

American Educational Research Association
Division A-Educational Administration

NEWSLETTER

Winter 2002

James G. Cibulka, Secretary and Newsletter Editor
University of Maryland, College Park

Contents

Message from Your Secretary.

Task Force on Developing a Research Agenda in Educational Leadership,
by William Firestone and Carolyn Reihl.

Invited Commentary: The ISLLC Standards at Work,
by Joseph Murphy.

Wanted: Proposals, AERA Division A 2001 Outstanding Dissertation Competition,
by Bob L. Johnson.

Preview of 2002 AERA Annual Meeting Division A Program,
by C. Cryss Brunner.

Contacting Your Committee Chairs.

Directions for Subscribing to the AERA Division A Listserve.

This newsletter and other AERA/Division A information are also available at the AERA website: www.AERA.net. Contents of this newsletter were compiled by James Cibulka, Secretary of Division A-AERA. Announcements and newsworthy items for future issues may be sent for consideration to James Cibulka at College of Education, 3119 Benjamin Building, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742 or jc282@umail.umd.edu.

MESSAGE FROM NEWSLETTER EDITOR

With this issue I have assumed the editorial responsibilities for the Division A Newsletter. I know I join everyone in thanking Mark Smylie for the outstanding job he did as editor the past two years. He deserves not only our thanks but accolades for undertaking this task.

One of the advantages of editing the Newsletter is that it is a flexible vehicle for communications among our members. I encourage you to contact me concerning announcements you would like posted, noteworthy news concerning yourself, or other items. In some issues I will include invited commentaries on important issues such as administrative preparation programs. Accordingly, for this issue Joseph Murphy kindly agreed to address “The ISLLC Standards at Work.” In a future issue, David Sperry will offer his views on the recently completed work of the NPBEA Working Group for NCATE Standards.

My purpose in including these columns is to encourage discussion and debate. I do not wish to privilege particular points of view. Accordingly, I invite your proposals about potential topics and contributions, including your own. Please contact me at jc282@umail.umd.edu.

James Cibulka

A MESSAGE FROM THE VP

Karen R. Seashore (aka Karen Seashore Louis)

The fall AERA Council meeting is somewhat different from the others. Council business takes a back seat to the work of the many AERA committees, and it is the VP's job to attend one of those meetings and report back. We also had a brief meeting of the Vice Presidents that was held separately from the other Council members.

I was assigned to the annual conference committee, and spent more than four hours listening to (and participating in) their discussions, much of which focused around the proposal submission and review process. It appears that the electronic submission process went much better this year – only a few people had serious problems, and those problems were at their end, and not at Michigan State. However, there were concerns about the ability of the system to handle the kind of “rapid response” communication needs that section and program chairs confront as they perform their hectic work. This led into a discussion about the fact that AERA's web-support is a shoestring operation at this point – one Associate professor and a couple of graduate students at Michigan State

University—and they occasionally have to sleep. In the long run, this is not likely to be a viable solution for the Association’s expanding computer needs.

This same issue was revisited in the VP meeting, where there was consensus around the hope that AERA could use some of its accumulated surpluses to bring the website up to a more contemporary standard (for example, like the American Psychological Association’s), and for the development of an accurate list of member e-mail addresses in order to communicate with division members. At the moment, for example, our newsletters will only be available on the web, but we have no way of informing members that they are available except by mail! Another issue was the need to expand the ability of the Association to respond more quickly to pressing educational issues— for example, to have supplied website links to appropriate resources for educators after 9/11.

Some of the needs expressed by committees and the VPs would require more money. There was considerable discussion about what a bargain AERA membership and conference fees are compared with other associations, and many felt that there could be some increase in dues that would use rates indexed to income. In general, the annual conference committee was in favor of keeping the current policy of a “cheap” conference fee in place, and looking to other sources of additional revenue.

Don’t forget to send a nice e-mail to Bill Russell (wrussell@area.net), who will be leaving this spring. For those of you who follow these things, that’s four years after he announced his resignation! His patience and good humor with a rowdy governance structure will be missed.

Task Force On Developing A Research Agenda In Educational Leadership

From 1997 to 2000, Division A had a Task Force on Research and Inquiry exploring issues of improving the quality of research in educational administration. The work of that committee is reported in the August 2000 issue of Educational Administration. While that committee was very productive, there was still a feeling that more progress was needed when it reported out. To that end, Vice-President Karen Seashore appointed a second committee to develop a research agenda in educational leadership. This committee is chaired by Carolyn Riehl and Bill Firestone.

This new committee’s challenge is framed by some of the recommendations of the earlier committee:

- To map the enduring conceptual problems of the field.
- To ensure that those conceptual challenges to address the practical challenges administrators face.
- To promote a limited number of lines of inquiry that can be pursued over an extended period of time with a sustained and relatively high level of effort so that progress is likely to be made.

This committee has had two planning meetings to date: in April, 2001 at AERA in Seattle and in November, 2001 during the UCEA convention in Cincinnati. The first extended meeting (sponsored by the Laboratory for Student Success at Temple University) is being held on November 14 and 15 at the Philadelphia Airport Marriott. The meeting addressed the following questions:

- Where do we lack knowledge and understanding that can improve leadership practice? What problems exist for which answers are neither simple nor obvious, and where long-term investment in research could have important benefits?
- What do we already know about leading schools and school systems effectively that has lasting value?
- How can research in educational leadership be conducted to draw on and contribute to both the improvement of practice and the development of knowledge?
- What are the disjunctures between what we know about effective educational leadership and what typical leadership practice is, in various contexts? How can research contribute to closing these gaps?
- How can research on educational leadership draw on and contribute to related research developments in other academic disciplines and applied fields?

We anticipate that these discussions will be a first step towards developing a focused research agenda, providing justification for that agenda, and generating the support needed to pursue it for an extended period of time.

If you have suggestions or would like further information, please contact Bill Firestone (wilfires@rci.rutgers.edu) or Carolyn Riehl (cjriehl@uncg.edu).

**Invited Commentary:
The ISLLC Standards At Work**

**Joseph Murphy
Chair, The Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC)**

Since their publication in 1996, the ISLLC *Standards for School Leaders* have played a major role in reshaping the profession of school administration. As with other successful reform initiatives, some of this influence can be traced to good timing. Specifically, given 20 years of concentrated work on schools that work well for all youngsters, the core premise of the *Standards*—that educational leadership should be scaffolded on our best understanding of learning, teaching, and school improvement—is resonating well with increasing numbers of colleagues in the practice, academic, and policy domains of the profession. Research tells us that this empirically anchored set of values would have been much less well received before the mid 1990s.

Some of the influence can be traced to the changing environment in which the profession is nested. For example, a widespread focus on standards-based reform in education writ large made the *Standards for School Leaders* more accessible and more acceptable to many colleagues, especially those in the practice and policy spheres of the profession. The newly forming environment for preparation programs—one that, for better or worse, accentuates the centralizing role of state governments (e.g. departments of education and standards boards) and that, however dimly, is beginning to spotlight market forces—provides a second example of how changing context has created a climate in which many are finding it difficult to avoid attending to the *Standards*.

But even more importantly, influence can be traced to concerted efforts by the ISLLC partners (the 35 or so states and the 10 university and practice-based associations) to link the *Standards* to major leverage points that can be used to recast the profession (e.g. preparation programs, accreditation, licensure, professional development, and so forth). In activating these leverage points, ISLLC has consciously engaged government, professional, and market forces as available and appropriate. Our most visible use of government strategies has been in the area of licensure, where we have worked with one of our non-consortium partners, the Educational Testing Service, to develop a new examination (The School Leaders Licensure Assessment) for initial licensure. In a year, the SLLA will be in use in 18 states. As with all assessments, there are pros and cons associated with the SLLA and its employment. What is absolutely clear, however, is that control over licensure is an especially robust, government-based strategy for reweaving the fabric of school administration writ large and the content of preparation programs in particular.

In a similar vein, ISLLC has invested a considerable amount of its resources in energizing professional strategies to bring the *Standards* to life. One of our high profile efforts has been to work closely with the professional associations that shape accreditation to have the *Standards* form the infrastructure for NCATE reviews. At the same time, we also are working with these associations from practice and academia to explore other avenues that can be

followed in our effort to strengthen school leadership. For example, we have been a junior partner with AASA, NAESP, and NASSP in the search for a productive path that would terminate in the creation of professional “certification” grounded on the ISLLC *Standards*. We have partnered with the Delaware Association of School Administrators to create a national model of evaluation for principals and superintendents that privileges the values and the research undergirding the ISLLC *Standards*. We have also had a role in helping state associations throughout the country to platform professional development for existing school leaders on the *Standards*. At the university level, ISLLC has been a partner in helping a number of educational administration departments develop standards-based preparation programs.

ISLLC has also been active in helping fuel incipient market strategies that offer some promise of assisting in the recasting of the profession, although it is important to note that the market sphere of activity is relatively thin. For example, we work with high quality, standards-guided, market-based delivery systems (e.g. The Big Picture Company, New Leaders for New Schools) with the expectation that at least some loosening of the monopoly over preparation programs for school leaders may encourage change in the profession consistent with the research and values—with the knowledge and dispositions—embedded in the ISLLC *Standards*.

The ISLLC *Standards* are an empirically-based set of values that go a long way in redefining the field of school administration. They privilege the core technology of the business—i.e. learning and teaching—as well as the knowledge about how to develop schools where all youngsters learn well—i.e. school improvement. They acknowledge the critical nature of the political, managerial, and organizational dimensions of the profession, for sure. But, in a break from the past, they link these elements, or put these dynamics, in the service of education—learning, teaching, and school improvement.

The game plan to bring the *Standards* to the center stage of school administration is quite straightforward and highly instrumental: (1) identify all the major leverage points that provide texture and shape to the profession and then (2) reform each of these leverage points using all the governmental, professional, and market forces that can be harnessed.

In closing, it is important to acknowledge the obvious. All of the heavy lifting on this voyage of redefining the profession is being undertaken by colleagues across the full spectrum of the educational leadership landscape. Sometimes it is an individual professor or group of faculty at a single institution or cluster of programs throughout a state, as in Mississippi and Missouri. Sometimes, as in the development of the SLLA, it is a small set of dedicated players from our departments of education. Often, as in the hard work to forge

the new NCATE guidelines, it is a cross-functional team. Occasionally, as in the struggle to craft a viable model of professional certification, it is the persistent voice of a single advocate.

At the end of the day we can only progress as far as our colleagues in the profession are willing to travel. On this issue, for the first time in the last quarter century or so, there is cause for considerable optimism.



Wanted: Proposals!

AERA Division-A

2001 Outstanding Dissertation Competition

Nominations are invited for the annual Division-A competition for the best doctoral dissertation in the broad field of educational administration, including the organization and administration of schools and the work and preparation of school leaders. This award is intended to recognize outstanding dissertation research appropriate to the field. Studies embracing traditional and/or alternative conceptualizations and methodologies are welcomed. The Committee will consider work completed and formally accepted by the entrant's dissertation committee between **Jan. 1, 2001 and Dec. 31, 2001**.

Evaluation Criteria

1. Significance and clarity of problem and investigation.
2. Adequacy of conceptualization and development of research questions.
3. Quality of review of relevant theoretical and research literature.
4. Appropriateness and rigor of research design and methodology.
5. Clarity of reporting findings/results.
6. Appropriateness of interpretation of the research for theory, policy, practice, and further research.
7. Quality and clarity of writing evidenced in the abstract and (for finalists only) in the complete dissertation.

Submission and Selection Procedures

1. **hard copy material** - Hard copies (not faxed copies) of the following items should be submitted to the Chair of the Dissertation-Award Committee by **January 15, 2002**. (Must be post-marked by this date)
 - a. **abstract: six blind copies**:- Six *blind* (no names please) copies of a 7-page double-spaced abstract of the dissertation providing a concise overview of the problem, design, findings or results, and interpretations. Abstracts longer than 7 pages may not be reviewed.
 - b. **contact information** - Complete mailing address, e-mail address and phone number of author.
 - c. **dissertation chair** - Statement from the dissertation chair confirming the date of acceptance of dissertation.
 - d. **Division-A member** - An endorsement letter from a Division-A member familiar with the entrant's work.

2. **committee logistics** - The Committee will select no more than three of the most promising abstracts and then request the appropriate number of copies of the complete dissertation for Committee review. The Committee expects to complete its selection of one award and two honorable mentions by the end of March 2002 (*Note*: If no deserving entries are received, the Committee reserves the right not to give the Award).

Send submissions to:

Bob L. Johnson, Jr., Division-A Awards Committee
Department of Educational Leadership and Policy
1705 E. Campus Center Dr., Room 339
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112-9254

bjohnson@gse.utah.edu

PREVIEW OF 2002 AERA ANNUAL MEETING DIVISION A PROGRAM

Division A Presidential Address
to be delivered during
AERA 2002

Karen Seashore, University of Minnesota

“DEMOCRATIC SCHOOLS: FROM THEORY TO PRACTICE”

GENERAL THEMES

across the
AERA Division A Program Sessions

- School Organization, Culture, and Leadership – *including: sense making, continuity and change, international studies.*
- Rethinking Conceptions of Leadership—*including: challenges, issues of power and control, foundations, multiple perspectives of the role, truth telling and vision*
- Leadership and Reform—*including: district and school level reform, predictive measures, macro reform, inquiry-based reform*
- Policy and Leadership—*including: district-level policy analysis, emerging issues*
- Professional Development of Leaders in the 21st Century—*including: new models, learner centered approaches, induction, socialization, National Commission for Advancement of Educational Leadership preparation program*
- Principal Leaders—*including: recruitment, retention, identity, practices*
- Teacher Leaders—*including: learning, retention, action research*
- Pedagogy, Learning, and Leadership—*including: lived experiences of children, managed performances, connection to learning, learning communities*

Please check the AERA website for details of the Annual Meeting Program (<http://www.aera.net/meeting/>).

CONTACTING YOUR COMMITTEE CHAIRS

The work of the Division continues and we need your help. If you would like to serve on any of the Division's committees, you may contact their chairs using the following e-mail addresses.

Affirmative Action	Rod Ogawa Pedro Reyes	<rodney.ogawa@ucr.edu> <preyes@mail.utexas.edu>
Awards	Bob Johnson	<bjohnson@gse.utah.edu>
Conference Program	Paul Bredeson <bredeson@education.wisc.edu> Cryss Brunner <brunner@education.wisc.edu>	
Graduate Student	Eric Moore	<moor0210@umn.edu>
Membership	Bobbie Derlin Alan Shoho	<rderlin@nmsu.edu> <ashoho@lonestar.utsa.edu>
Nominating	Wayne Hoy John Tartar	<waynehoy@aol.com> <tartarc@stjohns.edu>
International	Jeroen Imants Hanne Mawhinney	<j.imants@ils.kun.nl> <hmawhinn@wam.umd.edu>
Task Force Implementation	Bill Firestone Carolyn Riehl	<wilfires@rci.rutgers.edu> <cjriehl@uncg.edu>

Directions for Subscribing to the AERA/Division A Listserv(s)

AERA sponsors a variety of Internet Forums for communication, information, and discussion of educational research. You may subscribe to any list by following this procedure:

1. Address an e-mail letter to `LISTSERV@asu.edu`.
2. Make the single line contents of that letter read as follows:
`SUB<listname><your name>`

For example, if the Division A Secretary wished to subscribe to the AERA/Division A list that carries announcements of conferences, publications, committee information, and more he would address his e-mail letter to `LISTSERV@asu.edu` and make it read `SUB AERA-A James Cibulka`. You must use two names—your first and last.

In just the same way, you can remove your name from a list by sending the following e-mail message to `LISTSERV@asu.edu`, `UNSUB<listname>`. For example, if Cibulka wished to remove his name from the AERA-A list, he would send the following e-mail message: `UNSUB AERA-A`. In adding and removing his name, the server will use Smylie's return address for its action.

Here are some of the AERA lists to which you can subscribe:

- AERA American Educational Research Association List (notices of general interest, e.g., conferences, publications, job postings, etc.).
- AERA-A AERA Division A: Educational Administration Forum.
- AERA-L AERA Division L: Politics and Policy in Education Forum.
- ERL-L The Education Research List (general education research discussion).