

AERA Division A Newsletter

School Leadership News

Issue 5

Fall 2003

VICE PRESIDENT'S CORNER

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

I hope that all of you are having a great year despite the severe economic challenges that many of us face. This message was written prior to the first fall meeting of the AERA Council so there is not much organization-wide business to report. However, the Division's work goes on and there is some important information.

Consistent with the Bylaws adopted by the Division in Chicago, a Division A Executive Committee will begin work this year to enhance continuity and participation. Membership on the Executive Committee is ex officio based on current and past roles in the Division. This year, the Committee will include **Karen Seashore** and **Terry A. Astuto** (two immediate Past Vice Presidents), **Gary Crow** (Secretary), **James G. Cibulka** (immediate past Secretary), **Rodney T. Ogawa** (Vice President Elect), **Carolyn Riehl** ('04 Program Chair), and **Joan Poliner Shapiro** (Affirmative Action Committee Chair). As Vice President, I will chair the Committee and **Gary Crow**, as Secretary, is Vice Chair. I look forward to working with this distinguished and dedicated group of colleagues in the inaugural year of its operation.

I am aware of five items drawn from the Chicago business meeting and informal discussions that should be placed on the Executive Committee's agenda for this year: (1)

recommendation to the San Diego business meeting of a possible name change for the Division (name suggestions or opinions on this subject should be sent to me), (2) Consideration of the Division's communications performance as noted in the **Scott McLeod** report; (3) evaluation of the Bylaws through year one, (4) a review of the Clark Seminar (its purposes, policies and procedures), and (5) concerns with proposal review (criteria, reviewers, and new system). Members of the Division are invited to request that the Committee consider additional agenda items.

Appointments to this year's committees are nearly complete. The current, active committees and the listing of Chairs and Vice Chairs is on page 9. Please volunteer your services to the committees that interest you by contacting the Chairs directly. One position, Vice Chair for the Membership Committee/New Members Committee, remains to be filled. **Fran Kochan** chairs that committee and anyone interested in volunteering to work or serve as Vice Chair for 2004 should let me know. The Vice Chair becomes the Chair for 2005.

Carolyn M. Shields (Chair) and **Janice R. Fauske** (Vice Chair) have graciously agreed to jump start the Division's Mentoring Program for the San Diego meeting. As you may recall, AERA provides divisions with \$2,000 annually to implement mentoring. Until this year, we had not been taking advantage of these funds. A reasonably large group volunteered to work with Carolyn and Janice on this first effort.

Jeroen Imants takes over as Chair of the Division's International Committee this year. The committee planned an especially informative session for Chicago last year. Jeroen will be joined by new Vice Chair **Selahattin Turan** of Turkey and we look forward to increased international activity in Division A.

If you experienced difficulties with the new proposal submission system, please document the problems and send me a copy.

That's the news from Division A headquarters here at Oklahoma State University -Tulsa. Don't hesitate to e-mail with ideas and questions. Cheers!

FROM THE EDITORS

Rodney Muth, Editor, University of Colorado at Denver, rodney.muth@cudenver.edu
Tricia Browne-Ferrigno, Associate Editor, University of Kentucky, ferrign@uky.edu

Our Division A VP and both editors traveled extensively during the fall months. Unfortunately, the two editors were out of town at different times, which made it difficult to prepare a Fall 2003 newsletter. We apologize for the delay but expect that the Winter 2004 issue will follow in a few weeks. The Spring 2004 newsletter, which will focus on the 2004 annual meeting of AERA (April 12-16 in San Diego), will be posted on the Web site at least two weeks prior to the meeting.

Call for Support

One 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 our Vice President, Pat Forsyth (forsytp@okstate.edu), or to the editorial team. Specific suggestions to improve the newsletter layout should be sent to the Associate Editor, Tricia Browne-Ferrigno (ferrign@uky.edu). Anyone wishing to assume responsibility for one or more of the content areas should contact the Editor, Rod Muth (rodney.muth@cudenver.edu). Other contributions can be sent to either editor. Please help us keep each other well informed about Division A and our fields.

Highlights of the Fall 2003 Issue

This issue includes the **Vice President's Corner**, a **Commentary** about the foundations for the ISLLC Standards by Joseph Murphy (page 3), and the **List of Appointments for 2003-2004** (page 9). Please contact Patrick Forsyth (forsytp@okstate.edu) if you wish to volunteer or become involved in Division A activities for the 2003-2004 year.

COMMENTARY: Some Notes on the Foundations of the ISLLC *Standards*

Joseph Murphy

Professor, Peabody College of Vanderbilt University, and Chair, ISLLC

joseph.f.murphy@vanderbilt.edu

Editor's note: This article is adapted by the author from a paper commissioned by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration: *Reculturing Educational Leadership: The ISLLC Standards Ten Years Out* (September 2003).

Early Years

The field of school administration was informed during its initial phase of development by ideas from philosophy and religion, which resulted in something akin to a doctrine of applied philosophy being introduced to the profession (Button, 1966; Callahan & Button, 1964; Moore, 1964). Unfortunately, few of the ideas embedded in the ideal of the administrator as philosopher-educator from the 1800s found their way into the blueprints of the profession (Callahan, 1962; Farquhar, 1968; Harlow, 1962). Instead, school administration was constructed almost entirely on a two-layered foundation built up during the 19th century: concepts from management, especially from the private sector, and theories and constructs borrowed from the behavioral sciences.

The idea of school leaders as business managers first surfaced during the early decades of the 20th century when the paramount hero in the larger society was corporate enterprise and its apotheosis, the CEO (Gregg, 1960; Newlon, 1934; Tyack & Hansot, 1982). This perspective has been reenergized and refined over the decades as each new idea from the corporate sector is held up as a tool or framework that school administrators should adopt (e.g., management by objectives, total quality management, benchmarking, 360-degree evaluation, and so forth).

After WW II, the mosaic of American society and the issues confronting school leaders began to change (Hencley, 1962; Norton, 1957; Watson, 1977). Scientists, not business people, were held in highest regard (Halpin, 1960), and a quest for a science of administration in schools

was engaged (Culbertson, 1964, 1965; Greenfield, 1988). Forged from withering attacks on “the hortatory, seat-of-the pants literature already in place” (Crowson & McPherson, 1987, pp. 447-448), a movement “away from techniques-oriented substance based on practical experience” (Culbertson & Farquhar, 1971, p. 9), and crafted from clamorings for more scientifically based underpinnings for the profession (Getzels, 1957; Grace, 1946; Griffiths, 1959; Halpin, 1960), knowledge blocks from the behavioral and social sciences were laid into the foundation of school administration. While advocates of the behavioral sciences were somewhat successful in cementing a science of administration into the profession, historical reviews are much less sanguine about their efforts to dismantle the existing management pillars supporting school administration (Campbell, Fleming, Newell & Bennon, 1987; Murphy, 1992b). Instead, what developed was a ladder-shaped structure for the profession, with one leg fostering the growth of ideas from management and the other leg nurturing the development of concepts from the social sciences. Anyone who seeks confirmation of this reality need look no further than the traditional curriculum that defines graduate study in school administration—courses, for the record, that “are not informed by a vision for leading change to meet students’ needs” (Fay, 1991, p. 72).

ISLLC

This was the intellectual landscape confronting ISLLC when it began its work in 1994: fairly well established patterns but with significant discontent with those motifs, a fair amount of critique, and a few rudimentary change initiatives in play. A corollary was the reliance

in the profession on a well-worn strategy for trying to garner improvements, that is, by adding lengths to either or both sides of the ladder. For example, if current management ideology is not performing to expectations, add new ideas from our corporate colleagues (e.g., 360-degree evaluation or Baldrige models). Or, if knowledge from the currently highlighted portfolio of behavioral sciences is proving inadequate, stretch the ladder by adding new ones. Anyone who has a history in the profession will remember when first sociology (organizational theory), then political science (politics of education), and then anthropology (qualitative methods) were introduced as new paradigms to put the challenges confronting school administration to rest (Murphy, 1991a).

Based on extensive reviews of the literature in school administration, the ISLLC project leaders decided early on that rebuilding school administration by polishing up or extending the current foundations, that is, expanding the current ladder-shaped underpinning of the profession, likely would be less than fruitful. While cognizant that ideas from these two domains are of importance to school administrators, the project leaders concluded that these ideas no longer merited an exclusive franchise (Sergiovanni, 1990). The project leaders decided not to focus on the two questions that had guided the development of the field for the past century: (a) What is afoot in the corporate world that we can borrow to rethink the work of school leaders, and (b) what is unfolding in the behavioral sciences that can be applied to power reform efforts? The project leaders instead sought alternative and what they hoped would be more productive pathways to the goal of regrounding the profession.

Because many colleagues had already exposed problems with the current state of the field (see, for example, Beck, 1994; Donmoyer & Scheurich, 1994; Greenfield, 1988; Griffiths, Forsyth, & Stout, 1988), organizing the critical analysis was a less arduous aspect of the ISLLC work. Considerably more effort needed to be devoted to developing alternative blueprints that

might be productive to follow in rebuilding school administration and in securing and arranging the raw material to be employed in the construction process. A portfolio of eight strategies was assembled, in addition to examining the status quo in the field at large and reviewing standard-like ideas already in play in the associations. Four of these pathways are noted below in the form of a question followed by brief reviews developed to shape the formulation of the standards and to help recenter school administration. The first two questions form the heart of the matter.

1. What Do We Know about Schools Where All Youngsters Achieve at High Levels?

A significant chunk of the *Standards* is supported by empirical findings from studies of effective schools and from the larger body of research on school improvement in which school-effects studies are nested. The framework employed by ISLLC was developed by Murphy and Hallinger in the early 1980s (Murphy, Hallinger, & Mesa, 1985; Murphy, Weil, Hallinger, & Mitman, 1985). By the time of the formation of the Consortium, this research had been deepened by a decade of additional work (cf. Beck & Murphy, 1996; Murphy, Beck, Crawford, Hodges, & McGaughy, 2001; Teddlie & Reynolds, 2000). The framework also included research on teacher effects (cf. Brophy & Good, 1985; Murphy, Weil, & McCrear, 1986; Rosenshine, 1983). The definition of effective, success, or improvement is the standard one forged by school effectiveness researchers in the early 1980s; that is, (a) high levels of student achievement (quality dimension), (b) achievement results that are fairly distributed across the student population (equity dimension), and (c) outcomes that are attributable to the school (value added dimension) (Murphy, Hallinger, & Peterson, 1986).

The body of research on school improvement underscores a variety of conditions linked to the core technology that help explain student learning (e.g., opportunity to learn, direct instruction of basic skills, tightly aligned

curriculum, careful and systematic monitoring of student performance) as well as a host of school-level cultural or environmental variables associated with achievement (e.g., a safe, orderly learning environment; academically focused rewards and incentives; a personalized learning environment in which children are well-known and cared for; a sense of community among staff; well-developed and academically focused linkages between home and school). The collective body of research on school effects also features important perspectives and values largely absent from education for most of the 20th century: (a) the need to backward map administrative action from student outcomes, (b) the belief that all youngsters can learn, (c) the understanding that schools are responsible for student outcomes, and (d) the knowledge that schools work best when they operate as organic wholes rather than as collections of disparate systems and elements (Murphy, 1992a, 1992c; Murphy & Datnow, 2003a, 2003b).

Empirical evidence on the centrality of mission (vision) and community is also laced throughout the effective schools research. So, too, the spotlight in this literature is clearly directed at youngsters who had been left behind in America's schools for nearly a century, especially children from low-income homes, students of color, and pupils with a first language other than English (Edmonds, 1979; Ellis, 1975; Gault & Murphy, 1987; Murphy, 1995a; Weber, 1971).

While the early research on school effectiveness was flawed in important ways (Huberman, 1993; Murphy, Hallinger, & Mesa, 1985; Ralph & Fennessey, 1983; Rowan, Bossert, & Dwyer, 1983; Sirotnik, 1985), in its second-generation package it provided a robust collection of findings that could be used by ISLLC to help reshape understanding of the purposes of school administration and the appropriate functions of school leaders. The aim of the development team was to define leadership in terms of connections to conditions of schooling (e.g., high and appropriate expectations, clear academic goals) that explain student achievement—to

backward map leadership from student learning. (See Evertson & Murphy, 1992; Murphy, 1991b; 1999c; 2004 for discussion of post-standards developments.)

2. What Do We Know about the Actions and Values of the Men and Women Who Lead Effective Schools and Productive Schools Systems?

In developing the *Standards*, the Consortium also relied heavily on the research on principals and superintendents who were especially productive in leading high-performing organizations, again with performance being established by reference to the three-part definition of effectiveness outlined above (quality, equity, and value added). The Consortium employed “instructional leadership” frameworks developed by Murphy and Hallinger from their empirical studies and their reviews of existing research available at the time the Consortium began its work. (For studies of principals and superintendents, see, for example, Hallinger & Murphy, 1985; Murphy 1990d; Murphy, Hallinger, Lotto, & Miller, 1987.)

At the risk of considerable oversimplification, the research revealed portraits of effective leaders who had a deeper understanding of and who were much more heavily invested in the core business of schooling—learning and teaching—than was the norm in the profession (McNeil, 1988). It surfaced a narrative of leaders who were concerned with nourishing the educational as well as the managerial arteries of influence. It provided a picture of school administrators who had a gift for infusing “organizational routines with educational meaning” (Rallis, 1989, p. 201). Answers to this question again led the Consortium to conclude that the organizing center for school administration should be student learning and that the professional spotlight should shine on outcomes in this area. Or, as Evans (1991) so nicely captures it, “the deep significance of the task of school administration is to be found in the pedagogical ground of its vocation. It is the

notion of education that gives the idea of leader its whole purpose” (pp. 17, 3).

3. What Are the Major Changes Underway in the Schooling Enterprise Itself?

The development of the *Standards* was also influenced by analysis of key changes unfolding in each of the three levels of the school organization—in the core technology, in the procedures and arrangements by which schools are organized and managed, and in the ways schools work with their constituents (Murphy, 1991b; Murphy & Hallinger, 1993; for a post-*Standards* discussion of changes in these three areas, see chapters 8-19, Murphy & Louis, 1999)—often as a consequence of the external forces noted above. In the area of learning and teaching, from the cognitive sciences ISLLC participants saw the emergence of a new theory of learning, a regrouping of education around principles of learning (rather than around teaching strategies), and an explicit acknowledgment of the cultural and social dimensions of learning. The Consortium also perceived a deepening of instructional perspectives (and accompanying views of assessment) beyond the transmission and delivery models of teaching that had proven their worth in helping youngsters master basic skills. They foresaw a more pronounced place in the pedagogical portfolio for constructively grounded perspectives (e.g., scaffolded instruction, cognitively guided instruction) (Bransford, 1991; Cohen, 1989; for reviews employed by the Consortium, see Evertson & Murphy, 1992; Hallinger, Leithwood, & Murphy, 1993; Murphy, 1991; 1992b).

In the organization and management domain, ISLLC team members observed trend lines moving away from the heavy reliance on hierarchical forms and bureaucratic tenets that characterized schools in the 20th century (Sykes & Elmore, 1989; Weick & McDaniel, 1989). They saw instructional values vis-a-vis managerial values gaining “a new currency” (Johnson, 1989, p. 110). The team members saw organization being informed by and in the

service of learning (Little, 1987)—of organization growing from our best theories of learning (Elmore, 1990; 1991; 1996; Evertson & Murphy, 1992; Marshall, 1990). They discerned a re-coupling of administration and teaching (Evertson & Murphy, 1992). The ISLLC team discussed an evolution to smaller, flatter, knowledge-shaped, and market-influenced organizational forms (e.g., small schools, charter schools, networks of home-schooled youngsters) as well as a wider distribution of influence, judgment, and leadership (e.g., teacher leadership, site-based management) (Murphy, 1994b; Murphy & Beck, 1995).

The central shift underway was from a focus on schools as organizations to schools as communities (Little & McLaughlin, 1993a). (See also Beck, 1994; Sergiovanni, 1984, 1994.) The notion of community that found its way into the *Standards* was comprised of three key ideas, building powerful connections: (a) between home and school (home-school community); (b) among adults in the school (community of practice, “ethic of collaboration” [Lieberman & Miller, 1999, p. 64], and “community of leadership” [Barth, 1988, p. 129]); and (c) between adults and youngsters (a personalized learning climate [Sizer, 1984]). (For a review, see Beck & Murphy, 1996.)

On relations with environmental actors, Consortium members judged that in the educational system of the future considerably more influence would be exerted by parents, by direct governance (e.g., charter schools), or through market mechanisms (e.g., various forms of choice) (Murphy, 1996, 1999b, 2000; Murphy & Shiffman, 2002). The members also foresaw an enhanced role for other environmental actors from the government and business community (Murphy, 1990a).

4. What Are the Valued Ends of Schooling?

Consistent with the logic employed throughout the development process, ISLLC team members believed that blueprints for school leadership would be stronger and more elegant if the focus

SCHOOL LEADERSHIP NEWS

was less on the dynamics of administration and more on what was best for youngsters in schools. In order to operationalize this guiding principle, attention was directed to the preferred ends of schooling, of which three stood out for team members: school improvement, community, and social justice (Beck & Murphy, 1993; 1994; Murphy, 1992b; also see Murphy, 2002a and 2002b for post-standards development analyses of this framework). Because the former two ends have already received significant attention elsewhere, the focus here is on the concept of social justice. As Riehl (2000) has noted, social justice in schooling decomposes into two large and interconnected ideas. One dimension is directed toward the role of the school in creating a more just society. The other attends to the just treatment of youngsters, and adults, inside the “school community.” It was scholarship in this latter area that most heavily influenced the work of the Consortium (Bates, 1994; Starratt, 1991; for scholarship employed by the Consortium, see reviews by Beck, 1994; Beck & Murphy, 1994; Beck, Murphy, & Associates, 1997; for a more recent comprehensive examination of this topic in school administration see Capper & Young, forthcoming; Larson & Murtadha, 2002; Riehl, 2000; and Shapiro & Stefkovich, 2001).

Consistent with the earlier analysis, the three dimensional social justice spotlight of care, critique, and justice was pointed directly at the equitable or inequitable provision of access to conditions of classrooms and schools that explain student learning (time, quality

instruction, personalization, content coverage, academic press, and so forth) (for reviews used by the Consortium, see Murphy, 1988a; 1993b; Murphy, Hallinger, & Lotto, 1986). Another element of this work focused on the reality that inequities in access to powerful conditions of learning, and often the resources that ensure their availability, fall disproportionately on children of color and youngsters from low-income homes.

Throughout most of the 20th century, schools educated well about one-third of their young charges. Another 40 percent were schooled but hardly well educated. And about a quarter of the children were left behind all together (Powell, Farrar, & Cohen, 1985; Sedlak, Wheeler, Pullin, & Cusick, 1986; Murphy et al., 2001). Poor minority children were disproportionately clustered in these latter two groups. The great tragedy here is that the profession’s 100-year infatuation with management practices and chunks of knowledge from the behavioral sciences rarely pushed the field of school administration to acknowledge let alone address this reality. The Consortium found this unacceptable. In reaching that conclusion, the Consortium developed a platform that demands, as one critic of the *Standards* laments, “school leaders [who] wield political and legal levers to advance social justice” (Hess, 2003, p. 14).

References

References for this article can be downloaded from the original paper at npbea.org.

**Do you have an announcement for Division A members?
Contact the Editors to have it included in next newsletter!**

FUTURE ISSUES

Material for the Spring 2004 newsletter is requested by **March 10** (a month later than the originally published deadline due to mid-April dates for annual AERA meeting). Please make note that Editor **Rod Muth** has a new e-mail address: [rodnev.muth@cudenver.edu](mailto:rodney.muth@cudenver.edu)

Submission and Publication Schedule

Issue Date	Deadline for Submissions	Submitted to AERA	Published Online	Announced Via E-mail
Winter 2004	October 10	November	December	December 10
Spring 2004	January 10	February	March	March 10
Summer 2004	May 10	June	July	July 10
Fall 2004	August 10	September	September	September 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.

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 2003-2004

Division A Executive Committee

Vice President & EC Chair

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

Secretary & EC Vice Chair

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

Vice President Elect

Rodney T. Ogawa
University of California-Santa Cruz

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

Joan Poliner Shapiro, Chair
Temple University
naoj@astro.temple.edu

Program Committee

Carolyn Riehl, Chair 2004
University of NC-Greensboro
cjriehl@uncg.edu

Committees

Graduate Student Representatives

Mark Salinas
Chabot College
tortuga3000@sbcglobal.net

Matt Militello
Michigan State University
militell@msu.edu

Newsletter Editorial Team

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

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

Awards Committee

Betty M. Merchant, Chair
University of Texas San Antonio
bmerchant@utsa.edu

Donald G. Hackmann, Vice Chair
Iowa State University
hackmann@iastate.edu

Affirmative Action Committee

Joan Poliner Shapiro, Chair
Temple University, College of Ed
naoj@astro.temple.edu

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

**Graduate Student Seminar
Planning Representatives**

Mark A. Gooden
University of Cincinnati
Mark.Gooden@uc.edu

David H. Monk
The Pennsylvania State University
dhm6@psu.edu

**Membership/New Members
Committee**

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

Vice-Chair to be appointed

--

--

Division Mentoring Program

Carolyn M. Shields, Chair
University of British Columbia
Carolyn.shields@ubc.ca

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

Nominating Committee

James R. Bliss, Chair
Rutgers University
bliss@rci.rutgers.edu

Barbara Schneider
University of Chicago
schneidr@norcmail.uchicago.edu

Kenneth Leithwood
University of Toronto
Kleithwood@oise.utoronto.ca

Program Committee

Carolyn J. Riehl, Chair 2004
University of NC-Greensboro
cjriehl@uncg.edu

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

John Heflin, Section Chair
Kent State University
jheflin@kent.edu

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

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

Linda C. Tillman, Section Chair
Wayne State University
ltillman@wayne.edu

**Ad Hoc Task Force: Developing a
Research Agenda**

William Firestone
Rutgers University
wilfires@rci.Rutgers.edu

Carolyn Riehl
University of NC-Greensboro
cjriehl@uncg.edu

**Ad Hoc Task Force: International
Committee**

Jeroen Imants, Chair
University of Nijmegen
J.Imants@ils.kun.nl

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

Ad Hoc Committee: Publications

C. John Tarter, Chair
St. John's University
ctarter@aol.com

Linda C. Tillman, Chair
Wayne State University
ltillman@wayne.edu

