

# AERA Division A Newsletter

## School Leadership News

Issue 10

Winter 2005

### **VICE PRESIDENT'S CORNER**

**Rodney T. Ogawa**  
University of California—Santa Cruz  
[rtoгава@ucsc.edu](mailto:rtoгава@ucsc.edu)

As Pat Forsyth reported at our 2004 Divisional Business Meeting, we will be considering a change in the Division's name. Division A's current appellation is "Administration." Since we are just two months away from meeting in Montreal, I think that we should join the debate over two questions: (a) Should Division A change its name? (b) And, if so, how should we characterize the focus of the Division's scholarship?

To begin the debate, let me offer arguments for both maintaining and changing our Division's name. Both arguments, it seems to me, lie in history. The arguments differ in their interpretation of the history of our field.

#### **Reasons to Keep Division Name**

Division A should remain the unit of the American Educational Research Association that emphasizes research on issues about the "administration" of educational organizations because the field of educational administration has a long and distinguished history. During the 19th century, the U. S. public education system took shape, owing much to the work and influence of educational administrators.

For nearly a century, scholars have conducted studies of the functions of educational administrators and the impact of administrators on performance of schools and school districts.

The scholarly field of educational administration has been reified in several ways, including professional organizations and academic journals.

The most prominent professional organizations in our field, including the University Council for Educational Administration and Division A, bear the stamp of "administration." Moreover, two prominent journals in our field—*Educational Administration Quarterly* and the *Journal of Educational Administration*—obviously emphasize "administration."

Thus, it is in keeping with the history and traditions of our field for Division A to remain the division of AERA devoted to the study of "administration." As I overheard a respected colleague say at our business meeting in San Diego, "If it ain't broken, don't fix it."

#### **Reasons to Change Division Name**

Division A should change its name because the education system is, indeed, "broken" and "administration" reinforces the existing system. The institutional history of the public education system in the U.S. reveals that the "one best system" was intended to use "science" to sort students along lines coincident with economic class and ethnic and racial background. As several scholars have observed, administration involves the maintenance of the system, while leadership involves the alteration of the system. Therefore, if members of Division A are to contribute to altering the educational system to better serve the needs of students from communities that historically have been

underserved—namely students of color and poverty—then the Division should be renamed to reflect better a transformational mission.

### Invitation to Join Debate

So, there you have it. These are my takes on why we should maintain or change the name of

our Division. I invite you to weigh-in on this debate by sending your thoughts to the editors of the Division A Newsletter. I ask that you keep your comments reasonably concise, so that we can report as many and diverse views as possible.

## FROM THE EDITORS

Rodney Muth, Co-Editor, University of Colorado at Denver & Health Sciences Center, [rodney.muth@cudenver.edu](mailto:rodney.muth@cudenver.edu)  
Tricia Browne-Ferrigno, Co-Editor, University of Kentucky, [tricia.ferrigno@uky.edu](mailto:tricia.ferrigno@uky.edu)  
Jeff Brooks, Associate Editor, Florida State University, [jbrooks@mail.coe.fsu.edu](mailto:jbrooks@mail.coe.fsu.edu)

The editors invite members to respond to Rodney Ogawa's debate about Division A name change (Vice President's Corner Winter 2005) and Patrick Forsyth's perspective (Are We Too Broken? Fall 2004). Please send your responses to all three editors.

### 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 ([rtoгава@ucsc.edu](mailto:rtoгава@ucsc.edu)) or the editorial team. Specific suggestions to improve the newsletter layout should be sent to Tricia Browne-Ferrigno ([tricia.ferrigno@uky.edu](mailto: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](mailto:rodney.muth@cudenver.edu)). Copy and other contributions should be sent to all three editors. Please help us keep each other well informed about Division A and our fields.

### Highlights of the Winter 2005 Issue

This issue includes a second installment in our **Listening to Leaders** interview series (page 3). The current **List of Appointments for 2004-2005** appears on page 15. Please notify Tricia Browne-Ferrigno ([tricia.ferrigno@uky.edu](mailto:tricia.ferrigno@uky.edu)) for correction and updates to that listing. If you would like to volunteer or become involved in Division A activities, then please contact Rodney Ogawa ([rtoгава@ucsc.edu](mailto:rtoгава@ucsc.edu)) immediately.

**Send your announcements for the Spring 2005 issue to us ASAP!**  
**Deadline: March 1, 2005**

**LISTENING TO LEADERS: James P. Spillane on Distributed Leadership**

**Jeffrey S. Brooks**  
 Florida State University  
[Jbrooks@mail.coe.fsu.edu](mailto:Jbrooks@mail.coe.fsu.edu)

*James P. Spillane is a faculty member with the School of Educational and Social Policy and a Faculty Fellow from the Institute for Policy Research at Northwestern University. Professor Spillane is Principal Investigator of the Distributed Leadership Project, a longitudinal study of urban school leadership funded by the National Science Foundation and the Spencer Foundation. This program of research is designed to analyze the practice of school leadership in urban elementary schools that are working to improve mathematics, science, and literacy instruction. He was interviewed by Jeffrey S. Brooks (Florida State University), Associate Editor, Division A Newsletter.*

**Jeffrey Brooks (JB):** What is the nature of the relationship between follower and leader from a distributive leadership perspective?

**James Spillane (JS):** A lot of people find the distinction I have drawn between leaders and followers problematic. In part I believe they assume that when I say ‘follower’ that I mean ‘teacher’ and that by using these terms I am suggesting that the follower is in an inferior role to the leader. Of course, in most schools the situation is such that the teacher can be in a leader’s role and you can certainly imagine instances when an administrator or other formal leader is in a follower’s role. I think that these distinctions, even though they are problematic for various reasons, give us some traction to understand leadership. My fear is that if we get rid of these distinctions, if we forget about followers and conceptualize everyone as a leader, they are going to fall through the cracks in our analyses of leadership practice. There are people who see themselves as “The Other,” not the leader, in certain circumstances. There are people who by the virtue of formal designation are a leader, and that brings with it political resources and other advantages. I don’t think we can afford to lose that distinction. For me, the importance of the follower is that the follower is not someone to whom leadership is done, the follower interacts with the leader and thereby contributes to a contextual definition of leadership practice. The follower and the leader, by virtue of how they participate, or don’t participate in leadership activity, can transform the nature of practice.

**JB:** The distinctions you draw bring attention to the concept of power. What is the nature of power in distributive leadership?

**JS:** In popular usage, distributive leadership is a synonym for concepts like shared leadership or democratic leadership. As far as I’m concerned that is a problem. Distributive leadership, at least the way I use it in my work, is not a normative perspective. I’m not arguing that distributive leadership is a good thing in and of itself. I am not suggesting it’s the way things should be. You can take a distributed perspective to analyze any leadership situation; that could be more or less democratic, more or less shared, it could be autocratic, and I think that is important. I do think that when people talk about democratic leadership or shared leadership they often forget the whole power issue. They adopt what I sometimes call a Post-Vatican Two notion: ‘we’re all a community, we all love one another, and we all get along well.’ And I find that very problematic because don’t get along well in many cases, and if we don’t acknowledge that we will forget or ignore the power dynamics of situations. So I think the distributive leadership perspective assumes some of that and equally applies across democratic and autocratic situations. I have not dealt a lot in my work with issues of power but they are critically important.

**JB:** You’ve written in your work of the importance of socio-cultural context. What do you mean when you use this term?

**JS:** The notion of ‘in context’ is something I have struggled with a lot. People in the socio-cultural tradition have been talking for a long time about the importance of context, but I think it has been under-theorized and not understood very well. So one of the big struggles we have with the distributive leadership study is how do we theorize and push on this notion that socio-cultural context is not simply a container for practice, but is instead something that contributes to define practice. That’s easy to say, but it’s much more difficult to be faithful to that broad perspective and use it in your analysis of the data. So, there are two things to which we have been paying a lot of attention. One is tools. When I say tools I use the term very broadly, I mean everything from student assessment data to writing folders to teacher evaluation forms. The second is routines, which of course pervade all organizations but there are lots of leadership routines in the schools—everything from evaluating teachers to monitoring instruction to breakfast clubs and stuff like that. The struggle we’ve had is to try and figure out how any of these tools and/or routines enable or constrain practice. It seems that certain tools and routines make leaders more or less heedful of certain things not of others. As a result, tools and routines are not accessories to practice, they fundamentally shape practice.

**JB: Can your research inform the way leaders are prepared?**

**JS:** I think that is the critical issue we are facing right now and I think that if we don’t address it, it will be addressed for us by policy makers. And it should be, if we don’t address it ourselves and take it seriously. I think that unless the field takes teaching educational administration and school improvement seriously, that is, if they don’t shift the focus of research from what ought to be to what is, we’re not going to get anywhere. That’s where the rubber meets the road. Most programs and most research agendas in educational administration do not study practice. Unless we put that at the center and backward-map out of that, we’re not going to get very far. We face a number of problems. Many programs are modeled to increase the capacity of the individual; they treat the leader as CEO. That system is congruent with certification, which is also individual-focused. But in some ways that’s a problem, because typically school-based problems are engaged by multiple people, not single people. I think we have to think seriously about how we develop leadership teams in schools or school districts. Part of that can be addressed by the way we prepare the individual but I don’t think it can be addressed entirely in that way.

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

## **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

### **In Search of Good Humor**

Do you ever have amusing encounters on your job and wish you could share them? *The School Administrator* publishes a monthly back-page humor column, “Leadership Lite,” and the editor eagerly solicits your stories: short, humorous anecdotes, told generally in no more than four paragraphs, that relate some telling aspect of life in educational administration, including university classrooms. Anecdotes should be based on the contributor’s experience—something seen or heard—in a school setting, administrative office, school board meeting, educational administration course, and so forth. *The School Administrator* will credit the source by name or withhold it, if requested. Please contact or e-mail or mail your stories to Jay P. Goldman ([jgoldman@asa.org](mailto:jgoldman@asa.org)), Editor, *The School Administrator*, 1801 N. Moore St., Arlington, VA 22209.

## DIVISION A 2005 PROGRAM HIGHLIGHTS

### Program Committee Report

Megan Tschannen-Moran  
College of William and Mary  
[mxtsc@wm.edu](mailto:mxtsc@wm.edu)

The 2005 Program Committee met in Washington DC on October 1 and 2 to put together the program for the upcoming annual meeting in Montreal. We came away quite pleased with the quality of the program we had been able to design. The Division A program includes 67 paper or symposium sessions, 4 roundtable paper discussion sessions, 1 poster session, 3 invited sessions, the business meeting, and the Division A/ Division L/ Corwin Press reception.

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. We anticipate that the acceptance rate will be approximately 40%, which is fairly typical across divisions. The notices of acceptance or rejection were sent November 3, 2004.

A goal of the AERA council and central staff as well as the **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 I take away from my two years serving on the program committee is the vital role of the reviewers. **There is no way that the five section chairs could make a fair assessment of the nearly 500 proposals without relying on the expertise of a small army of reviewers. Many thanks to all who supported our efforts!**

We faced two big challenges in the review process. First, there was 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 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 way the design of the All Academic system means that proposals cannot move forward to be available to place into sessions until they are 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 a short period of 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.

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** (University of Akron), Chair Section 1 (Leadership); **John Sipple** (Cornell University), Chair Section 2 (School Organization and Effects); **Joseph Johnson** (The Ohio Department of Education), Chair Section 3 (School Improvement); **Mary Driscoll** (New York University), Chair Section 4 (School Context and Community); **Juanita Garcia** (University of Texas at Austin), Chair Section 5 (Leadership Development). They all worked hard, were patient and steadfast in the face of significant technology challenges, got their work done on time, and most of all, they were fun to work with. I am so grateful for each of them and the gift of their time and expertise that they offered the division.

### Mentoring for Scholarly Publication: Editorial Assistance for New Authors

Linda C. Tillman  
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill  
[ltillman@email.unc.edu](mailto:ltillman@email.unc.edu)

Michelle D. Young  
University of Missouri—Columbia  
[youngmd@missouri.edu](mailto:youngmd@missouri.edu)

The purpose of this interactive symposium session during the 2005 Annual Meeting is to provide information and mentoring to junior faculty and graduate students interested in submitting manuscripts to one of the participating journals. Interested persons are encouraged to submit one-page outlines of potential articles to the editor of the selected journal. Outlines must be submitted electronically **not later than March 14, 2005**. Editors will review submitted outlines, provide constructive feedback, and make recommendations for manuscript submission during the session. E-mail addresses can be found on the editor's institutional website.

- **James J. Scheurich** (Texas A & M University), Editor, *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*
- **Sherman Dorn** (University of South Florida) Editor, *Education Policy Analysis Archives*
- **Diana Pounder** (University of Utah), Editor, *Educational Administration Quarterly*
- **Michael E. Dantley** (Miami University), Editor, *Journal of Cases in Educational Leadership*
- **Kenneth A. Leithwood** (Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Ontario), Editor, *Leadership and Policy in Schools*
- **Ulrich C. Reitzug** (University of North Carolina at Greensboro), Editor, *Journal of School Leadership*
- **Duncan Waite** (Texas State University at San Marcos), Editor, *The International Journal of Leadership in Schools*
- **Stephan J. Ball** (Institute of Education, London), Editor, *Journal of Educational Policy*
- **Carol Mullen** (University of South Florida), Editor, *Mentoring & Tutoring Journal*
- **Charles Webber** (University of Calgary), Editor, *Educational Forum*
- **Lucille Eckrich** (Illinois State University), Editor, *Planning and Changing*
- **James Koschoreck** (University of Cincinnati), Editor, *International Journal of Urban Educational Leadership*

**Spring 2005 Division A Newsletter will present conference highlights.**

## FUTURE ISSUES

Deadline for submitting material to be included in the Spring 2005 newsletter is **March 1, 2005**. Please send copy to the all three editors: [rodney.muth@cudenver.edu](mailto:rodney.muth@cudenver.edu), [tricia.ferrigno@uky.edu](mailto:tricia.ferrigno@uky.edu), [ibrooks@mail.coe.fsu.edu](mailto:ibrooks@mail.coe.fsu.edu)

### Submission and Publication Schedule

Issue Date	Deadline for Submissions	Submitted to AERA	Published Online	Announced Via E-mail
Spring 2005	March 1	March 8	March 10	March 10
Summer 2005	May 10	June	July	July 10
Fall 2005	August 10	September	September	September 10
Winter 2005	January 31	February	February	February10

### 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 with leadership educators, researchers, policy makers, and others.

**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 of interest, 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

**List of Appointments for 2004-2005**

**Division A Executive Committee**

**Vice President & EC Chair**

Rodney T. Ogawa  
University of California-Santa Cruz  
[rtogawa@uncsc.edu](mailto:rtogawa@uncsc.edu)

**Secretary (2003-2005)**

Gary Grow  
University of Utah  
[grow@ed.utah.edu](mailto:grow@ed.utah.edu)

**Vice President Elect**

TBA

**Immediate Past Vice President**

Patrick B. Forsyth  
Oklahoma State University  
[forsytp@okstate.edu](mailto:forsytp@okstate.edu)

**Past Vice Presidents**

Karen Seashore  
University of Minnesota  
[klouis@umn.edu](mailto:klouis@umn.edu)

Terry A. Astuto

New York University  
[ta4@nyu.edu](mailto:ta4@nyu.edu)

**Immediate Past Secretary**

James G. Cibulka  
University of Kentucky  
[cibulka@uky.edu](mailto:cibulka@uky.edu)

**Affirmative Action Committee**

James Earl Davis, Chair  
Temple University  
[james.earl.davis@temple.edu](mailto:james.earl.davis@temple.edu)

**Program Committee**

Megan Tschannen-Moran  
College of William and Mary  
[mxtsc@wm.edu](mailto:mxtsc@wm.edu)

**Division A Committees**

**Affirmative Action Committee**

James Earl Davis, Chair  
Temple University  
[james.earl.davis@temple.edu](mailto:james.earl.davis@temple.edu)

Vice Chair

TBA

**Awards Committee**

Donald G. Hackmann, Chair  
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign  
[dghack@uiuc.edu](mailto:dghack@uiuc.edu)

Catherine Lugg, Vice Chair

Rutgers University  
[lugg@rci.rutgers.edu](mailto:lugg@rci.rutgers.edu)

**Graduate Student Representatives**

Alex J. Bowers  
Michigan State University  
[Bowers@msu.edu](mailto:Bowers@msu.edu)

**Graduate Student Seminar Planning Representatives**

TBA

**Membership/New Members Committee**

Fran Kochan, Chair  
Auburn University  
[kochafr@groupwise1.duc.auburn.edu](mailto:kochafr@groupwise1.duc.auburn.edu)

Vice Chair

TBA

**Division Mentoring Program**

Janice R. Fauske, Chair  
University of South Florida  
[jfauske@sar.usf.edu](mailto:jfauske@sar.usf.edu)

**Division A Newsletter Editors**

Rodney Muth, Co-Editor  
University of Colorado-Denver  
[rodney.muth@cudenver.edu](mailto:rodney.muth@cudenver.edu)

Tricia Browne-Ferrigno, Co-Editor

University of Kentucky  
[tricia.ferrigno@uky.edu](mailto:tricia.ferrigno@uky.edu)

Jeff Brooks, Associate Editor

Florida State University  
[jbrooks@mail.coe.fsu.edu](mailto:jbrooks@mail.coe.fsu.edu)

**Nominating Committee**

TBA

**Program Committee**

Megan Tschannen-Moran, Chair 2005  
College of William and Mary  
[mxtsch@wm.edu](mailto:mxtsch@wm.edu)

Sharon Kruse, Chair Section 1

University of Akron  
[skruse@uakron.edu](mailto:skruse@uakron.edu)

John Sipple, Chair Section 2

Cornell University  
[jws28@cornell.edu](mailto:jws28@cornell.edu)

Joseph Johnson, Chair Section 3

The Ohio Department of Education  
[jfjohnson100@insight.rr.com](mailto:jfjohnson100@insight.rr.com)

Mary Driscoll, Chair Section 4

New York University  
[mary.discoll@nyu.edu](mailto:mary.discoll@nyu.edu)

Juanita Garcia, Chair Section 5

University of Texas at Austin  
[jwagstarr@mail.utexas.edu](mailto:jwagstarr@mail.utexas.edu)

**Ad Hoc Task Force: International Committee**

Selahattin Turan, Chair  
Osmangazi University, Turkey  
[sturan@ogu.edu.tr](mailto:sturan@ogu.edu.tr)

**Ad Hoc Committee: Publications**

Linda C. Tillman, Chair  
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill  
[ltillman@email.unc.edu](mailto:ltillman@email.unc.edu)