

School Leadership News

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

Issue 13

Fall 2005

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 contributions in the areas of educational administration, organization, and leadership.

In this Issue:

Vice President's Column.....1

Carol Mullen wins ASCD Award.....2

Does History Matter? A Critique of Levine's *Educating School Leaders*.....3

Listening to Leaders: Margaret Grogan's Insights on Women Leading Systems.....10

Book Review.....13

From the Editors.....14

Journal of Research on Educational Leadership Preparation Call for Proposals.....15

Division A Officers.....16

Vice President's Column

Rodney T. Ogawa, University of California

Division A's new name—"Administration, Organization, and Leadership"—acknowledges our field's past, which focused on functions associated with the administration of schools, while embracing two conceptual domains, complex organizations and leadership, which now direct the preponderance of scholarship in our field. By memorializing the past, when scholars and administrators joined with business interests to establish a new educational order, and highlighting contemporary research on efforts to empower leaders and organize schools and districts to enhance educational outcomes, the division's new name anticipates a crucial issue confronting scholars in our field: whether making alterations to schools, whose basic organizational structures were institutionalized in the late 19th century, will indeed open learning opportunities for students from communities that historically have been underserved and even ill-served by the education system.

In thinking about this perplexing issue, I am reminded of Stinchcomb's research from nearly a half-century ago that documented the stability of formal structures, suggesting an almost genotypic persistence of structures in organizations at their founding. Hence, it should not be surprising that schools in many ways look very much like they did when the "one best system" was established to socialize what seemed like a wildly diverse population drawn to America's cities to work in nascent and burgeoning industries.

What this suggests for educational reform and academic improvement, however, may come as a surprise to many. Is it possible that we can't solve the problems that plague education, including the so-called "achievement gap," by improving the existing system? Borrowing from Tyack (and, in this case, Cuban), perhaps tinkering will not lead to Utopia. Recall that population ecologists posit that basic change in the formal structure of organizations is not produced by organizational adaptation to changing environments. Rather, fundamental change in organizational form is introduced by entirely new populations of organizations, which better fit a particular niche or an environment that has undergone a fundamental shift.

Vice President's Column (continued)

If one buys this logic (or even finds it interesting), then it implies a range of potential topics for theorizing and research: How can we organize for learning and teaching, given current and projected economic, social, and cultural conditions? Are there examples of new forms of educational organization? How did they come into being? What conditions encourage the development of new forms? How and under what conditions do new forms thrive and disperse across organizational fields?

Some scholars are already attempting to answer these questions. Proponents of parental choice in education, for example, argue that the existing governance and organization of schools are fundamentally flawed. Their solution is the marketplace. Are there other mechanisms that could produce new forms of educational organization, forms that would better serve the needs of an increasingly diverse population in a post-industrial society? Clearly, we should be thinking about this.

Carol A. Mullen Wins Award

Carol A. Mullen, Associate Professor, University of South Florida, received the 2005 Florida Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (FASCD) Excellence Award for Excellence in Instructional Supervision. She was recognized for having made an outstanding contribution to quality educational practice that enhances the growth and development of students. The award results from her work in the Writers in Training (WIT) Doctoral program that she created and continues to lead. The program is based on a mentoring cohort model comprised of her protégés.

This initiative in educational leadership has the dual agenda of preparing students as dissertation researchers and as scholar-practitioners. The program combines the best attributes of informal mentoring with structured components, which include bimonthly meetings, turn taking, and guidelines for producing work found in formal heuristics. For five years now, WIT members have been meeting at the university and at Mullen's home on weekends. Members also exchange notices and files online via the WIT listserv. Because the university calendar does not dictate when and where the students meet—one draw of a non-institutionalized cohort structure—sessions are flexibly arranged over the duration of a student's program. Each meeting has a student-driven agenda where individuals are able to add their work, "as needed" on a rotational basis. Agenda items feature literature reviews, research instruments, and dissertation proposals and chapters.

A large group of Ed.D. and Ph.D. students identify themselves as "The WITs" mainly full-time, diverse K-12 practitioners in various stages of doctoral coursework, prospectus writing, or final defense. Several of the WITs have defended their dissertations and are able to provide mentoring and coaching to those still in the process. Most are striving to become principals and, a few, superintendents and professors. The WITs have participated as coauthors of Carol's, and several have been awarded paid research assistantships through her grants. Two of the WITs are also employed as Mullen's editorial assistants for the *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning* journal (Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group).

Finally, several case-based empirical studies of the WIT cohort have been produced, which identify the success of the members in three areas: developing a sense of identity and belonging, supporting learning and attainment of dreams, and experiencing a vibrant faculty-student support model. Resulting publications have appeared in several places, including the *Journal of Further and Higher Education* and in chapter form in *Fire and Ice: Igniting and Channeling Passion in New Qualitative Researchers*.

Does History Matter? A Critique of Levine's *Educating School Leaders*

Charles M. Achilles
Seton Hall University and Eastern Michigan University
plato936@rochester.rr.com

A critique of Levine (2005) might start with two assertions: Despite its probable high costs, this report on educational administration preparation programs offers nothing new, except an espoused ideology that offers unevaluated and non-tested ideas, and employs a selective and weak review, offering only a model for future ideological treatises that may further demonize education. Nevertheless, the report is important because it extends prior studies (Culbertson, Farquhar, Gaynor, & Shibles, 1969; Hallinger & Heck, 1996), which consistently criticize educational administration programs, confirming what I have reported for more than 20 years.

Some Particulars

Often before accessing and studying a report, I have seen a comment about it in the mass media (e.g., *USA Today*, 2005). Mass-media interest in anything educational suggests that reporters (at least) believe that the topic is newsworthy and probably controversial. Except on "school pages" of local outlets, one seldom encounters positive stories about education.

When examining the report, I usually turn first to its notes and references. Entries here alert me to sponsors and funders, to the degree of independence of the researcher(s) or co-authors, to ideological viewpoints, to incorporation of important and foundational studies and reports, to peer reviews of the work, and to potential sources of bias. The references show selectivity, sources of the building blocks of any theoretic framework, and extent of the research and literature review.

Levine (2005) shows a stunning lack of references to in-depth and important studies, reports, theoretic discussions, and reviews of educational administration preparation and practice by people *within the field* (critical or laudatory studies, past or present). The references and notes imply an overwhelming reliance on business (Business Roundtable), CEO, conservative, anti-public-school agendas. Probably one cannot fault the lack of ERIC citations given the current atmosphere of censorship of diverse ideas demonstrated by the dismantling of the institutional memory of ERIC and purging of studies that do not support prescriptions of NCLB.

Situating Levine

That practitioners generally have not taught in their educational administration classes what improves schools reflects upon the educational administration professoriate. Consider these supporting points. Research in educational administration is weak (Achilles, 1990, 1991; Boyan, 1981; Erickson, 1979; Haller, 1979; Haller & Knapp, 1985; Levine, 2005) and few educational administration professors do research or list it as a major strength (McCarthy, 1998; McCarthy & Kuh, 1997; McCarthy, Kuh, Newell, & Ioacona, 1988). The Haller, Brent, and McNamara (1997) findings simply added to many criticisms that drove the mid-1980s formation of the NCEEA and NPBEA. The title of Griffiths' (1988) paper said it well: "Educational Administration: Reform PDQ or RIP."

While educational administration professors might shrug off such criticisms, many have been from leaders in the field. Griffiths' RIP seems to win given

decades of lethargy and lack of action on the problems. In 1988, Hawley said, "Bluntly, most programs for training school administrators range in quality from embarrassing to disastrous" (p. 84). In 1990, Guthrie said that "The preparation of professional educational administrators is one of the weakest components of United States' education" (pp. 228-229). In 2005, Levine was still able to say that "The majority of [educational administration] programs range from inadequate to appalling" (p. 23).

How much of the field's lack of progress

stems from educational administration persons using ideas from flawed publications or from a lack of substantive research and literature reviews?

Educational administration research is typically conducted using questionnaires (Haller, 1979) and on perceptions and not on administering schools or how educational administration might influence schooling outcomes (Haller & Knapp, 1985).

Iannaccone (1976) claimed that educational administration research prior to 1950 or so was "trivial." Citing Boyan (1981), Erickson (1979) and Achilles (1991) said that educational administration "research has little practical utility...lacks vision and neglects impending problems" (p. 26). Given history, Levine (2005) could still claim that educational administration "scholarship is atheoretical and immature; it neglects to ask important questions; it is overwhelmingly engaged in non-empirical research; and it is disconnected from practice" (p. 44).

What about rigor in educational administration research, either by

professors or graduate students? Hawley (1988) noted that "Few persons teaching in doctoral programs are now or ever have been involved in research and are not qualified to supervise research. Thus, very little good research is being conducted by faculty and students" (p. 85). Hear Levine (2005): "The professoriate was cited for poorly preparing their students as researchers, and being inexperienced in or incapable of carrying out or supervising quality research themselves" (p. 44). If educational administration professors do little research, is it surprising that their work and their student's work add little

to theory and to the educational administration knowledge base (Achilles, 1990, 1991; Achilles & Finn, 2002)? Research should advance educational administration's purposes, relevant theory, and the knowledge base.

Old Wine, Old Bottles

Clearly, Levine (2005) has "discovered" some of what the educational administration field has known and been

concerned about for some time, but his fourth recommendation (p. 66), seems to generate from his stated interest in England's National College for School Leadership (NCSL). Although not cited, Levine's comparisons of NCSL and USA preparation models (Chart 2, p. 58) were foreshadowed by Pohland's (1988) NCEE piece titled "The Return of the Mayflower: British Alternatives to American Practice" (see Table 33-1, p. 464). Pohland suggested that a British trainee might end up with a Certificate of Advanced Study (Education Specialist or EdS) rather than simply creating a new degree (such as Levine's Masters of Educational Administration).

Unfortunately, Levine makes a comparison to the MBA! Lets see now: Enron, Tyco, WorldCom, Global Crossing, Savings and Loan scandals, Crises at GM and Ford, and Arthur Andersen Accounting.

Unfortunately, Levine makes a comparison to the MBA! Lets see now: Enron, Tyco, WorldCom, Global Crossing, Savings and Loan scandals, Crises at GM and Ford, and Arthur Andersen Accounting. The litany of business peccadilloes (a polite word for corruption) is appalling, perhaps triggering this new attack on education as a smokescreen, in the tradition of Sputnik-generated National Defense Education Act (NDEA), A Nation at Risk, and so forth.

Rather than continue this comparison of Education to Business, I prefer to consider education a primary social institution, akin to Family/Marriage, Religion, Health, Governance, Protection, Commerce/Trade, and so on. Education has its own goals and purposes and should be evaluated on them, not on goals for another institution. As Henry Ford said about business: The Business of Business is Business. A basic difference between Education and Business is that Business deals in dollars; Education deals in sense.

Levine (2005) notes that "An EdD is unnecessary for any job in school administration" (Is the job getting easier?) "and creates a meaningless and burdensome obstacle to people who want to enter senior levels of school leadership" (p. 67). Is this ideology speaking? Is the path to senior levels of school leadership simply aspiration to go there? (What is the success rate of those who have gone *there* from business, government, military, etc? Data are available).

A few points present my personal belief about this idea. When I choose an MD, I want some assurance that the person has training in medicine, so I ask questions. Without a solid, field-specific knowledge base, there is no *professional* expertise, so there is no reason why anyone who knows about change, fund

management, public relations, and so forth cannot run a school: Right? Wrong! For other important fields, consider

- a lawyer with fine speaking skills but ignorant of law
- a preacher with good oratory but absent any theology
- an MD with great bedside manner but absent any medical knowledge
- a CPA with mastery of math and budgets but no knowledge of tax laws
- a general with leadership theory and skills, but weak in military science
- an educational administration person or program . . . Alas!

A Sense of History

Educational administration preparation certainly has not been static; at least it has not wanted for studies, reports, or criticisms. One way that educational administration as a field has responded to criticisms is through the design and delivery of "innovative" preparation programs. Each successful program had considerable external funding, because to be successful, innovative programs need extra funds. Levine's (2005) recommendations one and two (especially two), recognize this, as well as the need for new incentives (see also Achilles, 1984). Levine (2005) exhorts us to "Redesign Educational Leadership Programs" (p. 66), and *that* exhortation seems ageless.

Achilles (1994, pp. 16-19) developed a table to compare eight milestone educational administration responses to studies, criticisms, and needs regarding educational administration preparation, 1950–1988. Key elements of preparation were divided into *preprogram* (e.g.,

recruitment, selection); *program* (e.g., content, structure, delivery) and *post-program* (follow-up, placement, evaluation). The eight examples were the cooperative program in educational administration or CPEA (1950–1959); Inter-University Project II (1961–1967); EPDA Part B, using the Leadership for Education in Appalachia Project, or LEAP (1968–1972); Culbertson et al. (1969); Danforth Programs (1986–1990); NCEEA/NPB (1987–now); and The North Carolina EdD Plan (beginning in 1989).

The 1994 table obviously did not include specific responses to Levine's (2005)

concerns and issues, but it did address prior educational administration critiques or studies of educational administration (e.g., Culbertson et al., 1969) that actually incorporated ideas generated from evaluations of early educational administration changes, such as CPEA, IUP-II, EPDA-B. The categories in the table were derived from the rationales and reports from those early programs and from interviews with persons involved in them,

such as Dan Davies, Edgar Morphet, Daniel Griffiths, faculty of IUP-II, Danforth Foundation representatives, and the NCEEA planning group. I was personally involved in five of the nine sources of data (see Achilles, 1994a, for detail.) The Levine (2005) report adds a ninth "example": the 22 key elements that included conceptual and operational points (e.g., selection, degree, full-time/part-time study, cohort, content, etc) can then be compared for all nine examples. There is some stretch to find all 22 elements from the table in Levine, but it is no stretch to claim that this latest attack on educational administration did not add anything to the original list

Levine has joined a long line of critics of educational administration. Many of his recommendations have been tried.

of eight programs, studies, and reports. To say it kindly, Levine contributed minimally to the knowledge about deficits in educational administration preparation or in approaches to correct the deficits.

Consider one example: a redesigned educational administration preparation effort at the Masters and Masters Plus levels, but no EdD, that was delivered combining on-campus and in-school efforts is presented in detail in Achilles (1988, p. 58). This design-tested, evaluated, and positively reviewed program seems to meet the conditions

present in Levine's (2005) preferred model, NCSL in England. The USA program is represented in Table 2 as LEAP, an EPDA-funded effort in the early 1970s that required rigorous (a) selection, (b) program components, and (c) evaluations. This critique could go on, but overkill seems unwarranted.

Levine (2005) has joined a long line of critics of educational administration. Many of his recommendations have

been tried. A few sound-bite briefs may be instructive. On page 32 in Table 5, Levine presents the low Graduate Record Exam (GRE) results for people planning to enter educational administration: thanks to Levine for updating Achilles (1984) and Keedy and Achilles (2001), who traced the decline in educational administration GRE performance, 1982–1996. Griffiths et al. (1988, pp. 284-304), covered the same topic, including recommendations for action. Levine's (2005) assignment of research to a few select PhD scholars somehow will need to overcome the present lack of research use by practitioners (see Achilles, 2005b) as well

as educational administration's long-standing discussions of PhD or EdD degrees. For weaknesses in educational administration research, both for professors and for doctoral students, a serious review of the topic would have cited Haller and Knapp's (1985) scathing commentary.

Levine (2005) does seem to support training of educational administration persons outside of the higher education setting and, besides England's NCSL (pp. 53-58) Levine provides a snapshot of alternative providers (pp. 49-52). While Levine noted that business professors "are a staple" in these programs, he made no mention of the previously cited problems in business that we clearly cannot afford in education. In that section, he also touts a "manifesto," even though some of these ideas have turned out badly (Carnoy, Jacobsen, Mishel, & Rothstein, 2005; Roy & Mishel, 2005). Levine (2005) also touts Leadership Academies that, as yet, have no positive track record as marked by student performance. Ideology, not data or evaluation of results, seems to play a key role in Levine's discussion. (See English, 2005 for a discussion of ideology.)

Levine (2005) would also eliminate the EdD. But how does eliminating a degree "fix" programs? What problem would be resolved by eliminating the EdD that has been awarded by Harvard, Stanford, and other major universities? Would he eliminate MD, LLD, DBA, Doctor of Theology, and other degrees using the same logic? Levine has reminded educational administration folks of what educational administration research,

scholarship, and history have said for 50 or more years! Will anyone in educational administration take reasonable action?

The only new twist in the 2005 criticism is Levine's heavy reliance on persons whose ideologies favor privatization, charters, vouchers, and market forces and who either are not currently represented in public school administration or whose works are not part of the "regular" curricula. Levine's recommendations have mostly been made before, generally have been tried, and have been shown not to work. Because I have made many of the same recommendations and identified many of the same issues in studies, articles, and presentations since 1984, I find Levine, in many ways, an ally. Because Levine's report does not contain new ideas of substance, educational administration seems to face an embarrassing conundrum:

If Levine is wrong, then 50 or more years of educational administration's own reports and research are wrong.

Or

If Levine is correct, why is what educational administration has known for 50 or more years still unsatisfactorily addressed?

Clearly, Griffiths (1988) had it correct: "Education Administration: Reform PDQ or RIP." That there was even a need for Levine (2005) is educational administration's new shame! The image of educational administration remains that of a playful puppy, hilariously chasing its tail in concentric circles!

References

- Achilles, C. M. (2005a). Drama in education administration (educational administration): A farce or a morality play? (In two parts). NCEA Report on educational administration Past, Present, Future. Washington, DC.
- Achilles, C. M. (2005b, July). A sense of history might help. Paper presented at the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration. Washington, D.C.
- Achilles, C. M. (2005c). Why hasn't class-size research been used appropriately (or even used)? Paper

- presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Convention. Montreal, Quebec, Canada.
- Achilles, C. M. (2004). Change the damn box. In D. C. Carr & C. Fulmer (Eds.), *Educational leadership: Knowing the way, showing the way, going the way*, (pp. 4-27). Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.
- Achilles, C. M. (1999, February). Are training programs in education administration efficient and effective? Paper presented at the National Conference of the American Association of School Administrators. New Orleans, LA.
- Achilles, C. M. (1994a, February). Searching for the golden fleece: The Epic struggle continues. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 30(1), 6-26.
- Achilles, C. M. (1994b). The knowledge base for education administration is far more than content. In J. Burdin & J. Hoyle (Eds.), *Leadership and diversity in education*. (pp. 164-173). Lancaster, PA: Technomic.
- Achilles, C. M. (1991, Spring). Reforming educational administration: An agenda for the 1990s. *Planning and Changing*, 22(1), 23-33.
- Achilles, C. M. (1990, Summer). Research in education administration: One position. *The AASA Professor*, 13(1), 1-4.
- Achilles, C. M. (1988). Unlocking some mysteries of administration and administrator preparation: A reflective prospect. In D. Griffiths, R. Stout, & P. Forsyth (Eds.), *Leaders for America's schools: Final report and papers of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration* (pp. 41-67). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Achilles, C. M. (1985). Building Principal Preparation Programs on Theory, Practice, and Research. Paper presented at the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration. Starkville, MS.
- Achilles, C. M. (1984, Fall). Forecast: Stormy weather ahead for educational administration. *Issues in Education*, 2(2), 127-135.
- Achilles, C. M., Brubaker, D., & Snyder, H. (1992). Organizing and leading for learning: The interplay of school reform and restructuring with preparation program reform and restructuring. In F. C. Wendel (Ed.), *Reforming and Restructuring Education*. UCEA Monograph Series, 21-39.
- Achilles, C. M., & Finn, J. D. (2002). The role of school and district leadership in reform: A case of validity as mistaken identity. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Achilles, C. M., & Nye, B. A. (1996). Education's equivalent of malpractice. Paper presented at The Quality Schools Conference, Oklahoma City, OK.
- Achilles, C. M., & Ramey, M. (1990). Evaluating preparation programs for school administrators. In M. Berney, & J. Ayers (Eds.), *Evaluating Preparation Programs for School Leaders and Teachers in Specialty Areas*. Boston: Kluwer. 13-32.
- Boyan, N. J. (1981). Follow the leader: Commentary on research in educational administration. *Educational Researcher*, 10(2), 6-13, 21.
- Bridges, E. M. (1982). Research on the school administrator: The state-of-the-art, 1967-1980. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 18(3), 12-33.
- Brown, G., Markus, F., & Lucas, S. (1988). Acquired administrative competence: A survey of national distinguished principals. *National Forum of Educational Administration and Supervision Journal*, 5(1), 58-66.
- Carnoy, M., Jacobsen, R., Mishel, L., & Rothstein, R. (2005). *The charter school dust-up*. Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute and Teachers College Press.
- Coleman, D. G., & Achilles, C. M. (1987, Summer). An agenda for program improvement in education administration preparation. *Planning and Changing*, 18(2), 120-127.
- Creighton, T. (2003, August). It's time to take back our profession. Paper presented at the National Conference of the Professors of Educational Administration. Sedona, AZ.
- Culbertson, J. A. (1990, Fall/Winter). Tomorrow's challenges to today's professors of educational administration. *The Record in Education Administration and Supervision*, 11(1), 100-107.
- Culbertson, J. A. (1988). A century's quest for a knowledge base. In N. J. Boyan (ed.), *Handbook of Research in Educational Administration* (pp. 3-27). New York: Longman.
- Culbertson, J. A., Farquhar, R., Gaynor, A., & Shibles, M. (1969). *Preparing Educational Leaders for the Seventies*. Final Report, Project 8-0230, Grant OEG 0-8-080230-2695 (010). U. S. HEW.
- English, F. W. (2005). Educational leadership for sale: Social justice, the ISLLC Standards, and the corporate assault on public schools. In T. Creighton, S. Harris, & J. C. Coleman (Eds). NCPEA (q.v.). 83-106.
- English F. W. (2003, January). The penetration of educational leadership texts by revelation and prophecy: The case of Stephen R. Covey. *Journal of School Leadership*, (12), 4-22.
- Erickson, D. A. (1979). Research on educational administration: The state-of-the-art. *Educational Researcher*, 8(3), 9-14.
- Glasman, N., & Glasman, L. (1997). Connecting the preparation of school leaders to the practice of school leadership. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 72(2), 3-20.
- Glickman, C. (1991, May). Pretending not to know what we know. *Educational Leadership*, 48(8), 4-10.
- Griffiths, D. E. (1988). Educational Administration: Reform PDQ or RIP. UCEA Occasional Paper 88312. Arizona State University. Tempe, AZ: UCEA.
- Griffiths, D. E., Stout, R., & Forsyth, P. (Eds). (1988) *Leaders for America's Schools*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Guthrie, J. (1990). The evaluation of educational management "Eroding myths and emerging models. In B.

- Mitchell, & L. Cunningham (Eds). *Educational Leadership and changing context of families, communities, and schools*. National Society for the Study of Education, pp. 210-231. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Haller, E. J. (1979). Questionnaires and the dissertation in educational administration. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 21(3), 151-168.
- Haller, E. J., Brent, B. O., & McNamara, J. H. (1997, November). Does graduate training in educational administration improve America's schools? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 79(3), 222-227.
- Haller, E. J., & Knapp, T. R. (1985, Summer). Problems and methodology in educational administration. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 21(3), 157-168.
- Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (1996, February). Reassessing the principal's role in school effectiveness: A review of empirical research, 1980-1995. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 32(1), 5-44.
- Hawley, W. D. (1988) Universities and the improvement of school management: Roles for the states. In D. Griffiths, R. Stout, & P. Forsyth (Eds). *Leaders for America's Schools*, pp. 82-88. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Hess, F. M., & Kelly, A. P. (2005, May 18). Learning to Lead? *Education Week*, 44, 32.
- Hoyle, J. R. (1991, Fall/Winter). Educational administration has a knowledge base. *The Record in Educational Administration and Supervision*, 12(1), 21-28.
- Iannaccone, L. (1976, May). *50 years of deed, program, and research in educational administration*. Tel Aviv: University of Tel Aviv.
- Keedy, J. L., & Achilles, C. M. (2001). The intellectual fire power needed for educational administration's new era of enlightenment. In T. Kowalski, & G. Perreault (eds). *21st Century Challenges for School Administrators*, 89-99. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.
- Levine, A. (2005, March). *Educating School Leaders*. New York City: Columbia University.
- McCarthy, M. M. (1998). The "new" educational leadership professor. In R. Muth, & M. Martin (Eds). *Toward the Year 2000: Leadership for Quality Schools. Sixth Annual Yearbook of the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration*, pp. 3-15. Lancaster, PA: Technomic.
- McCarthy, M. M., & Kuh, G. D. (1997). *Continuity and change: The educational leadership professoriate*. Columbia, MO: UCEA.
- McCarthy, M. M., Kuh, G. D., Newell, L. J., & Iacona, C. M. (1988). *Under scrutiny: The educational administration professoriate*. Tempe, AZ: UCEA.
- Murphy, J. (2005, February). Unpacking the foundation of ISLLC "Standards" and addressing concerns in the academic community. *Educational Administration Quarterly* 41(1), 154-191.
- National Policy Board for Educational Administration (1989). *Improving the preparation of school administrators: An agenda for reform*. Charlottesville, VA: Author, University of Virginia.
- Pohland, P. A. (1988). The return of the Mayflower: British Alternatives to American practice. In D. Griffiths, R. Stout, & P. Forsyth (Eds.).
- Rossell, C. H. (1980). Social science research in educational equity cases: A critical review. In D. C Berliner (ed). *Review of Research in Education*, pp. 237-295. Washington, DC: AERA.
- Roy, J. & Mishel, L. (2005). *Advantage none. Re-examining Hoxby's findings of charter school benefits*. Washington, DC: The Economic Policy Institute.
- USA Today. (2005, March 15). Principals pass—then fail, p. 12A.
- Van Meter, E., & Murphy, J. (1997, July). *Using ISLLC standards to strengthen preparation programs in school administration*. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.
- Waters, T., Marzano, R. J., & McNulty, B. (2003). *Balanced leadership: What 30 years of research tells us about the effect of leadership on student achievement*. Aurora, CO: McREL Education Laboratory.

Request for Participation

Rodney Muth, University of Colorado at Denver and Health Sciences Center
rodney.muth@cudenver.edu

As newsletter readers know, the Joint Research Task Force on Educational Leadership, sponsored by UCEA, AERA Division A, NCEA, and AERA-TEA SIG, seeks to document and develop research on educational leadership preparation writ large. Domain 5 of this effort, one of 10 that may become part of a Handbook of Leadership Preparation, focuses on Educational Leadership Faculty. One of the subsections is Preparation and Professional Development of Leadership Faculty, including non-tenure-track faculty such as clinical, adjunct, or instructors.

I have been asked to lead this effort, and, if you are interested in joining me in this section, I would be happy to have you sign on. Our charge between now and UCEA, November 10-13, is to develop an initial bibliography as well as a provisional outline of what might constitute a "section" or "chapter" on the preparation and professional development of leadership faculty. If you want to join me in putting together this section, please let me know ASAP, particularly whether you have any resources in this area that you can contribute. Then, as soon as we know our complement and our needs, we can agree on dispersing the responsibilities proportionately and develop a time line that will get us ready for UCEA.

I look forward to hearing from you at your earliest convenience.

Listening to Leaders: Margaret Grogan's Insights on "Women Leading Systems"

Diane Hodgins, Florida State University

Margaret Grogan is Professor and Chair of the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis, University of Missouri-Columbia. She directs the Hook Center for Educational Leadership and District Renewal and was the 2003-2004 President of the University Council for Educational Administration. Her research focuses on women in leadership, the superintendency, moral and ethical dimensions of leadership, and leadership for social justice. She is the author of *Voices of Women Aspiring to the Superintendency* (1996) and a co-author (with **Ernestine Enomoto**, and **Mary Gardiner**) of *Coloring outside the Lines: Mentoring Women into Educational Leadership* (2000). Her most recent work, with **C. Cryss Brunner**, was a study commissioned by the AASA which investigated women in the superintendency and central-office positions. Dr. Grogan was interviewed by **Diane Hodgins**, a doctoral student in Educational Leadership at Florida State University.

Diane Hodgins (DH): According to a recent study, only 18% of the nation's superintendents are women, while the teaching profession is still dominated by women. Is this an issue?

Margaret Grogan (MG): It is an issue not only because women dominate the teaching profession, but most graduate programs as well—especially at the doctoral level. The superintendency does not require a doctorate but there is an indication that women interested in advancing their careers are doing doctoral work. Since in most educational leadership doctoral programs, at least 50% or more of all students are women, it is a significant issue. When I first started my research in this area, I was told that women just simply didn't want those positions. I tried to unravel this question in my first book and found that was not the case. I interviewed 24 women who were aspiring to the superintendency and I had at least double that number to choose from. In my most recent research with Cryss Brunner, we found that 40% of the central office population that we surveyed, which included over 400 women, indicated they are aspiring to the superintendency. With that context in mind it still seems to me that 18% is not enough. It is better than it was—when I first began to research it

was about 5%. I am glad the numbers have improved, but it is not where it needs to be.

DH: Why aren't there more women superintendents, given that there are many qualified and interested candidates?

MG: This is due to a combination of factors. For a lot of women, their career path looks different from men's, who tend to take a more traditional path to the position. The traditional superintendent's path usually entails moving from a teaching position into a principalship, often a high school principalship. That person has also commonly been a coach. Then, in larger districts, that person becomes a central office administrator, most likely an assistant superintendent, and often they deal with facilities or personnel. The reason that the responsibility for facilities becomes important is that a lot of superintendents either have to renovate or build new buildings. Many women come through either the curriculum and instructional ranks, or special education and some school boards don't view the qualifications they bring to the table the same way they view the qualifications their male counterparts bring.

An interesting point that came out of the most recent research was that women in central office positions often earn quite a good salary. In fact, in some larger districts more than they would earn as a superintendent in a smaller district – making it less attractive for women to move into just any superintendency. I don't want to say that this issue is peculiar to women but I think it is a reality that sometimes it is hard to make that move to the first superintendency if you are well paid at the assistant level.

DH: How have the positions of principal and superintendent changed since you began your research?

MG: I see women doing more networking than when I first began my research. Some state superintendent or administrator organizations have provided more opportunities for women administrators to talk to and hear from women superintendents and other women administrators. It is important to have men involved in networking because in most states men still hold most of the power by the virtue of the fact that they are still in the superintendency in the greatest number. It makes a lot of sense to have everybody, men and women, working together to make sure that the superintendency is a more equitable position.

Mentoring is more available than it was. The term is used more in every day language today than it was ten or fifteen years ago with the introduction of mentoring for new teachers, principals, and superintendents. I still think that the kind of mentoring that is available sometimes is mentoring of like-minded people, so that somebody in a powerful position looks around and sees others who are similar to themselves, whether it is male or female. I still don't see enough mentoring of people who have different mind sets or who come out of different world experiences. In a sense, mentoring

is still largely associated with maintaining the status quo, and that disturbs me because another kind of mentoring needs to take place: a kind of mentoring which is a nurturing of spirit, of transformation, of change. Now, it is happening in some places. There are some really powerful and very forward thinking individuals out there who are mentoring a new generation of transformative leaders, but that is not the norm.

This whole accountability movement has fundamentally changed both positions. The superintendent and principal are doing jobs different from the ones they were doing when I started my research. The simplest change has been attention to achievement, defined very narrowly as standardized test performance. While that constrains principals and superintendents by demanding they focus on improving scores, they are still given freedom to introduce certain site- and district-level policies that focus on the academic and social growth of all children. It helps them recruit and hire teachers with better qualifications when they can. Principals and superintendents who take advantage of these opportunities can encourage transformative practices.

As Cryss and I wrote in a recent article and chapter the changes that have come with the high stakes testing and accountability movement have in fact been positive for women in terms of their chances for the superintendency. This is because a lot of school boards are now recognizing that expertise in teaching and learning is very helpful and these have traditionally been seen as particular strengths of women candidates for the superintendency. Does it mean that every superintendent is hired because of his or her expertise in teaching and learning? No, but because a lot of women have been in the classroom much longer than men and a lot of women have graduate

degrees in some aspect of teaching and learning, it bodes well for the future. There has also been more media attention paid to women's leadership issues. I think it is positive that reporters are writing about it and that the public is hearing about the fact that there are women superintendents. We need to keep public attention on it and get more people into researching it; researching it in ways we haven't even thought of yet. More research will mean we will get a better picture of what is happening, particularly to women as they shape the position to fit their passions and perspectives, and that may have an effect on the position itself. The more a position like the superintendency is reinterpreted and reinvented, the more options individuals have to make it their own.

DH: How has higher education met and/or failed to meet the challenge of providing adequate instruction relevant to today's leadership needs in education?

MG: Higher education needs to be more deliberate in making sure that the content of educational leadership courses includes experiences from women principals and women superintendents. Textbooks must report research on issues of diversity to include all the different ways to look at leadership in the United States. Higher education needs to make sure they recruit and support enough professors that represent all the diverse kinds of leadership.

I also think higher education has to take a more proactive stance in the selection of individuals into leadership preparation. Working together with school districts, institutions of higher education need to form partnerships so that we can identify individuals who for various reasons either may not self-identify, or who may be passed over because they look different, sound

different, and in some way don't fit the traditional mold.

Teacher preparation programs haven't done enough to encourage teachers to think about leadership in a more positive light. A lot of women are in those programs and they leave teacher education with a "we versus they" perspective. "We" being the teachers, "they" being the administration. I think we need to take a more proactive and more encouraging approach with teachers, even in their pre-service, to help them understand how teaching and leadership go together. They can be leaders in the classroom and they can be leaders when they take positions like the principalship. There is no dichotomy between teachers who work with kids and administrators who work with kids. We have to make a greater effort to help everybody see how those things are tightly connected.

One other piece I think higher education can help with is that women who have leadership responsibilities need to talk more about what's good about leadership, what's fun about it. It was very clear in the survey that Cryss and I conducted that women superintendents described the position as highly satisfying in much greater numbers than did men. Yet the myth out there is that it is such a difficult job that a sane woman would not want to take it on. We need to encourage women principals and women superintendents to come and to talk about what they can do as leaders that makes a difference in the lives of kids and families—to sit on panels and tell their stories and so forth. That is very powerful.

The Feature Editor for *Listening to Leaders* is **Jeffrey S. Brooks**, Florida State University. If you would like to submit an interview for publication or would like to contribute to the feature in another way, please contact Jeff at jbrooks@coe.fsu.edu.

Book Review: Climbing the Himalayas of School Leadership: The Socialization of Early Career Administrators (2004)

Author: **Carol A. Mullen**, University of South Florida

Reviewed by **Jan Hutinger**, University of South Florida, jan@aesdata.com

Get out your hiking boots, grab your backpack, and gather your climbing tools. In *Climbing the Himalayas of School Leadership: The Socialization of Early Career Administrators*, Carol Mullen envisions the early socialization of the new administrator as preparing to ascend the summits of a mountain range. Tapping her own trekking experiences, Mullen first introduced the backpacking metaphor into her pedagogy while teaching at the University of South Florida. Replete with the terminology of experienced mountain climbers, Mullen's metaphoric journey reflects the results from her current research, which focuses on the job experiences and program reflections of new assistant principals and principals in Florida. As Mullen writes, "It is what beginning school leaders have construed as important foci in relation to both their administrative roles and preparation programs that are the nucleus of this book" (p. 4). Inviting the reader to engage in *imagineering*, the combination of imagination and knowledge, Mullen personally accompanies the reader through this interactive journey.

Book Format

The book's 17 chapters draw from a mixed-method longitudinal study and are organized into three parts: "Mountaintop View of This Research Travelogue Through High-Power Binoculars," "What Practicing School Leaders Say About Their First Administrative Trek and Then Some," and "Climbing the Summit Using Signposts, Signal Flares, and Backpacking Tips."

Part I, "'Mountaintop View of This Research Travelogue Through High-Power Binoculars,'" focuses on bridging the gap between theory and practice and therefore influencing the content and design of EDL preparation programs. Analogous to binocular vision, Mullen believes the integration of theory and practice is vital to success in the professional domain. By removing theory, practice "would become random acts lacking meaning and coherence" (p. 17).

Part II, "What Practicing School Leaders Say About Their First Administrative Trek and Then Some," provides a list of necessary contents for the trekkers backpack. Each chapter describes an essential metaphoric tool, such as a map, compass, Swiss army knife, rope, and journal, with corresponding educational areas, in addition to survey results and highlights. Chapters provide case studies, reflections and discussions, summit data and analysis, lessons, backpacking tips, and leader activities. Topics include current, relevant issues such as school improvement, crisis management, and racism.

Part III, "Climbing the Summit Using Signposts, Signal Flares, and Backpacking Tips," is an overview of the metaphoric experience. Citing data from this mixed methods approach, Mullen presents an insightful account of the effectiveness of EDL programs. Suggestions for curriculum enhancement at the university level are based on the critical reflection of survey responses. Strategies for specific theory-based exercises center on mentoring relationships, simulations, and applying "relevant research perspectives and information" (p. 245).

Final Thoughts

Mullen has expertly woven a metaphoric guidebook rooted in empirical data and experiential analysis that has great potential to transform the way future educational leaders are prepared. Each chapter is packed with information, insights, and compelling stories that readers will no doubt contemplate well after they have finished. This book gives the aspiring school leader and those responsible for EDL preparation programs a direct link to novice leaders' individual experiences. As Mullen notes, "this multifaceted, multilayered study has accommodated the viewpoints of new administrators so the leadership field can potentially make new strides" (p. 241).

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.

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 Winter 2006 newsletter is **October 10, 2005**. Please send your copy to any newsletter editor: rodney.muth@cudenver.edu, tricia.ferrigno@uky.edu, jbrooks@mail.coe.fsu.edu, jamesc@unlv.nevada.edu

Submission and Publication Schedule

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