to these challenges; and

• What they have found to be the most interesting or challenging aspects of conducting research in these contexts.

On behalf of all of the SIG members able to attend the panel discussion, I would like to thank the panelists for sharing their experiences in what was a very informative and enjoyable session.

Kind regards,

Hans W. Klar
LSI SIG Immediate Past Chairperson
AERA Business Meeting Minutes, 2017

Leadership for School Improvement SIG Business Meeting
AERA 2017, San Antonio, Texas
Friday, April 28, 2017—6:15 pm to 7:45 pm

6:20: Welcome (Hans Klar)
Hans welcomed the LSI-SIG membership to the LSI-SIG Business Meeting.

6:25: Panel Discussion (Hans Klar)
Hans introduced the “International Perspectives on Leadership for School Improvement” panel, which included Helen Goode of the University of Melbourne (Australia), Ross Notman of the University of Otago (New Zealand), and Charles Slater of the California State University Long Beach (United States) who are all a part of the International School Leadership Development Network. Each of the panelists addressed the following questions: 1) What are the main challenges school leaders encounter when leading school improvement efforts in contexts where you conduct research? 2) What strategies do successful school leaders employ to lead school improvement efforts in response to these challenges? and 3) What have you found to be the most interesting or challenging aspects of conducting research in these contexts?

7:05: Reports and Announcements

AERA Program Report (Angela Urick)
Angela reported the LSI-SIG received 39 proposal submissions from national and international scholars who addressed various issues related to leadership for school improvement. The LSI-SIG AERA 2017 Annual Meeting Program consisted of three paper sessions, three roundtable sessions, one symposium, and one business meeting. Angela thanked the reviewers and chairs/discussants for the contributions to the SIG.

Membership and Financial Reports (Kristin Huggins)
Kristin distributed the LSI-SIG membership and financial report. The SIG balance on hand as March 2017 is $5,738.98. As of April 2017, the SIG has 204 members.

Newsletter Report (Alison Wilson)
Alison provided the newsletter report and encouraged members to submit to the newsletter.

LSI SIG-IAP Book Series (Pam Angelle)
Pam discussed the new LSI-SIG Information Age Publishing (IAP) book series and the printed and listserv distributed call for book proposals for the series.

Graduate Student Connections (Lee Flood)
Lee discussed the LSI-SIG graduate student involvement at the AERA 2017 Annual Meeting and encouraged graduate student present at the LSI-SIG Business Meeting to be involved in the SIG.
7:10: **Dissertation of the Year Award Finalists** (Rebecca Thessin)
- Romy DeCristofaro, University of Illinois at Chicago (Advisor: Shelby Cosner)
- Arronza LaBatt, The George Washington University (Advisor: Jennifer Clayton)
- José Montaño, Loyola Marymount University (Advisor: Elizabeth Reilly)

Rebecca discussed the Dissertation of the Year Award process, mentioned the finalists, and announced that Romy DeCristofaro from the University of Illinois at Chicago’s dissertation, “A Multi-Case Study Examining Reflection within Collaborative Teacher Inquiry” was the winner of the Dissertation of the Year Award. Romy was in attendance to accept her award and present a synopsis of her dissertation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2016-17 LSI SIG Executive Committee</th>
<th>2017-18 LSI SIG Executive Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chairperson:</strong> Hans Klar, Clemson University</td>
<td><strong>Chairperson:</strong> Angela Urick, University of Oklahoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Immediate Past Chairperson:</strong> Jennifer Clayton, The George Washington University</td>
<td><strong>Immediate Past Chairperson:</strong> Hans Klar, Clemson University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Chairperson:</strong> Angela Urick, University of Oklahoma</td>
<td><strong>Program Chairperson:</strong> Kristin Huggins, Washington State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secretary/Treasurer:</strong> Kristin Huggins, Washington State University</td>
<td><strong>Secretary/Treasurer:</strong> Rebecca Thessin, The George Washington University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dissertation Award Committee Chairperson:</strong> Rebecca Thessin, The George Washington University</td>
<td><strong>Dissertation Award Committee Chairperson:</strong> David DeMatthews, University of Texas at El Paso</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7:25: **Transition to new LSI SIG Executive Committee Officers** (Hans Klar)

Hans explained the LSI-SIG Executive Committee Officer succession process of the LSI-SIG and announced new officers, including David DeMatthews, joining the Executive Committee after being elected Dissertation of the Year Award Chair.

**Book Series & Newsletter Editor:** Pam Angelle, University of Tennessee, Knoxville

**Newsletter Co-Editors & Graduate Student Representatives:** Lee Flood, University of Tennessee, Knoxville and Alison Wilson, University of Oklahoma

7:30: **Social Time**

Hans invited all in attendance at the LSI-SIG Business Meeting to stay for social time and enjoyment of the hors d’oeuvres provided.

7:30: **Business Meeting Ended**
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

Send in Your News
Call for manuscripts, conference announcements, reading lists, or publications you would like to have considered for publication in LSI Newsletter to:

Brandon Clark, Co-Editor LSI Newsletter
brclark@iastate.edu

Amber M. Graeber, Co-Editor LSI Newsletter
agraeber@iastate.edu
Calls for Articles & Book Chapters

North Carolina Association for Middle Level Education Journal

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!
Calls for Articles & Book Chapters

You are Invited

Intent to Submit A Book Chapter Proposal

Publisher: Palgrave MacMillan

Book Title

_Differentiated Teacher Evaluation over the Career Span: Promoting Growth and Assuring Quality From Pre-Service to Retirement_

Book Focus

Teachers have differing needs for evaluation and professional development over the stages of their careers. A high percentage of teachers are committed and successful professionals, who seek and benefit from helpful, evidence-informed feedback and dialogue throughout their careers. Thus, evaluation and professional development must be differentiated in order to contribute to the continuous growth of competent teachers. On the other hand, there is a need to address problematic teaching practice through more structured assistance and when necessary, the implementation of policies for the fair, just and timely removal of the incompetent or uncommitted. This book explores how evaluating teachers might be more effectively enacted over a teacher’s career continuum. These career stages might include but are not limited to pre-service, beginning, tenured and also those whose practice is marginal or unacceptable.

We will invite high quality papers (conceptual, analytical or empirical; both quantitative and qualitative) which make an important and substantial contribution to differentiated teacher evaluation and professional development. The coverage includes (non-exhaustive):

- Evaluation systems that differentiate by teacher competencies
- Professional growth for teachers at all performance levels
- Specific growth strategies such as effective feedback, productive observations, and job-embedded professional development
- Policies and practices addressing removal or dismissal of teachers when necessary
- The motivational impact of policies such as tenure, merit pay and differentiated compensation.

Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 31, 2017</td>
<td>Send an email of intent to submit a proposal to <a href="mailto:mderring@utk.edu">mderring@utk.edu</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Title your email Intent to Submit Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1, 2017</td>
<td>Proposal Due (See criteria below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 31, 2017</td>
<td>Selected authors invited to submit full chapters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1, 2018</td>
<td>A 5000 – 7000 word chapter due to be sent for peer review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1, 2018</td>
<td>Peer review feedback completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Process for Proposal Submission

Proposals should be 500 words excluding references and include the following sections:
1. abstract
2. research questions
3. theoretical or conceptual framework
4. description of methodology
5. significance of the work to the policy and practice of teacher evaluation

*In addition relevant references (APA style, 6th edition, )

Co-Editors

Mary Lynne Derrington, Associate Professor University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee USA mderring@utk.edu

Jim Brandon, Associate Professor, University of Calgary, Alberta, Canada jbrandon@ucalgary.ca

The book is one of three in a series titled: *Learning and Leading in Education*. The series editor is Dr. Maria Assunção Flores Fernandes, University of Minho, Portugal.
CALL FOR CHAPTERS *

School type diversification in England and the United States of America: Implications for school leader preparation programs

Editor: Valerie A. Storey, University of Central Florida

Proposals that (1) give an overview of education reform policy in England and the United States of America from the perspective of school leaders/practitioners leading innovative schools; and (2) explore educational leaders preparation to lead school system-embedded learning in a diverse, increasingly complex and corporatized education landscape are welcome.

Domestically and internationally there is an increasing interest in diverse school models, specifically meeting the need of local context, stakeholders and policy makers. Research suggests that leadership development and preparation programs ought to engage in innovative approaches that promote a broader and deeper understanding of issues related to reforming school leadership for learning. Chapter proposal submission is invited from school leaders of any of the school models listed below. This list is not exclusive and chapter proposal submission is welcome from school leaders of other innovative school reform models not referenced.

Chapters (England)
Community School, Foundation School, Trust School, Academy School, Studio School, Free School, City Technology College (CTC), Grammar School, Faith School, Independent School, and Boarding School.

Chapters (USA)
Traditional Public School, Magnet School, Charter School, Teacher-Powered Schools Initiative, Virtual School, Private School, New York School models, and Home School

FORMAT OF PROPOSAL: You are invited to submit a proposal of no more than 500 words (not including the listing of up to 10 references).

The submitting authors will be notified of the editors’ decision by the end of August (see projected deadlines below). Corresponding authors of full chapters are required to participate in a blind review of two other full chapters, submitting comments three weeks after the full chapter submission deadline. Please email proposals as attachments in Microsoft Word format to both Dr. V. Storey (Valerie.storey@ucf.edu). Enquiries are welcome.

PROJECTED 2017 DEADLINES:
Manuscripts should be between 6,000 and 7,000 words and prepared following APA 6th edition formatting guidelines.

IAP– Information Age Publishing, Inc. PO BOX 79049 Charlotte, NC 28271 Phone: 704-752-9125 Fax: 704-752-9113 www.infoagepub.com
Calls for Articles & Book Chapters

New Series Call for Editors

IAP IS PROUD TO INTRODUCE THE FOLLOWING SERIES:

Leadership for School Improvement Series
Edited by
Pamela S. Angelle, The University of Tennessee

The Leadership for School Improvement Special Interest Group (LSI SIG) of AERA announces a partnership with Information Age Publishing (IAP) for a book series devoted to current research in national and international school improvement.

The purpose of the LSI SIG is to examine how leadership of teachers, principals and superintendents influences instructional capacity resulting in improved student outcomes and how policy guides this collaborative effort. In addition, the Leadership for School Improvement SIG encourages discussion and development of the philosophical, theoretical and empirical tenets guiding school and system renewal.

With this call, the LSI SIG invites expressions of interest to edit the inaugural volume of the LSI Book Series. As our inaugural volume in the book series, we seek an editor who will highlight the history of school improvement and the LSI SIG.

Chapters in this volume will serve as a lens for understanding the following:
• The evolution of the SIG and its impact;
• The evolution of the field of leadership for school improvement;
• Trends and issues in the field of leadership for school improvement;
• School improvement and the policies which have shaped its growth;
• The future of leadership for school improvement research

LSI SIG members interested in editing this volume, or those seeking to serve as editor for future volumes in the book series, should submit a proposal which includes the following:
• Volume description
• Significance of the volume proposed to the field of leadership for school improvement research.
• Proposed volume outline.
• Proposed volume timeline.
• Contact information for editor(s)

Volume proposals should be forwarded to the LSI Book Series Editor:

Pamela S. Angelle, Ph.D., The University of Tennessee
(865) 974-4139 (office)
(865) 974-6146 (fax)
pangelle@utk.edu

IAP– Information Age Publishing, Inc. PO BOX 79049 Charlotte, NC 28271 Phone: 704-752-9125 Fax: 704-752-9113 www.infoagepub.com
Open Positions in Leadership

Wayne K. and Anita Woolfolk Hoy Endowed Professorship of Education in Educational Leadership at Pennsylvania State University
(Dr. Deborah Schussler, Chair)

We are seeking an experienced scholar whose credentials will be commensurate with appointment at the full professor level. We are especially interested in recruiting a scholar with a strong focus on educational leadership who studies equity through a lens of organizational climate and behavior, resource allocation, education law, or educator development and evaluation. This is a tenure-track, 36-week appointment with the possibility of supplementary summer appointments in research and/or teaching. Full University benefits apply. Penn State has a strong commitment to the diversity of its workforce and encourages applications from individuals of diverse backgrounds. Start Date: Fall, 2018

Responsibilities:
• Conduct nationally and internationally recognized research and scholarship related to educational leadership;
• Advise doctoral and master’s students in the Educational Leadership graduate program;
• Seek and secure external support for research;
• Provide vision and leadership to program revisions and new program initiatives;
• Teach courses on campus and online to graduate students with interests in educational leadership and;
• Make strong linkages in the field and to the profession by engaging in service and outreach activities with appropriate audiences, including practitioners.

Required qualifications:
• Earned doctorate in Educational Leadership, Educational Policy or a relevant discipline including but not limited to: public policy, economics, political science, demography, educational law, or sociology;
• Evidence of an accomplished and robust program of research demonstrating leadership in the field;
• Evidence of interest in obtaining external funding to support research;
• Evidence of a commitment to excellence in teaching and advising including a willingness to teach in online environments along with an interest in the use of modern technology;
• Evidence of strong collaboration with and mentorship of graduate students in research and/or evaluation efforts; and
• Evidence of a commitment to working collegially and with individuals from diverse backgrounds.

Applicants must submit a letter of application documenting qualifications for the position, a current curriculum vitae, up to three representative reprints or preprints of scholarly publications, and at least three names, mail and e-mail addresses, and telephone numbers of academic references. Applications received by October 20, 2017 are assured full consideration; however, applications will be accepted until the position is filled. See https://ed.psu.edu/employment/hoy-professorship for more information or contact Dr. Deborah Schussler at dschussler@psu.edu.
New Book Information

The Role of Leadership Educators: Transforming Learning

By: Kathy L. Guthrie, Florida State University and Daniel M. Jenkins, University of Southern Maine

A volume in Contemporary Perspectives on Leadership Learning
Series Editor: Kathy L. Guthrie, Florida State University

Leadership, as a discipline, leadership education, as a field, and leadership educator, as a profession are still in their infancy and rapidly evolving. As professionals in higher education, we are constantly asked to provide opportunities for students to learn leadership, whether that is inside or outside of the classroom. However, very little, if any professional development occurs in how to create such learning opportunities.

This book provides resources for leadership educators in three sections. The first section sets the stage for leadership education and the professional work of leadership educators, culminating with a variety of professional development resources for leadership educators. The second section introduces a leadership learning framework, provides characteristics and examples of strong leadership programs and assessment practices, and describes the transformative practice of leadership education. The third and final section offers specific instructional and assessment strategies ranging from discussion, case study, and reflection, to team-based- and service-learning to self-assessments, role-play, simulation, and games, to fulfill learning outcomes.

CONTENTS:
Preface
Acknowledgments
SECTION I: LEADERSHIP CAN BE TAUGHT: EDUCATION AND EDUCATOR
CHAPTER 1: Setting the Stage: Importance of Leadership Education
CHAPTER 2: Leadership Educator as a Professional Identity
CHAPTER 3: Leadership Educator Resources
SECTION II: DESIGNING OPPORTUNITIES FOR LEADERSHIP LEARNING INTRODUCTION
CHAPTER 4: Leadership Learning Framework
CHAPTER 5: Leadership Education and Learning Contexts
CHAPTER 6: Characteristics of Distinctive Leadership Programs
CHAPTER 7: Distinctive Contextual Leadership Program Examples
CHAPTER 8: Assessment in Leadership Education
SECTION III: DELIVERING LEADERSHIP EDUCATION
CHAPTER 9: Leadership: An Applied Discipline
CHAPTER 10: Discussion: Leadership Education’s Signature Pedagogy
CHAPTER 11: Case Study Methods for Leadership Education
CHAPTER 12: Reflection as Leadership Pedagogy
CHAPTER 13: Team-Based Learning: It’s All About Process
CHAPTER 14: Service-Learning as Leadership Pedagogy
CHAPTER 15: Self-Assessment, Peer-Assessment, and Observation Instruments
CHAPTER 16: Role-Play, Simulation, and Games as Leadership Pedagogy
CHAPTER 17: Leadership as Art
References
About the Authors

More titles in this series can be found at: http://www.infoagepub.com/series/Contemporary-Perspectives-on-Leadership-Learning

IAP—Information Age Publishing, Inc. PO BOX 79049 Charlotte, NC 28271
Phone: 704-752-9125 Fax: 704-752-9113 www.infoagepub.com
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