

AERA Division A Newsletter

School Leadership News

Issue 12

Summer 2005

VICE PRESIDENT'S CORNER

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

By most accounts, our recent annual meeting was a success, apart from the long distances that participants had to travel between venues. Much credit goes to those who organized the Division A program: Chair **Megan Tschannen-Moran** (College of William and Mary) and her colleagues **Sharon Kruse** (University of Akron), **John Sipple** (Cornell University), **Joseph Johnson** (Ohio Department of Education), **Mary Driscoll** (New York University), and **Juanita Garcia** (University of Texas at Austin). [For information about the 2005 annual meeting, see the Program Committee Report on page 10.] I would also like to thank the officers, chairs, and members of the many committees that contributed to the accessibility and vibrancy of the Division's sessions. [A listing of the 2004-2005 volunteers appears on page 15 of this newsletter.]

As many of you already know, at the 2005 Division A business meeting the membership voted overwhelmingly—and with breathtaking efficiency—to change the divisional name to **Administration, Organization, and Leadership**. The division's newly adopted name acknowledges the field's history, which focused on functions associated with the administration of schools, while emphasizing the two conceptual domains—complex organizations and

leadership—that currently direct the preponderance of scholarship in our field.

In the next year and on several fronts, Division A will continue its efforts to bolster and celebrate excellence in scholarship on administration, organization, and leadership. First, the division will continue its collaboration to advance research on the preparation of educational leaders, which is a most timely and pressing topic. Second, I have asked the Division's Awards Committee to develop a proposal for additional awards to honor outstanding scholarship in our field. Third, I have joined **Carolyn Herrington**, Division L Vice President, in organizing an ad hoc committee to review the annual David L. Clark National Graduate Student Research Seminar with an eye to strengthening the link between future scholars and outstanding researchers in our field. Finally, the Executive Committee has recommended the formation of a task force to examine how our field can enhance the preparation of researchers on administration, organization, and leadership.

I urge Division A members to participate in and support these efforts. As scholars, our chief warrant in working to expand educational opportunity lies in the quality of our research. Thus, I ask you to join the Division in enhancing our field's research capacity and in celebrating research excellence.

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

We would like to introduce to you a new member of our newsletter editorial staff. **James Crawford** (University of Nevada-Las Vegas) responded to our invitation to assist in “any way needed” to expand and improve the Division A newsletter. We hope that having another set of eyes to review and edit copy will help us meet our publication deadlines. Thank you, James! We invite other members to join in helping us expand the Division A newsletter to meet the interests of our members.

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. In the hopes of beginning dialogue about **Rodney Ogawa’s** plan to form a task force about researcher preparation in our field, the editorial team offers a commentary about contrasting perspectives presented by **Patrick Forsyth** in the Fall 2004 issue and by **Lars Björk** and **James Rinehart** in the Spring 2005 issue beginning on page 3.

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

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.

Highlights of the Summer 2005 Issue

This issue includes a **Commentary** by the newsletter editors about contrasting perspectives of previously published **Perspectives** and an invitation to members to respond to those articles (pp. 3-4). This **Listening to Leaders** interview presents **Martha McCarthy’s** “Advice to New Faculty and Thoughts on School Law Instruction” (p. 5). The annual **Secretary’s Report** written by **Gary Crow** begins on page 7, followed by reports by the 2005 Program Chair **Megan Tschannen-Moran** (p. 10) and International Committee Chair **Selahattin Turan** (p. 11). See pages 12-13 for announcements about the School Technology Leadership Initiative by **Scott McLeod** and publication opportunities with *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning* by Editor **Carol Mullen**. The Division A **listing of volunteers for 2004-2005** appears on page 15. If you would like to volunteer or become involved in Division A activities, please contact **Rodney Ogawa** (rtogawa@ucsc.edu).

COMMENTARY: Contrasting Perspectives and Invitation to Dialogue

Rodney Muth
University of Colorado at Denver
rodney.muth@cudenver.edu

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

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

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

Editors' Note: *In recent Division A newsletters, issues have been raised about the need to support students seeking to be researchers and the general difficulty of engineering support for students in educational administration. The question is one that has perplexed the field of educational administration since support for graduate education in educational administration waned 30 or so years ago. Thus, we ask, Can we create ways of investing in the professional development of educational leadership at all levels?*

An interesting juxtaposition of two commentaries, voiced first by Immediate Past VP **Patrick Forsyth** (Oklahoma State University) during his address to Division A during the 2004 AERA annual meeting, which was published in the Fall 2004 newsletter, and then by **Lars Björk** (University of Kentucky) and **James Rinehart** (University of Kentucky) in the Spring 2005 issue, outlined the problem well.

Forsyth (2004) said that

Institutions of higher education need to strengthen support for education researchers. For example, universities might establish a science-based track where students who so choose would study advanced research methods and design (both qualitative and quantitative), including structural equation modeling and hierarchical linear modeling. Rather than just be elected by only a few, such a track would be expected of those considering research careers. This approach could be coupled with a research internship including full-time engagement with an active research team of senior scholars—at a rival university, if necessary. (p. 8)

Long-standing challenges in preparation of future educational administrators were raised by Björk and Rinehart (2005):

Currently, states have been reluctant to support full-time internships, and aspiring administrators are not financially able to support themselves while gaining work experience. As a consequence, the majority of aspiring superintendents continue to self-select into graduate degree and licensure programs, attend on a part-time basis, hold mid-level administrative positions, and have family obligations that preclude participation in extensive field-based activities. The lack of time to participate in substantive field-based work experiences is a serious limitation for students in educational administration programs. (p. 8)

Provocative Contrast

While Forsyth rightly argues the need for doctoral-level support for professional research activities, Björk and Rinehart suggest that states and other authorities are unwilling—more likely unable—to provide support for “extensive field-based activities” that can facilitate more substantive, necessary, and concentrated preparation experiences. On the one hand, Forsyth charges us to provide opportunities for full-time engagement for would-be researchers in doctoral programs. On the other, we are told that, while efficacious, such opportunities are virtually impossible to implement under current and foreseeable conditions.

Even though these two perspectives speak to different levels and types of preparation, they raise multiple issues that face educational administration, and we might profitably engage in a conversation about them to see what solutions might surface. For starters, below are a few questions that occur to us, intended simply to stimulate our thinking about ways to address the long-standing concern.

1. Can we develop partnerships with districts such that the districts support one or more students for part-time study?
2. Can we design programs with partner districts that engage only those who already evidence leadership and in whom the district might want to invest?
3. Can states be encouraged to underwrite to some degree the preparation of researchers whose initial fieldwork is with the supporting agency?
4. Can programs affiliate with “problem donors” who seek help and pay for that help by investing in students: either those

preparing to be researchers or those developing as educational leaders at levels useful to the donor?

5. Can consortia of districts organize leadership academies, which partner with universities, using a “Wednesday only” approach that releases those in preparation one day per week for classes and field assignments that provide assistance to the releasing districts?

Invitation to Dialogue

Per the request of the Executive Committee, **Rodney Ogawa** (rtogawa@ucsc.edu) will be appointing a task force to examine ways for our field to enhance the preparation of researchers. If you have (a) ideas that you want to share, (b) questions that you would like to raise, (c) proposals for solutions, (d) practices in which you already are invested which others might find useful, or (e) other points that you want to get into the mix, please join the conversation by sending your comments to the editors. We will print the results in future newsletters and continue the conversation as appropriate.

Editors’ Footnote: *While preparing this newsletter issue, the editors themselves responded differently to the provocative contrast in the two commentaries published last year and enjoyed the opportunity to reflect about the concerns and ideas presented by Forsyth and by Björk and Rinehart. We look forward to reading comments by our colleagues and sharing them with the Division A membership.*

Do you have a response to the *Perspectives* or this *Commentary* that you would like to share with Division A members?

Please send an e-copy to the Editors!

Division A is now known as *Administration, Organization, and Leadership*. Does the name of the Division A Newsletter need to change, too? If so, please offer suggestions to the editors!

Listening to Leaders: Martha M. McCarthy's Advice to New Faculty and Thoughts on School Law Instruction

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

Martha M. McCarthy is a Chancellor's Professor in the Educational Leadership and Policy Studies Department at Indiana University (IU) and the Director of the High School Survey of Student Engagement (HSSSE). Professor McCarthy specializes in educational law and policy and has published widely in these areas over the past 30 years. Her current research interests include church-state relations, equity issues such as sexual harassment, reform of leadership preparation programs, and student engagement. Over her career Professor McCarthy has received numerous awards for her leadership and scholarship that include the McGhehey Award for Contributions to the Field of School Law and the Living Legend Award presented by the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration. She received the Roald F. Campbell Lifetime Achievement Award in November 2004 at the annual convention of the University Council for Educational Administration. Professor McCarthy was interviewed by Amy M. Steketee (Indiana University), associate instructor and doctoral student in the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies.

Amy Steketee (AS): I imagine that your experience as one of the first women to integrate the educational leadership professoriate has heightened your sensitivity to the concerns of newly appointed faculty members. What is your advice for new members of the educational leadership professoriate?

Martha McCarthy (MM): One thing I have learned is the value of networking. I urge new faculty to network with colleagues in other units at their own institutions and with faculty across universities. This was a necessity when I entered the professoriate because there were so few women in educational leadership units; connecting with other women across campus and at other universities was crucial in order to establish a support group. Networking remains important for most new faculty members because they often find themselves alone in their unit in terms of their area of specialization. By connecting with faculty members elsewhere who share your interests, not only do you gain support from these colleagues, but also you can collaborate on research projects.

Closely related is the importance of involvement in professional associations. I would urge new faculty members to identify a niche where they can feel comfortable right away. It might be a Special Interest Group in AERA or a

professional organization. For me, it was the Education Law Association. The important thing is to align yourself with a group that is small enough for you to become involved quickly in meaningful ways. Participation in larger organizations, such as AERA and UCEA, also has benefits. At the national meetings of these groups, new faculty can interact with the senior people in the field. One reason I suggested that UCEA start holding conventions almost two decades ago was to encourage such conversations and collaboration across institutions. And it has happened!

AS: You mentioned networking. Didn't you start a Network of Women Administrators in Indiana?

MM: Yes, and I am very proud of this group. After I had been at IU for a few years, a female graduate student (there were not many in those days) came to me and shared that she and the few other female students felt uncomfortable attending the School Administration Workshop. Most of the male participants in the Workshop knew each other, and the women felt that they were outsiders. I arranged for a reception prior to the Workshop's opening dinner so at least the women could meet each other and go to the dinner together. This evolved into the Indiana Network of Women Administrators, which still continues to meet at least annually. The sessions

have become quite substantive. The Network now has very influential members, including the state superintendent of public instruction and the past president of the Indiana superintendents' association. When the Network started, however, its members were primarily aspiring school administrators—none were superintendents.

AS: What is your advice regarding the expectations of scholarly research, writing, and publishing?

MM: I suggest that new faculty NOT try to publish their dissertations as books, at least initially. They might start with an article from their dissertation instead. I have seen several very bright young colleagues spend so much time trying unsuccessfully to publish their dissertations that they did not write articles and thus failed to get tenure. That first article is the most difficult to write, but if you persevere, it will get published.

My advisor at the University of Florida, **Forbis Jordan**, gave me some advice about my dissertation that I think is equally valid for new faculty who are trying to write articles. He said not to let a day pass without doing work on my dissertation until it was finished. I adhered to that advice as a new faculty member by writing something every day. At times I did not write much if I got home late after teaching off campus, but I edited or wrote something. If you always have a research project in progress and do a little on it each day, your publication record will be fine. But if you put writing aside for a week, it is easier to let it go for another week, and before you know it the semester has slipped away. And when you take a hiatus from a project, your notes get cold. By the time you get back to it, you may be starting over or at least reviewing a lot to get back into it.

In addition to writing regularly, it is important to have something to say! It is crucial to identify research themes that really engage you. Writing is not easy; I still go through MANY drafts with every piece I write. If the topic is not meaningful to you, your interest will quickly wane. And do

not get discouraged when submissions are rejected. This happens to everyone!

It is helpful to get senior faculty members to review your work. When I was new in the field, I was very hesitant to ask senior faculty to do this, in part because I did not want to infringe on their time and partly because I was insecure regarding my own work. But you *should* ask others to review your manuscripts: Their suggestions will be helpful as you revise your work, and it is also beneficial to have others know the substance of your research. Many institutions, including my own, now have a formal mentoring system, which I applaud. But you should go beyond your assigned mentor and ask senior faculty to give you suggestions. They will gladly do so. I still remember getting a two-page critique of a manuscript from Egon Guba.

AS: You have been instrumental in cementing legal instruction as an integral component of the educational leadership and teacher-preparation programs at IU. What role does legal instruction play in developing school leaders?

MM: I feel passionate about that. It seems that school law has been slighted when we have given attention to redesigning leadership preparation programs. In fact, sometimes law is left out of the conversation altogether. There is some sentiment that the law is just a technical skill—rules and regulations that must be followed, and thus, students do not need to study school law. I strongly disagree! You cannot just give school leaders a handbook with the legal requirements and assume that is enough. Legal instruction should be an integral part of leadership preparation at all levels and should be part of the teacher preparation program as well. Ideally, school law should permeate the curriculum instead of being taught as a separate course.

AS: Why is understanding school law so important?

MM: Certainly, it is necessary for educators to know basic legal requirements and practice preventive law. But it is far more important for them to understand and appreciate the role of law in safeguarding freedoms and giving structure to our democratic society. Those preparing to be teachers and school leaders should reflect on how values such as equity, justice, and fairness are embodied in the law; acquiring a legal perspective can help them be better educators. They also should explore the tension between majority rule and protecting minority rights, the interaction between law and ethics, and the role

of civil disobedience. And my sincere hope is that this understanding and appreciation of the evolving nature of the law will then be transmitted to students in elementary and secondary schools. We are not doing a very good job of this currently. Now more than ever, our young people need to understand their rights and responsibilities and their role in creating and changing laws. But too often educators transmit a disdain for the law instead. Many teachers and administrators view the law as establishing a barrier rather than assisting them in performing their jobs. This is, indeed, unfortunate!

Do you know someone who we should interview for the *Listening to Leaders* column? Please contact Jeff Brooks.

SECRETARY'S REPORT

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

Rodney Ogawa (University of California-Santa Cruz), Division A Vice President, called the meeting to order at 6:15pm. Ogawa welcomed members and made several announcements:

Outstanding Research Awards. **Catherine Lugg** (Rutgers University) has been recruited to convene an ad hoc committee to develop Division A awards for outstanding research (e.g., book, conference presentations). Division A members interested in working on this committee should contact Lugg.

Research in Educational Administration. **Bill Firestone** (Rutgers University) notified the group of an upcoming book about an agenda for research in educational administration to be published by Teachers College Press. The book, coauthored by Firestone and **Carolyn Riehl** (University of North Carolina-Greensboro), is based on the work by the Division A Task Force on Research in Educational Administration.

Continued Task Force Charge. The Division A Executive Committee discussed a third phase for the Task Forces on Research in Educational Administration. The Vice President will appoint co-chairs of a new group focusing on how to prepare graduate students to conduct high quality research in the field.

Program Chairs Named. Ogawa announced that **Mary Driscoll** (New York University) will be the Program Chair for the next annual meeting in San Francisco, which will be held **Saturday, April 8 through Wednesday, April 12, 2006**. This Saturday-to-Wednesday schedule is a major change for AERA, and Ogawa asked members attending the meeting to share the news with those not present. **Michael Dantley** (Miami University) will serve as the 2007 Program Chair.

Next on the agenda were reports by committees. Ogawa introduced chairs as each moved to the podium to share news with members present.

Program Committee. Chair **Megan Tschannen-Moran** (College of William and Mary) thanked the section chairs for the work on the 2005 conference program: **Sharon Kruse** (University of Akron), **John Sipple** (Cornell University), **Joseph Johnson** (Ohio Department of Education), **Mary Driscoll** (New York University), and **Juanita Garcia** (University of Texas at Austin). She presented the following statistics at the meeting (see page 10 in this newsletter for the complete report):

- Approximately 500 proposals were received.
- 42% of the proposals were accepted.
- Division A held 75 sessions (28 symposia, 42 paper sessions, 4 roundtable sessions, 1 poster session).

Tschannen-Moran discussed the challenge for the committee to receive on-time reviews; many individuals who agreed to review proposals did not. She also stated that the AERA proposal system now has the capacity to identify “delinquent reviewers” over the years so that program chairs can avoid assigning proposals to them. Several members mentioned problems they had with the electronic system, and Tschannen-Moran responded that she has given suggestions to AERA for improving the proposal system. Driscoll told members that a longer review time will be available next year and encouraged members to volunteer as reviewers.

Affirmative Action Committee. Division A Affirmative Action Officer **James Earl Davis** (Temple University) described the work of these officers and the AERA Affirmative Action Council, which is composed of all Division affirmative action officers. He announced that the Council has developed a handbook for the divisions and that **Chris Brown** is the new AERA Director of Social Justice. Davis is now soliciting names for the 2006 Affirmative Action Committee, who will be appointed by the Vice President. He also reported that data on participation demonstrates that the Division is on its way to meeting goals. Members from the audience encouraged the committee to publish participation data in the Division newsletter.

Membership/New Member Committee. Chair **Fran Kochan** (Auburn University) introduced the 2005 committee and announced that **Cindy Reed** (Auburn University) will be the next chair. Kochan described the work of the committee as “attracting, maintaining, and engaging members” and remarked that getting information about new members from AERA should improve next year. She announced that over 35 individuals attended the New Member Orientation Meeting held on Monday, April 11 and estimated that Division A gained between 60 and 70 new members this year. A survey will be sent to new members to get their perceptions about areas for improvement.

Mentoring Committee. Chair **Janice Fauske** (University of South Florida) described the two sessions for new faculty included in the conference program: (a) tenure and promotion, and (b) mentoring scholars of color. She described the challenge of getting the word out to potential participants and asked senior faculty to recommend new faculty that might benefit from the work conducted by the committee. Fauske announced that **Linda Tillman** (University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill) will be the next chair.

International Committee. Chair **Selahattin Turan** (Osmangazi University, Turkey) reminded members of the committee’s goal to stimulate cross-national collaboration and to provide opportunities for those from other nations to contribute to Division A. The focus for this year’s international symposia was the worldwide work of principals; 37 scholars attended the session. He encouraged more members to participate in the international sessions. [See complete report on page 11 of this newsletter.]

Division A Newsletter. Co-Editor **Tricia Browne-Ferrigno** (University of Kentucky) reminded members that the current newsletter is posted on the Division A Web site and that many past newsletters are also archived there. She introduced Associate Editor **Jeffrey Brooks** (Florida State University) who described a new feature of the newsletter, “Listening to Leaders,” which presents the work of Division A members

in an interview format between junior and senior faculty. Browne-Ferrigno announced that a special addendum to the Spring 2005 issue, a collaborative response to the Levine report, was currently posted on the Web site. She encouraged committee chairs to update their listing of co-chairs for the Summer 2005 issue to archive this year's listing of volunteers.

Graduate Student Seminar. UCEA Executive Director **Michelle Young** (University of Missouri-Columbia) presented an overview of the 2005 David L. Clark National Graduate Student Seminar. She announced that 85 students were nominated, the largest number in the history of the seminar, and that 45 were selected to attend. She also introduced the planning committee: **Michael Dantley** (Miami University), **Laura Hassler** (Florida State University), **Carolyn Herrington** (Florida State University) **Meredith I. Honig** (University of Maryland-College Park), **George Petersen** (California Polytechnic State University-San Luis Obispo), and **C. John Tarter** (St. Johns University).

Task Force on Research on Leadership Preparation. **Michelle Young** also discussed the work by a joint task force sponsored by Division A, UCEA, TEA SIG, and NCPEA. The goal of this task force is to publish a handbook on research on leadership preparation. Ten domains have been identified, facilitators were selected, and a preliminary work session that included interested contributors was held during the 2005 AERA annual meeting. She encouraged members to get involved in this work.

Following the committee reports, Ogawa asked presenters to make the 2005 award announcements:

Davis Award. UCEA Executive Director **Michelle Young** and *EAQ* Editor **Diana Pounder** (University of Utah) announced winners **Marilynn Tallerico** (Syracuse University) and **Jackie M. Blount** (Iowa State University) for their article, "Women and the Superintendency: Insights from Theory and History," which appears in the December 2004 issue. They also announced that the selection committee awarded honorable mention to **Gail C. Furman** (Washington State University) and **David A. Gruenewald** (Washington State University) for their February 2004 article, "Expanding the Landscape of Social Justice: A Critical Ecological Analysis." Young and Pounder thanked the selection committee: **Helen Marks** (The Ohio State University), **Susan Printy** (University of Michigan), **Betty Malen** (University of Maryland), and **Larry Parker** (University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign).

Division A Outstanding Dissertation Award. Chair **Donald Hackmann** (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign) announced the 2005 winner **George Theoharis** for his dissertation, *At No Small Cost: Social Justice Educational Leaders and Their Response to Resistance*, chaired by **Colleen Capper** (University of Wisconsin-Madison). Hackmann also announced two honorable mentions: (a) **Courtney Bell** who wrote *Parents' View of School Choice: An Unexamined Perspective* with advice from **Gary Sykes** (Michigan State University); and (b) **Claribel Torres-Lugo** who presented *Principals' Assessment of Florida's Accountability Model: A Descriptive Overview of School Factors Associated with High Stakes Accountability*, mentored by **Larry Daniel** (University of North Florida).

At the conclusion of the award presentations, Ogawa thanked all committee chairs and members for their contribution to the work of the Division. The next item on the agenda concerned changing the name of Division A. Ogawa discussed the extensive consideration over two Vice Presidents' tenure of a possible name change for the Division. He also reminded the members that the Division's By-Laws require that any consideration of by-law changes must be announced prior to the meeting, which was done in previous issues of the Division A Newsletter. The Division A Executive Committee recommended that the name of Division A be changed to **Administration, Organization, and Leadership**. The motion was seconded. A "call the question" motion was immediately offered from the floor and seconded. The vote to change the name was almost unanimous.

Ogawa reminded members of the reception following the business meeting and adjourned the meeting.

Support the work of Division A: Contact Rodney Ogawa ASAP to volunteer!

Program Committee Report

Megan Tschannen-Moran, 2005 Chair
College of William and Mary
mxtsch@wm.edu

I want to thank the members of the 2005 Division A Program Committee. The most rewarding part of being program chair was the opportunity to work with a great team of section chairs. These fine people were **Sharon Kruse** (Section 1, Leadership), **John Sipple** (Section 2, School Organizations and Effects), **Joseph Johnson** (Section 3, School Improvement), **Mary Driscoll** (Section 4, School Context and Community), and **Juanita Garcia** (Section 5, Leadership Development). The work was time consuming, and we were all doing it on top of all of the other things that normally fill our days. My committee members worked hard, remained patient and steadfast in the face of significant technology challenges, completed their work on schedule, and especially enjoyable for me, were fun to work with. I am so grateful for each of them and the gift of time and expertise that they offered the division.

The program committee met in Washington, DC, on October 1-2, 2004, to put together the program for the 2005 annual meeting in Montreal. We were pleased with the overall quality of the proposals. Because the number of proposals was up from last year, as was our proportion of the total submissions to AERA, our allotment of sessions was slightly higher than last year.

A goal of the AERA council and central staff, as well as President Marilyn Cochran-Smith and Program Chair Ana Maria Villegas, was to improve the quality of the annual meeting by improving the review process for proposals. We had some success in that endeavor, but still face significant challenges. The biggest change was in collecting information on reviewer qualifications, including a sample of three representative publications and status (doctorate or masters) and in making that information available to the section chairs as they assigned reviewers. This allowed for a much more careful matching process of reviewers to proposals. To those people who stepped up to the plate to complete reviews, we extend a warm word of thanks. One of the lessons that I take away from my two years serving on the program committee is the vital role of the reviewers. The five section chairs could not have made a fair assessment of the nearly 500 proposals without relying on the expertise of a small army of reviewers.

We faced two big challenges in the review process. First, we had a significant shortage of reviewers in the reviewer pool. This resulted in some people being assigned more proposals than they had volunteered to review, although we tried hard to keep it within one or two over. In addition, due to a technology glitch, people who had volunteered for other roles (discussant or chair) showed up in the reviewer pool and were also therefore assigned reviews that they had not volunteered to do.

The second major challenge was the problem of delinquent reviewers. On the morning after our extended deadline for reviews (extended because of a system crash at All Academic on the final weekend of our reviewing window), *half* of our nearly 500 proposals were listed as incomplete, meaning that they still had one or more missing reviews. This was alarming because the design of the All Academic system meant that those proposals could not move forward to be available to place into sessions until they were complete. And AERA has a commitment that every proposal should have at least two reviews. Our

section chairs faced a formidable challenge to bring those nearly 250 proposals to completion in just a little over a week’s time so that they would be ready for consideration at our meeting.

As a division, we need to strengthen the sense of professional commitment to the review process for the annual meeting so that more people volunteer to review. We also need to foster greater citizenship so that reviewers complete the reviews they are assigned. In most cases, reviewers had over a month to complete their work. **Diana Pounder** (University of Utah) has suggested that we articulate as a professional norm that authors commit to at least three reviews for every submission they make, whether a conference proposal or a journal article.

Of our 75 substantive sessions, we accepted 28 symposiums and created 42 papers sessions, 4 roundtable sessions, and 1 poster session. We accepted 206 papers and 28 symposia for an acceptance rate of 47%. We co-listed two of our sessions with the Organizational Theory SIG and transferred 8 papers from Section 5 to the Teaching in Educational Administration SIG for inclusion in two roundtable sessions highlighting research on leadership preparation. That was especially good given thrust of the new Joint Task Force between Division A and UCEA to encourage research on education leadership preparation.

<u>Section</u>	<u>Proposals</u>	<u>Reviewers</u>	<u>Sessions</u>	<u>Symposia</u>	<u>Paper Sessions</u>
A			7	5	
1	161 (166)	163	22	6	16
2	89 (91)	63	12	4	8
3	79 (86)	73	11	6	5
4	77 (81)	54	11	4	6
5	86 (87)	91	12	7	5
Total	492 (511)		75	28	42

In before- and after-hours slots we created our business meeting and reception, and a new member orientation. Two mentoring sessions were included in the program slots, one on writing for publication (an interactive symposium with journal editors) and another on promotion and tenure.

A complete list of the Division A sessions was printed as a pull-out section of the Spring 2005 issue of the Division A newsletter. Despite the logistical challenges in Montreal, including many small rooms and meeting space spread across multiple settings, the sessions were generally well attended and well received. I am very grateful to have had this opportunity to serve in the capacity of program chair. I have learned a lot and have especially enjoyed getting to know new colleagues.

International Committee Report

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

The Ad Hoc International Committee is concerned with the quality of research and its application to the administration of education in an international context. In other words, the aims of this committee are (a) to stimulate cross-national communication and collaboration on issues of shared interest, (b) to stimulate interest in comparative approaches among North American researchers, and (c) to provide opportunities for people from non-English speaking countries to participate and play an active role in the division A program.

Our design of the 2005 symposium was guided by the history of the International Committee and by evaluative remarks of participants during the 2001, 2002, 2003 and 2004 sessions. In the 2001 and 2002 sessions, the focus was on the *preparation of school leaders* and the *meaning of learning communities in schools*. In the 2003 symposium, we built on results of the previous years by taking the emerging networks around these themes as the starting points for discussions in two roundtable groups. The 2004 session theme was *international developments in theory and research in educational administration*.

During the 2005 annual meeting we examined the *life and work of principals worldwide*. The purpose of this year's interactive symposium was to examine and explore the context and characteristics of the principalship in developing countries and to examine similarities and differences between principals in developed and developing countries and within the latter. The papers and data on the principalship, patterns of leadership styles, and managerial aspects of the principal's role were discussed. The papers shared common features such as limited autonomy, autocratic leadership style, summative evaluation, low degree of change initiation, values of principals, and lack of instructional leadership functions. Theoretical implications, suggestions for comparative educational policy and reforms, and challenges of burnout, subjective role perceptions, and careers in leadership were analyzed. Participants in the symposium included **Jeroen GM Imants** (University of Nymegen), **Stephan G. Huber** (University of Erfurt), **Edith J. Cisneros-Cohernour** (University of Yucatan), **Izhar J. Oplatka** (Ben Gurion University), **Lejf Moos** (The Danish University of Education), **Anthony C. Townsend** (Florida Atlantic University), **Donald A. Wise** (California State University–Fresno), **Christopher Sny** (Bowie State University), **Jennie M. Billot** (UNITEC New Zealand), **David Jackson** (National College for School Leadership), **Charles L. Slater** (Texas State University–San Marcos), **Mel West** (University of Manchester), **Helen R. Wildy** (Murdoch University), **Manfred Lang** (University of Kiel), and **Cemil Yucel** (Afyonkocatepe University). **Aimee A. Howley** (Ohio University) and **Charles Webber** (University of Calgary) served as discussants, and **Selahattin Turan** (Osmangazi University) chaired the symposium.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Preparing Technology-Literate Administrators

Scott McLeod
University of Minnesota
mcleod@umn.edu

The School Technology Leadership Initiative (STLI) at the University of Minnesota was created to help address the critical nationwide shortage of administrators who can effectively facilitate implementation of technology in schools and school districts. The STLI offers 15 one-credit school technology leadership courses that can be taken for degree, licensure, and/or professional development purposes. These courses are offered both on campus and online and can be taken individually or as part of a School Technology Leadership graduate certificate program. The STLI graduate certificate is the first and only academic program in the country to comprehensively address the breadth and depth of ISTE's National Educational Technology Standards for Administrators (NETS-A).

The STLI works through its Postsecondary Partnership Program (P3) to enhance the technology-related preparation practices of other university educational leadership programs. The STLI currently has 15 university partners involved in P3. These institutions receive license-free access to STLI lesson plans, teaching activities, and other resources as well as a free site visit to the University of Minnesota.

The American Institutes for Research (AIR) is serving as the STLI's external evaluator. AIR's three-year summative evaluation is based upon a mixed-methods approach that includes the collection and analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data on graduate certificate cohort participants. Results to date have shown statistically significant, positive impacts on cohort students' technology leadership knowledge, skills, and abilities.

The STLI is supported by nearly 40 corporate, organizational, and institutional partners and offers a number of other resources for K-12 technology leaders. More information about the STLI is available at www.schooltechleadership.org.

Publication Opportunities for Authors and Reviewers

Carol A. Mullen, Editor
University of South Florida
cmullen@coedu.usf.edu

Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning invites manuscripts from Division A members and from authors in the educational leadership field. This international refereed journal has quickly become the major resource to exchange information on mentoring and tutoring and collaboration and learning, particularly in schools, further and higher education, hospitals, industry, and the management professions. The journal publishes papers and reports on all aspects of mentoring, tutoring, and partnership. The criteria for acceptance of papers are that they are analytical/empirical and critical, add to scholarship in the field, and that the ideas being presented have possible relevance to learning situations in other educational systems and cultures and are accessible to an international audience.

Doctoral students and junior professors are encouraged to submit their excellent works for review. The mentoring aspects of editorship and review are being upheld through timely feedback, supportive critiques, and guidance for authors. Feel free to email me an abstract or a paper (maximum of 30 pages) prior to formal submission. I will be happy to preview your work in a timely manner. The acceptance rate of the journal currently is 25%. Notably, the turnaround time for the review process is relatively short—typically no more than 2 months! If you are willing to review for the journal, please let me know.

The "Reviews" section of the journal is a forum in which contributors discuss topical mentoring issues, as well as critique and analyze related books, documents, pieces of artwork, education policies and legislation, and teaching materials. Contributions should be no more than 2,000 words and double-spaced. Please send reviews to

Harriett Arnold harnold@pacific.edu
M&T Reviews Editor (2005)
University of the Pacific
Gladys L Benerd School of Education
3601 Pacific Avenue
Stockton, CA 95211, USA.

**Do you have news or an announcement to share?
If so, please send your information the editors!**

FUTURE ISSUES

Deadline for submitting material to be included in the Fall 2005 newsletter is **August 10, 2005**. Please send your copy to any newsletter editor: rodnev.muth@cudenver.edu, tricia.ferrigno@uky.edu, jbrooks@mail.coe.fsu.edu, jamesc@unlv.nevada.edu

Submission and Publication Schedule

Issue Date	Deadline for Submissions	Submitted to AERA	Published Online	Announced Via E-mail
Fall 2005	August 10	September	September	September 10
Winter 2006	October 10	November	December	December 10
Spring 2006	January 10	February	March	March 10
Summer 2006	May 10	June	July	July 10

Regular Newsletter Features

Vice President's Corner: A regular feature, the Vice President provides commentary about Division A events, business and expectations for the Division.

Secretary's Report: An occasional item, the minutes of Division A's annual business meeting are featured in the summer issue.

Graduate Students Update: News and announcements from Division A's graduate student representatives.

From the Editors: This section appears regularly and supplies notes about the current and upcoming issues, requests input, and discusses other editorial concerns.

Listening to Leaders: Interviews by Division members with leadership educators, researchers, policymakers, and others about issues related to AERA, research, teaching and practice, and policies.

Perspective or Commentary: Papers considered for inclusion will be 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.

Member News and Notes: This section includes information about members: what people are doing, what they have accomplished, what they plan for research and with whom, what they are discovering about teaching that others might find interesting, and so forth. Books and articles, special recognitions, and the like are appropriate. If you are interested in helping with this column, please contact the editors.

Regular Features (as appropriate and as available, based upon newsletter publication dates)

- information about Division A committee work supplied by committee chairs
- announcements of calls for papers, dissertation award submissions, and other information
- listings of SIG contact information relevant to Division A members
- listings of annual award winners

Many thanks to all the volunteers this year!

Division A Officers

Vice President & EC Chair

Rodney T. Ogawa
University of California-Santa Cruz
rtogawa@uncsc.edu

Secretary (2003-2005)

Gary Grow
University of Utah
ggrow@ed.utah.edu

Vice President Elect

TBA

Immediate Past Vice President

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

Past Vice Presidents

Karen Seashore
University of Minnesota
klouis@umn.edu

Terry A. Astuto
New York University
ta4@nyu.edu

Immediate Past Secretary

James G. Cibulka
University of Kentucky
cibulka@uky.edu

Affirmative Action Committee

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

Program Committee

Megan Tschannen-Moran
College of William and Mary
mxtsc@wm.edu

Division A Committees

Affirmative Action Committee

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

Awards Committee

Donald G. Hackmann, Chair
University of Illinois at
Urbana-Champaign
dghack@uiuc.edu

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

Graduate Student Representatives

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

**Graduate Student Seminar
Planning Committee**

Michael Dantley
Miami University

Laura Hassler
Florida State University

Carolyn Herrington
Florida State University

Meredith I. Honig
University of Maryland
College Park

George Petersen
CA Polytechnic State University
San Luis Obispo

C. John Tarter
St. Johns University

**Membership/New Members
Committee**

Fran Kochan, Chair
Auburn University
kochafr@groupwise1.duc.auburn.edu

Cynthia J Reed, Co-Chair
Auburn University
reedcyn@auburn.edu

Division Mentoring Program

Janice R. Fauske, Chair
University of South Florida
jfauske@sar.usf.edu

Division A Newsletter Editors

Rodney Muth, Co-Editor
University of Colorado-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

Nominating Committee

TBA

Program Committee

Megan Tschannen-Moran, Chair 2005
College of William and Mary
mxtsch@wm.edu

Sharon Kruse, Chair Section 1
University of Akron
skruse@uakron.edu

John Sipple, Chair Section 2
Cornell University
jws28@cornell.edu

Joseph Johnson, Chair Section 3
The Ohio Department of Education
jfjohnson100@insight.rr.com

Mary Driscoll, Chair Section 4
New York University
mary.discoll@nyu.edu

Juanita Garcia, Chair Section 5
University of Texas at Austin
jwagstarr@mail.utexas.edu

**Ad Hoc Task Force: International
Committee**

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

Ad Hoc Committee: Publications

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