

School Leadership News

The Newsletter of AERA Division A: Administration, Organization, & Leadership

Issue 14

Winter 2006

The American Educational Research Association (AERA), a professional membership organization, strives to improve the educational process by encouraging scholarly inquiry related to education. AERA offers a comprehensive program of scholarly publications, training, fellowships, and meetings to advance educational research, to disseminate knowledge, and to improve the capacity of the profession to enhance the public good. Division A of AERA is devoted to furthering the aims of the organization through scholarly contribution in the areas of educational administration, organization, and leadership.

In this Issue:

Vice President's Column.....	1
Carol A. Mullen Book Announcement.....	2
AASA Journal Call for Proposals.....	2
Moral Agency of the Educational Leader Call for Proposals.....	3
Sustainable Educational Improvement by Michael Fullan.....	4
Hiring Practices for women minorities.....	7
UCEA Convention Call for Proposals.....	11
From the Editors.....	12
Journal of Research on Educational Leadership Preparation.....	13
Division A Officers.....	14

Vice President's Column

Rodney T. Ogawa, *University of California*

I have learned that some members of Division A have expressed concerns about the process that was followed to appoint the Division's Nominating Committee and to select nomination slates. In an effort to provide clarification, I'd like to recount the events that occurred.

Sparked by the publication of nomination slates in the *Educational Researcher*, a member of Division A's Executive Committee informed me that I had not consulted with the Executive Committee regarding the appointment of the Nominating Committee, which is required by our by-laws. Indeed, in my haste to meet AERA's deadline for submitting the Nominating Committee roster, I had failed to consult with the Executive Committee. It was an innocent error, but an error nonetheless.

In a series of email exchanges, members of the Executive Committee suggested two courses of action: (1) Void the Nominating Committee and begin the process anew or (2) maintain the existing committee composition and let the nomination slates stand. Proponents of the former took the position that my mistake violated the principle of transparency and thus violated the letter and spirit of the by-law. Proponents of the latter argued that I was fulfilling the spirit of the by-law by consulting with them, albeit after the fact. Some members of the Executive Committee also expressed concerns with what they perceived to be a lack of diversity in the research philosophies of nominees. However, the discussion focused appropriately on procedural matters, as stipulated by the by-laws.

In an effort to clarify what the by-laws required, I contacted the staff at AERA, who consulted with the association's attorney. I was informed that the Division's by-laws require only that the Vice President consult with

Vice President's Column (continued)

Committee. It was suggested that I propose a Nominating Committee to the Executive Committee, receive feedback, and then finalize the Nominating Committee's membership. Thus, I submitted the original Nominating Committee to members of the Executive Committee. Because a strong majority expressed support for the proposed composition of the committee, I decided to let the committee and its nomination slates stand.

I apologize for problems and misunderstandings that my mistake may have caused. I hope that it will not shake members' trust in how Division A goes about its business. That would be a most unfortunate outcome, for the by-laws, which were adopted in 2004, were intended to provide greater transparency in the governance of the division. I have disclosed the events surrounding this year's nomination process in the same spirit.

A Graduate Student Guide: Making the Most of Mentoring

A new book by Carol A. Mullen available at: www.rowmaneducation.com/

Here is a doorway through which readers will sneak a peak at the academy—its exterior and interior spaces. There is much within the academic environment that can invite entry or obstruct movement. With this text, doors have been opened for novice scholars and new faculty, as well as experienced academicians and administrators. Each chapter has an aperture on vital mentoring issues (such as productive learning within groups, developing effective marketing and networking strategies, and creating successful student-centered programs) that, together, provides a broader perspective on the professoriate. Readers are guided through the process of becoming successfully mentored, largely by entering into viable relationships and learning the art of receiving and giving. The various mentoring formats described provide exposure to a wide range of options that readers can mindfully act upon; these also demonstrate the value of learning within one-to-one systems and group contexts. Finally, readers are given access to guarded secrets about graduate school, not only concerning unspoken norms but also the "hidden curriculum" of the academy and of mentor's expectations. The mentoring concepts and practices narrated have all been tested in real-life settings. Further, the chapters' case scenarios and analyses are supported with data collected from multiple sources—documents, surveys, and interviews—including the Writers in Training (WIT), a long-standing doctoral cohort. Dozens of graduate students in education in particular, as well as faculty and administrators have contributed to this work.

AASA Magazine Welcomes Contributions

Faculty in educational leadership programs are invited to submit articles, columns and even humor items for consideration in *The School Administrator*, the monthly magazine of the American Association of School Administrators. The magazine is most interested in articles that have a significant practical application for school-system leaders. Author guidelines and back issues can be accessed at www.aasa.org. The editor, **Jay P. Goldman**, can be contacted at magazine@aasa.org.

CALL FOR PROPOSALS: THE MORAL AGENCY OF THE EDUCATIONAL LEADER

LAUREL POINT INN, VICTORIA, BRITISH COLUMBIA, CANADA, OCTOBER 5 - 7, 2006.

Join us in beautiful Victoria, British Columbia, Canada for the Eleventh Annual Values and Leadership Conference. The theme of this year's conference, *The Moral Agency of the Educational Leader* will provide a context for the exploration of values and ethics in educational leadership.

Conference Theme

Primary Theme: *The Moral Agency of the Educational Leader*. Scholars do a reasonably good job of describing the General Ethics of Educational Leadership—the promotion of the ethics of justice and care, and institutional critique. What is lacking is a treatment of the *Special Ethics* of the profession of educating, namely, the “good” that our profession is supposed to pursue and promote. The special “good” that the profession of education should pursue, promote, support is the good of learning. The good of learning is the good of discovering, naming, constructing oneself as one encounters the natural, cultural and social worlds that constitute one's personal and public context. The good of learning also includes learning the rights and responsibilities of being a member of those worlds, the good of learning how and why to participate as citizens in and of those worlds. The special moral agency of the educational leader, *qua educational leader*, means the proactive pursuit, cultivation, and support of those goods of learning in and for a democratic community and polity.

Three Sub-Themes:

Case Studies of Authentic Moral Leadership. We invite proposals for the presentation of narratives, case study research, biographies, and panel discussions on educational leadership practices that exemplify leadership as moral agency.

The Dimensions of Social Responsibility in a Global Society/ We invite proposals for papers and symposia that focus on social responsibility as an element of ethical leadership practice in a global society and on the promotion of social responsibility as part of the curriculum and school culture.

Cross-Cultural Perspectives. We invite proposals for papers and symposia focusing on aboriginal issues, First Nation, and American Indian perspectives that address the role of school leaders in recognizing and addressing cross-cultural perspectives.

Our sponsors this year include the British Columbia Ministry of Education, the University of Victoria, and Royal Roads University, in addition to the generous support we annually receive from Penn State. Our Penn State sponsors include the Willower Endowment, the Rock Ethics Institute, the Department of Education Policy Studies, and the College of Education Outreach Unit. For more information about the conference visit:

<http://www.ed.psu.edu/UCEACSLE/Conference06/index.htm>

Sustainable Educational Improvement

Michael Fullan
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
University of Toronto, Canada
E-mail: mfullan@oise.utoronto.ca

Editors' Note: Michael Fullan has written extensively about the influence of change forces on education and about leading change initiatives. Recently, he has turned his attention to exploring ways to ensure that successful innovations are sustained. In this perspective, he shares new lessons learned and ideas for improving student learning.

For the past few years, I have been pursuing a strategy for accomplishing tri-level reform in partnership with several countries and individuals. The idea is to build capacity and coordination within and across three levels: (a) the school and its community, (b) the district or school system, and (c) state and federal components. The goal is not to align the three levels but rather to shape and reshape them through interaction that I would call *permeable connectivity*. This concept signifies interaction and multi-way mutual influence—a complexity theory concept, namely that systems change by discovering new patterns through interaction.

I also addressed this same tri-level goal through the lens of *Leadership and Sustainability* (2005), in which I propose eight elements required for sustained innovation:

1. Public service with a moral purpose
2. Commitment and action to changing context at all levels
3. Lateral capacity building through networks
4. Intelligent accountability and vertical two-way relationships
5. Deep learning
6. Dual commitment to short-term and long term results
7. Cyclical energizing
8. The long lever of leadership

These sustainability elements are being pursued in partnership in several systems with which we are engaged including England, New South Wales (Australia), Ontario (Canada), South Australia, and Washington State (United States). These elements have also been used for district-wide reform in Pike County, Kentucky (Browne-Ferrigno, 2005; Fullan, 2006), and York Region, Ontario (Sharratt & Fullan, in press).

In our most recent work, we have attempted to become more systematic. Peter Hill, Carmel Crevola, and I (2006) have proposed a system to achieve *Breakthrough* defined as achieving 90%+ success in, for example, literacy by the age of 8. Our proposal is based on three crucial components: (a) *personalization*, (b) *precision*, and (c) *professional learning*. At the classroom level, personalization concerns a teacher addressing the unique needs each

student. Precision means addressing these needs in a specific way, geared to the learning needs of the student as these needs occur, but without falling into a prescriptive trap where instructional flow is pre-designed. Professional learning can be accomplished only through personalization and precision and requires a classroom teacher to provide ongoing, appropriate individualized learning activities every day.

Our notion of *breakthrough* focuses on building the infrastructure necessary to accomplish the 90%+ results, which is the new achievement standard for the 21st century. Key to breakthrough is having a data-driven system of information with three characteristics: It is *practical* (not requiring huge workload increases), *timely* (i.e., rapid, ongoing, readily available), and *effective* (helps address the personalization problems at hand). Leadership—leaders developing other leaders—is the force for creating and sustaining system reform.

Recently, I also examined the particular phenomenon of how to deal with schools needing a “turnaround” (i.e., schools identified as failing or underperforming). I wanted to go beyond the narrow definition of fixing one school at a time toward a *Leadership* (in press) conceptualize this notion, change basics to put this context of real reform reducing the income gap low earners in society. that, independent of how a whole, the larger its lower the life expectancy fortunate. The reasons, straightforward. It is not

**“Leadership—
leaders
developing other
leaders—is the
force for creating
and sustaining
system reform.”**

Beyond Turnaround agenda. To I returned to the problem in the agenda in society: between high and Evidence suggests wealthy a nation is as income gap, the for those less however, are not deprivation per se

that is the culprit, but rather the psychological and social consequences of being at or near the bottom of the social heap. I assert that we need to conceive educational reform in relation to the larger goal of reducing income differentials. To put it in other words, the goal of education reform should be to reduce the gap in educational achievement between the highest and the lowest as part and parcel of a more fundamental societal reform.

When I then turned to failing schools, I found that intervention schemes are narrowly conceived, resulting in at best short term improvement (usually caused by new externally introduced leadership buttressed by outside support), and perversely establish the very conditions that make sustainable or continuous improvement impossible. If one word summarizes the entire literature on change, it is *motivation*.

Turnaround strategies depend on external motivators and actually never get around to internal motivators—in fact, they unwittingly inhibit the development of internal commitments to invest in continuous improvement. Leadership

beyond simply turnaround strategies is based on ten principles required to motivate and mobilize entire systems:

1. Define closing the gap as the overarching goal.
2. Attend initially to the three basics (literacy, numeracy, and well being).
3. Be driven by tapping into people's dignity and self-respect.
4. Ensure that the best people are working on the problem.
5. Recognize that all successful strategies are socially based.
6. Assume that lack of capacity is the initial problem and then work on it continuously.
7. Stay the course through continuity of good direction.
8. Build internal accountability linked to external accountability.
9. Establish conditions for the evolution of positive pressure.
10. Use the previous nine strategies to build public confidence.

Many of the insights and finer details of these strategies emerged from our work with two school system partners in trying to put them into practice. One involves York Region, a large multicultural district just north of Toronto with 170 schools. We have been working together for four years on district-wide capacity building within and across all schools.

The other partnership involves the whole public school system in the province of Ontario. In collaboration with the Premier and the Minister of Education and with all districts and schools, we are in the midst of a systematic attempt to improve literacy and numeracy in all 4,000 elementary schools, across all 72 school districts that make up the public school system of Ontario. Our work has been framed by the sustainability, breakthrough, and leadership strategies shared here.

What is exciting about this work is that the concepts and strategies are becoming more robust and clear. Correspondingly, policy makers and practitioners—what I call *system thinkers in action*—are becoming more plentiful and engaged. In this way, system thinking is becoming less the private domain of academia and more the purview of practitioners. This in turn promises to make educational change and reform efforts more powerful both practically and theoretically.

References

- Browne-Ferrigno, T. (2005, Fall/Winter). Fullan's framework for innovation and sustainability. *Kentucky school leaders*, 4-5.
- Fullan, M. (2006). *Facilitators guide and DVD to Leadership and sustainability*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Ontario Principals Council.
- Fullan, M (in press). *Beyond turnaround leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Fullan, M. (2005). *Leadership and sustainability: System thinkers in action*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Fullan, M., Hill, P., & Crevola, C. (2006). *Breakthrough*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Sharratt, L., & Fullan, M. (in press). The school district that did the right things right. *Journal of School Leadership*.

**Operating below the radar screen:
Hiring practices at non-Hispanic serving institutions for women minorities**

Carol A. Mullen
University of South Florida
Email: cmullen@coedu.usf.edu

Here I expose some of the inequities of academic hiring practices at non-Hispanic Serving institutions for women minorities. Women academics shared stories that could benefit others. A Hispanic female's account and the lessons learned frame this piece. Analyses of story data and statistics suggest that discrimination in academic hiring practices operates below the radar screen.

Imagine being in this female Hispanic's shoes as junior faculty:

Once engrossed in my dissertation, the "light bulb" came on. I started seeing the academy as my next career move. Before defending my work, I sent out 39 applications. I got only one bite. Because the university that expressed interest in me was advertising a visiting assistant professorship only, I wasn't interested. But my chair persuaded me, saying that I needed the interview experience and that I could move to a higher status institution afterward. I put my best foot forward and got the job.

While I was at my new location, I sought a tenure track position at a solid research institution, but my applications were rejected. Finally, I became a candidate for one highly desirable position. My talk at the campus interview served up a buffet of the best of my work to the exclusively male department. However, I only got this job in view of the fact that the other finalist (a male) turned down the offer (a fact that I wished my colleagues had not disclosed to me). My competitor had found the salary offer too low, but it was significantly higher than mine and, besides, the prestigious university was a fit with my aspirations.

Some hidden realities have since been surfacing. Last year, my publishing record far outran my departmental colleagues' accomplishments, yet we were all awarded the same merit raise. Also, I have learned to contain my enthusiasm for scholarship and teaching, downplay my publication successes, and change my ways in order to fit in. But this is not to imply that I could get away with being less than competent as a teacher and scholar, so I work doubly hard. My former dissertation chair helps me sort through what is important regarding my hornets' nest of worries and pressures. (personal communications, 2005)

Story Analysis

First, contextual details are in order: What are the research origins of Ivette's story? In 2005, I identified female junior professors from across the United States who work at research I institutions and then emailed 130. Among the 25 who responded, each shared a personal story about their experience of the academy. Ivette shared an especially revealing account (shortened and edited for anonymity). As intimated, gender discrimination and race discrimination play a role in academic hiring practices, operating as insidious forces.

From the other women academics, I received similar stories. Most of these junior faculty had formed the identity of professor relatively late as adults, and they were either employed in a male-dominated discipline or in temporary, non-tenure track, positions. Most described the atmosphere of repression in the academy that affects women academics and various forms of gender imbalance.

Considering Ivette's struggle to land a tenure track position at a major research university, it comes as no surprise that she persevered to such an extent while building up her vita. However, in actuality, higher education appears to be a women's domain these days. For the first time, in 2001–2002, women earned more doctorates than men in the U.S. (as cited in Wilson, 2004). However, when one digs deeper, looking across all disciplines and beyond professions like English and psychology, it becomes clear that "at the country's big research universities, the vast majority of professors [70%] are men" (Wilson, p. A8). Even at the assistant professorial entry level, in 2001–2002, men constituted almost 60% of the positions at research universities.

"While I was at my new location, I sought a tenure track position at a solid research institution, but my applications were rejected."

Certainly, women have been making inroads in higher education, statistically speaking, with the proportion of female faculty rising by 28% over an 11-year period (from 1989–1990 to 2001–2002), but "the more prestigious the institution, the fewer women it has" (Wilson, 2004, A8). "Despite these significant gains," according to the American Association of

University Women (AAUW), "women remain underrepresented in the highest echelons of higher education: the rank of tenured professor" (<http://www.aauw.org/laf/library/tenure.cfm>). Highlighting 19 legal court cases, an AAUW publication (2004) explains that sex discrimination continues to be a factor in why female faculty are denied tenure at 4-year degree-granting colleges and universities where women make up only 27% of tenured faculty. Moreover, female and minority professors are less likely than their white male counterparts to have tenure; in fact, "academe remains substantially white" (Schneider, 1998, p. 3). This statement suggests that race discrimination also operates below the radar screen.

Considering the odds—that an early-career, female minority scholar managed to secure a position at a "powerhouse" institution—luck seems to have been on Ivette's side. Women academic's comparatively underdeveloped professional networking skills is one significant barrier to success—two others are exclusion from "good ol' boys" circles and employers' negative attitudes about women (Baker, Graham, & Williams, 2003). However, a conflicting dynamic involving negative gender bias was also at work. Tenure-earning women (like Ivette) at doctorate-granting institutions will have to contend with inequity along a number of lines (Wilson, 2004). Overall, they get paid less than their male counterparts (as

in Ivette's case), often advance less quickly on the tenure track, and are more prone to feeling dissatisfied with their job (Mullen, 2006). As Baker and colleagues (2003) explain, the glass ceiling with respect to gender inequities for academic women contributes to their "relative career brevity and lower productivity" (p. 3). They cite data from various studies indicating that women in academia experience disparities "by almost every indicator of professional status, including rank, salary, tenure, job satisfaction, and working conditions" (p. 4). Relative to careers more generally, women's wages and advancement are less impressive than men's, mostly because they gravitate toward (or end up in) less financially rewarding positions, are more responsible for the domestic sphere, and, for family reasons, leave the workforce (Baker, et al., 2003).

Another issue that Ivette raises is fairness (or the lack thereof) involving merit pay. The reported gender difference in productivity did not result in proportional pay or recognition. In fact, as the only female in her department, her productivity for the year she was employed apparently outshone that of her male colleagues, yet she received the same merit pay as she. Virginia Valian, a distinguished professor of psychology and linguistics, points out that, because the dynamics of discrimination occur below the radar screen, many women do not perceive themselves as being prejudiced against (as cited in Wilson, 2004). One tenure-earning female disclosed that although she did receive differentiated merit pay at her institution, both males and females who received less each year felt disgruntled and even ostracized her. This reaction is not surprising. Apparently bullying behavior is not unusual among university faculty where females are enlisted to perpetuate a climate of domination and competition, partly as an effort to maintain control over women colleagues (Brunner & Costello, 2003).

"I only got this job in view of the fact that the other finalist (a male) turned down the offer (a fact that I wished my colleagues had not disclosed to me)."

As another spin on the matter of in-group favoritism, professor Virginia Valian hints at an underground gender dynamic. She refers to how female protégés tend to be promoted less by their advisors than male students. What this amounts to is that advisors commonly believe more in the potential of their male Ph.D. graduates, so they actively network to get them into the most prestigious universities (as cited in Wilson, 2004). As applied to Ivette's situation, there is an absence of information regarding this deep-seated marketing dynamic—she sent out numerous applications for both of her positions, and no reference was made to any networking or assistance from her major professor. Based on what recent male graduates of doctoral programs have informally shared with me, their supervisors have helped them to become savvy about what to negotiate for.

The relevance of Ivette's case to marketing and job searching is not whether men and women are treated equally so much as whether females receive lower

job offers and related perks for the same work and status. The mysterious force known as in-group favoritism that benefits male faculty is pervasive beyond salary and merit pay, as working conditions are also generally more difficult for new female faculty (Mullen, 2006). A significant study of 983 assistant professors at 6 major research institutions (conducted in 2002 by Harvard's Graduate School of Education) found that, on 19 out of 28 measures, female scholars were less satisfied as employees than males (as cited in Wilson, 2004). Dissatisfaction had resulted from ambiguity about the expectations for tenure, insufficient time and funds for research, and poor support from their department chairs (as cited in Wilson, 2004). Ivette's story encapsulates some of these realities but excludes many other perennial workplace inequities, such as gender (and personality) differences in the negotiation of startup funds, space, administrative or research assistance, faculty teaching load, tenure, and promotion to full professor. Those areas pertaining to new faculty are typically nonnegotiable, at least with respect to female academics, despite the contradictory message that their time is being protected until tenure is awarded.

Let us continue interrogating and revealing what is happening below the radar screen. One unresolved question centers on the extent to which the various inequities touched upon here are characteristic of all or nearly all universities, not just the most high-ranking or prestigious.

Finally, as a bicultural (White/Native American) tenured female and editor of the *Mentoring & Tutoring* journal, I believe women academics should mentor their junior counterparts through such means as mentoring relationships and systems and through such dynamics as storytelling, collegiality, and networking.

References

- American Association of University Women (AAUW). (2004). *Tenure denied: Cases of sex discrimination in academia*. Washington, DC: AAUW Educational Foundation and the AAUW Legal Advocacy Fund.
- Baker, B., Graham, S., & Williams, S. (2003). Teaching under a glass ceiling: A study of gender equity in federal education career fields. *Advancing Women in Leadership*, 13, 1-9.
- Brunner, P. W., & Costello, M. L. (2003). When the wrong woman wins: Building bullies and perpetuating patriarch. *Advancing Women in Leadership*, 13, 1-9.
- Mullen, C. A. (2006). *A graduate student guide: Making the most of mentoring*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.
- Schneider, A. (1998, March 13). More Professors are working part time, and more teach at 2-year colleges. *The Chronicle of Higher Education (Chronicle Careers)*, 1-6. Online at <http://chronicle.com/prm/che-data/articles>.
- Wilson, R. (2004, December 3). Where the elite teach, it's still a man's world. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 51(15), A8-A12.

Call for Proposals UCEA Convention 2006
"Exploring Contested Intersections of Democracy, Social Justice, and Globalization"

The 20th annual convention of the University Council for Educational Administration will be held at the St. Anthony Hotel in San Antonio, Texas from November 9-12, 2006. **The deadline for all submissions is April 24, 2006.** The purpose of the 2006 UCEA Convention is to engage participants in discussing research, practice, policy and traditions within educational administration as it is conceptualized in the U.S. and internationally.

Convention Theme

The 2006 Convention theme draws attention to tensions between theory, research and practice, particularly with regard to democracy, social justice and globalization. The theory, practice and research concerning democracy, social justice and globalization are embroiled within a contemporary struggle, as many groups within and outside of the educational establishment struggle to have their perspectives, values, and reform agendas take precedence. Educational administration is centrally about providing democratic and moral leadership in educational institutions with the purpose of supporting the education and development of all students. As the United States and countries across the globe become increasingly interconnected, the promises and contested intersections of globalization, democracy, social justice and educational leadership emerge in sharp relief. Proposals focusing around the following issues are especially encouraged:

- What are the different agendas for the reform of leadership preparation, and who are the actors and agencies promulgating them? What are the concerns of these reforms, and how many are concerned with globalization, democracy, and social justice?
- How will the continued emphasis on national testing (and other similar reforms) in the US and many other countries impact leadership and efforts to build schools that support democratic community and social justice?
- What has been the role of the public media in championing democracy and social justice in the schools?
- How much real progress has been made in reducing inequity in education, such as the over identification of Black males for special education and the gender gap in the principalship and superintendency?
- What kinds of research are most likely to facilitate the development of democratic communities in our schools, to help us understand how to support the learning of all children and to lead to the erasure of social injustice in the U.S. and the world?
- What are the implications of calls for "scientifically-based" research in the field of education, on educational leadership scholarship, and on the preparation of future researchers in our field?
- What are the implications of globalization and demographic change for educational leadership preparation?
- Will increased competition from the private on-line higher education agencies raise or lower standards? What is the evidence so far?
- What preparation practices (e.g., the internship, pedagogy, curriculum) need to change (and how) to ensure that leaders are well prepared to support the learning of all children?
- How can we facilitate better cross-national communication and exchange concerning the preparation of educational leaders?
- What can UCEA do to further promote an agenda of social justice and democratic community in the preparation of educational leaders?

For more details about proposal criteria, convention theme, San Antonio, and UCEA, visit www.ucea.org.

From the Editors

Rodney Muth, Co-Editor, University of Colorado at Denver, rodney.muth@cudenver.edu

Tricia Browne-Ferrigno, Co-Editor, University of Kentucky, tricia.ferrigno@uky.edu

Jeffrey Brooks, Associate Editor, Florida State University, jbrooks@mail.coe.fsu.edu

James Crawford, Copy Editor, University of Nevada-Las Vegas, jamesc@unlv.nevada.edu

The editors encourage members to use the Division A Newsletter as a forum to debate articles published in it, present new or timely perspectives about topics about educational administration, or make announcements of interest to members. Manuscripts will be edited to conform to the Newsletter layout and editorial style.

Call for Support

Our goal continues to be expanding the content and distribution of the Division A Newsletter. To make our Newsletter a "must read" for our entire membership, we seek

- commentaries that focus on topical issues
- perspectives that provide readers with insights about Division A concerns
- critiques and recommendations to improve the newsletter content and format
- information and announcements to include in future issues
- volunteers to serve as reporters, historians, and so forth

Submissions or suggestions for improving the newsletter should be sent to **Rodney Ogawa** (rtogawa@ucsc.edu) or the editorial team. Specific suggestions to improve the newsletter layout should be sent to **Tricia Browne-Ferrigno** (tricia.ferrigno@uky.edu). Anyone wishing to assume responsibility for one or more of the content areas should contact **Rod Muth** (rodney.muth@cudenver.edu). Copy and other contributions should be sent to all four editors. Please help us keep each other well informed about Division A and our fields of interest.

Submission Guidelines and Deadlines

In addition to the sections included in this issue, **School Leadership News** periodically considers publication of brief articles on issues that are trenchant and of interest to Division A members. Restrictions for publication will apply (preferably no more than 1,000 words or 5 to 7 pages of double-spaced text) in order to meet newsletter page limitations (2-3 pages). The editors reserve the right to edit for style and length. Suggestions for articles will be accepted from Division A officers, committee chairs and members, and members of Division A and related Divisions or SIGs.

Deadline for submitting material to be included in the Spring 2006 newsletter is **March 10, 2006**. Please send your copy to any newsletter editor: rodney.muth@cudenver.edu, tricia.ferrigno@uky.edu, jbrooks@coe.fsu.edu, jamesc@unlv.nevada.edu.

Submission and Publication Schedule

	Submissions Submitted to AERA	Published Online	Announced Via E-mail
Spring 2006	March 10	March 20	March 20
Summer 2006	July 10	June	July 10
Fall 2006	August 10	September	October 10
Winter 2006	October 10	November	December 10

We welcome you to browse both the AERA Division A Web Site and the Archives of the Division A Newsletter, both available at www.aera.net.

JOURNAL OF RESEARCH ON LEADERSHIP EDUCATION (JRLE) CALL FOR PAPERS

The editor of the *Journal of Research on Leadership Education (JRLE)*, Edith Rusch of the University of Nevada-Las Vegas, invites you to submit manuscripts to be considered for publication in *JRLE*. *JRLE* is a peer reviewed electronic journal focused on leadership education. As such *JRLE* is a forum for relevant research that seeks to understand the relationship between the preparation and practices of educational leaders. To expand and provoke discourse, we invite work from a multidisciplinary community including sociology, philosophy, public administration, economics and law. Our editorial team intends to, illuminate rigorous scholarship on the *teaching, learning, and assessing* of leadership preparation and practice, spotlight research on the political and contextual issues that impact leadership education, and thus advance a diverse conversation about what leadership really means. We seek work based on traditional and emergent research paradigms and strongly encourage work that is co-authored, cross-disciplinary or global in nature. We encourage empirical or conceptual work that:

- establishes links between leadership education and student learning, specifically tracing the transfer from preparation to practice
- expands the knowledge base for evaluating leadership education
- examines the philosophical underpinnings of leadership education in multiple fields or diverse and global contexts.
- compares and critiques administrative credentialing practices
- compares the 'theories-in-use' of leadership program framers to the theories-in-use of program implementers

SUBMISSION GUIDELINES

JRLE uses an electronic submission and review process that allows authors to track the progress of a manuscript. Manuscripts in the form of word documents can be emailed to the JRLE Editor, Edith Rusch, at rusche2@unlv.nevada.edu. If for some reason the manuscript cannot be submitted electronically, a floppy disk or CD version may be mailed to:

**JRLE Editor
Professor Edith A. Rusch, Ph.D.
Department of Educational Leadership
University of Nevada Las Vegas
4505 Maryland Parkway
Las Vegas, NV 89154**

MANUSCRIPT SPECIFICATIONS

Research manuscripts should be approximately 20-30 pages in length and conform to the style of the fifth edition of the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (APA)*. Figures may be submitted as TIFF or JPEG images, although we can accept most other formats. Please contact the editor if you have specific questions.

SPECIAL FEATURES SUBMISSIONS

In addition to its regular blind-refereed empirical or conceptual manuscripts, the *JRLE* editorial staff reviews and accepts other work for inclusion in the "Special Features" section of the journal. These works may include conceptual, policy, and empirical work from other disciplines, reviews of extraordinary program/course designs and delivery models, reports from ongoing professional task forces, and contributions from past and current students that illuminate the praxis of leadership.

CALL FOR REVIEWERS

If you are interested in reviewing manuscripts for the Journal of Research on Leadership Education (JRLE), please contact the editor via email at rusche2@unlv.nevada.edu.

Division A Officers

Vice President

Rodney T. Ogawa
University of California, Santa Cruz
rtogawa@ucsc.edu

Immediate Past Vice President

Patrick B. Forsyth
Oklahoma State University
forsythp@okstate.edu

2006 Program Chair

Mary Erina Driscoll
New York University
mary.driscoll@nyu.edu

Section 1: Leadership

Nona Prestine
Penn State University
prestine@psu.edu

Section 2: School Organization and Effects

Michael Dantley
Miami University of Ohio
dantleme@muohio.edu

Section 3: School Improvement

Gerardo Lopez
Indiana University
lopezg@indiana.edu

Section 4: School Contexts and Communities

Meredith Honig
University of Maryland
mihonig@umd.edu

Section 5: Leadership Development

Michelle Young
University Council for Educational
Administration
youngmd@missouri.edu

Secretary (2003-2005)

Gary Crow
University of Utah
gcrow@ed.utah.edu

Affirmative Action Committee

James Earl Davis, Chair
Temple University
james.earl.davis@temple.edu

Membership Committee/New Members Committee

Cynthia Reed, Chair
Auburn University
reedcyn@auburn.edu

Newsletter Editorial Team

Rodney Muth, Co-Editor
University of Colorado at Denver
rodney.muth@cudenver.edu

Tricia Browne-Ferrigno, Co-Editor
University of Kentucky
tricia.ferrigno@uky.edu

Jeffrey S. Brooks, Associate Editor
Florida State University
jbrooks@coe.fsu.edu

James Crawford, Copy Editor
University of Nevada Las Vegas
jamesc@unlv.nevada.edu

Nominating Committee

Paula Cordeiro, Chair
University of San Diego
cordeiro@SanDiego.edu

James Scheurich
Texas A & M University
jscheurich@tamu.edu

Alan Shoho
University of Texas--San Antonio
ashoho@utsa.edu

Awards Committee

Catherine A. Lugg, Chair
Rutgers University
lugg@rci.rutgers.edu

Mentoring Program Committee

Linda C. Tillman, Chair
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
ltillman@email.unc.edu

Ad Hoc Division A International Committee

Selahattin Turan, Chair
Osmangazi University, Turkey
sturan@ogu.edu.tr

Graduate Student Seminar Planning Committee

Patrick B. Forsyth, Chair
Oklahoma State University
forsythp@okstate.edu

Graduate Student Representatives

Alex J. Bowers
Michigan State University
bowers@msu.edu

Leslie Hazle Bussey
Saint Louis University
busseylh@slu.edu