

Learning and Teaching in Educational Leadership SIG Newsletter

The LTEL-SIG brings together discipline specialists, educational theorists, curriculum developers, educational researchers, classroom experts, practitioners, policy makers, and others concerned with teaching in Educational Administration.

LTEL SIG Message from the Chair Daniel Reyes-Guerra Florida Atlantic University

I am struck, at times, by how our discipline has such outstanding thinkers and do-ers, and by their willingness to provoke, share, partake in dialogue, and - most importantly - engage in the search for improving both the understanding and the practice of the area of teaching and learning in educational leadership. Last Fall's newsletter provided exactly that with two excellent articles, one by Bogotch and the other by Myran, that leapt into the dialogue about this profession whole-heartedly.

Not to be outdone, this Spring Newsletter brings with it three excellent articles that continue the dialogue. ***So read on.*** You will find that Dr. Irby has done an excellent job of highlighting the issues raised in both aforementioned articles as well as brought forth some very poignant questions, among them one of my favorites: *why aren't their more dissertations that deal with leadership preparation, specifically concerning what this SIG is all about: the teaching and learning of educational leadership?*



Inside This Issue

- 1 Message from the Chair
- 3 An Invited Critique
- 7 Feature Article on Internships
- 16 AERA LTEL Sessions
- 17 Graduate Student News
- 18-19 Sig Member Awards & Publications
Kottcamp Winner
- 20 Faculty Achievement Award in
Service and Board Members

Learn more about the LTEL SIG online at:
<http://www.aera.net/SIG129/LTELSIG129>

This is followed by an excellent article on the internship by Drs. Niño and Garza that is a must-read, as we continue to look at our programs and focus on the most significant place where pre-service learning can take place: the “doing” of school leadership, in this case the internship.

I was intrigued by the SIG’s Graduate Representative, Mr. Bourkiza, who makes an interesting point of order: should it be teaching and learning or learning and teaching? As I muse over his call for reframing and reflection, I wonder to myself if it should be “learning and facilitating” at worst and “learning and learning” at best? Think about this, and I invite you to provide us with a strong article for our Fall newsletter to continue the dialogue we are engaged in.

We will be celebrating the excellence of one of those dissertations that DOES deal with our discipline at our LTEL-SIG Business Meeting on Sunday, April 30th, along with recognition of one of our colleagues for the SIG’s service award, so don’t miss it. BUT, an equally exciting component will be the special guest panel that will begin the meeting, with four San Antonio educational leaders starting us off in thinking about their experiences and our programs and the issues that urgently confront us today. DON’T MISS IT! I look forward to seeing you all in San Antonio, and if not, wish you the best for the end of this Spring semester.

As always, special thanks to Dr. Hayes and Dr. Anderson for their work on this newsletter, and to the rest of the Executive Committee for their dedication to the SIG.

Promotion News

Share your promotions, new jobs, graduations, and awards with the LTEL-SIG Newsletter committee to feature your accomplishments in our next newsletter!



An Invited Critique

Educational Leadership Preparation as a Discipline

Beverly J. Irby

Texas A&M University



I was most intrigued to read the LTEL SIG Newsletter Fall, 2016. Therein were two papers, one by Ira Bogotch and another by Steve Myran, related to the field of learning and teaching in educational leadership. SIG Chair, Daniel Reyes-Guerra commented on them as follows, “Bogotch’s and Myran’s thinking is that there has been a level of disregarding by our field: one speaks to a narrowing of educational leadership theory and the other of an ignoring of what the learning and cognitive sciences have discovered that is applicable to our discipline” (p. 1).

I have considered both works, as did Reyes-Guerra, and find them to be a call to action for faculty, as researchers and practitioners, in our field. I was invited to write a response to their papers, and to that my words are, “Ok, ditto and ditto.” I agree with the commentaries of both authors; however, I do have a few points to add to their poignant concerns brought forth. First, I recap some of the issues eloquently addressed by each of the authors; then, I share what I believe to be yet another huge gap in the research and practice of learning and teaching of educational leadership.

Issues Promulgated by Bogotch

In my opinion, there are so many thought-provoking commentaries in Dr. Bogotch’s paper, it is hard to contain them. However, I will attempt to distill it into four major takeaways. Those follow:

1. The first important observation by Bogotch is his observation about the TEA/LTEL SIG. The formation of the SIG and the focus on teaching and learning in educational leadership altered the landscape for our field. He said, “...the very topic of teaching and learning (of leadership) helped to democratize our field and bring wider diversity of people and ideas as never before. Looking back, I don’t think the TEA/LTEL SIG has received the credit it deserves for this unintended, but powerful, consequence” (p. 4). We, the membership and leadership of the SIG, over the years, should be pleased to have made this happen.

2. The second profound commentary that Bogotch brings forth is that related to educational leadership and theory. He noted that at the same time that the field was advanced, the field also has narrowed in terms of research on leadership theory development. Specifically, he stated:

...the distance between leadership preparation and actual administrative practices continues to make the search for direct evidence elusive in terms of school, student and community effects. Of course, there is no reason why both leadership development studies and theory-building cannot be conducted in concert, except for the fact that this artificial and empirical distinction continues to be promoted by individual researchers, by our professional associations, and by our scholarly journals. (p. 4)

3. Bogotch brought forward, in 1998, the concept of a logic chain of how pedagogy in leadership with teaching, learning, and researching can transform thinking and action. He advocated that the concept of a logic chain is still relevant, and I agree. Specifically, he called for leadership preparation faculty to “develop their own unique and contextual logic chains for teaching and learning He discussed standards in our teaching and indicates that standards and scope and sequence of our curriculum are logic chains in and of themselves, but that alone is “not sufficiently explicit so as to advance theory development around diversity and complexity” (p.5).

4. He also discussed the literature as to what is and not what might be. He indicated that within the past decade:

most of the literature still focused on descriptive accounts of distinct programs and modes of delivery with evaluation research still mired in participants' perceptions and satisfaction, not performance. What is also clear is that leadership preparation has been strongly influenced by research on school improvement – seeking to give aspiring administrators a better understanding of the conditions of schools (as organizations, communities, etc.) as they exist, not as they could or might be. ... We have not *advanced leadership development as new learning theories* which take into account world events, a democratic ideal, diversity, and beyond school efforts to minimize social injustices. (p. 7)

5. Lastly, I found his assessment of research to be spot on. He discussed the fact that researchers have not sought to “integrate the ‘what works’ and ‘evidence-based’ findings with discussions on the purposes, means and ends, or education in society” (p.8). Bogotch indicated that the field has legitimized quantitative research while minimizing or ignoring strong qualitative research. He posed the question if we, in educational leadership, should be chasing after a leadership science.

Ira Bogotch ultimately, gave researchers in the field three challenges:

1. To continue to build theories and models that acknowledge our history via the TEA/LTEL SIG and to forge a way forward with such models and theories.
2. To consider what those upon whom shoulders we rest – to consider what they would say about current scholarship (he gave that challenge to not only us as members, but to editors of UCEA-affiliated journals);
3. To set out, as a SIG and lead in this effort, an agenda grounded in curriculum, pedagogy, and leadership development theories (p. 9).

Issues Promulgated by Myran

Dr. Myran provided, in his paper, a conceptual framework that differs somewhat to that of his colleague, Dr. Bogotch. While I am not going to compare the two papers—I will let you draw your own conclusions—I will do the same for Myran's work as I did for that of Bogotch. I will draw out three salient points that can lead our conversations in the furthering of educational leadership preparation.

1. Myran stakes his claim for the learning and cognitive sciences to be included in educational leadership. After presenting several arguments related to such and related to what he finds alarming – that of a de facto theory, scientific management, dominating the field of educational leadership, he stated, “this acceptance of the de facto theory of leadership allows an ill-defined and conflated view of learning to go largely unchallenged and just as importantly for the substantive body of knowledge about teaching and learning found in the learning and cognitive sciences to go underutilized by the field of educational leadership” (p. 12). He made a powerful statement regarding our future. He noted that is not possible to “untether” ourselves from scientific management notions and guidance, if the community of scholars in educational leadership continues to perpetuate functionalist and instrumental norms.

2. Myran very eloquently laid out an epistemological perspective on the research that has been conducted in educational leadership. He noted that it is basically grounded in functionalist and instrumental perspective which constrain the entire field. He stated, “In this way an important question for our field to ask is, are our notions about leadership appropriately and adequately grounded in the very science it purports to have influence over, that is learning” (p. 15).

3. Myran challenged us in the field regarding what is being taught in preparation programs by stating: “Without a substantive shift in how we view the student I argue virtually all research based leadership and instructional practices will lack their potential fidelity as the result of being filtered through a belief system, which is fundamentally at odds with what we know about the importance of the student as active and deliberate agents in their own learning” (p. 15).

Myran left the faculty in educational leadership preparation with a main challenge regarding the field’s future as he proposed that we should consider taking what we know in learning and cognitive science and applying that to our field. He left us with the ultimate question specifically about students in schools and their learning. He asked, “Do our notions about leadership have appropriate and adequate grounding in the vary science we claim to have influence over?” (p.15).

Furthering the Conversation

I have been quite concerned for at least 10 years about the issues that both Drs. Bogotch and Myran have promulgated. They have demonstrated several gaping holes in our profession and have suggested some ways forward. In addition to their thought, I would like to add one additional consideration. When I was the chair of the Kottkamp Dissertation Award several years back, I was alarmed at the few dissertations that were being submitted for the award. Over the years, I have brought that issue forward to the LTEL Board as we discussed the few dissertation research studies that actually further our field of educational leadership preparation—the learning of and teaching in educational leadership.

I am in the midst of a scoping analysis (Arksey, & O’Malley, 2005) related to dissertations that deal with leadership preparation.

I believe this is important since (a) the individuals we chair are a reflection of who we are to become or what the field will become and (b) the chairs of the dissertations, are, to a large extent, the gatekeepers to open and close ideas for dissertation studies (topics and research types). Therefore, what are we, as faculty doing, to further our field—that of educational leadership preparation via these dissertations? This study is still in the beginning stages, but I think some of the initial findings are interesting and are worth noting. In the initial scoping analysis which is only within this millennium (2000-2016) , using the search term, educational leadership preparation programs, there were 1313 citations (note that this is only with these search term and does not include a search or initial analysis of educational administration preparation programs; that is currently being searched and will be filtered with the current results). In reviewing these, there were only 79 that met the criteria of “a study related to educational leadership preparation programs.” Among those studies, there are 24 categories of study topics. Those are as follows:

- Special Education (leadership preparation; 2)
- Internship (5)
- Information Environments (2)
- Doctoral Student Perceptions (2)
- Cohort Models (2)
- Analysis of Programs (9)
- Instructional Leadership (5)
- Policy Issues (7)
- District-University Partnerships (2)
- Philosophy and Ethics (2)
- Program Influence on Novice Leaders (5)
- Program Effectiveness (5)
- Superintendency (4)
- Social Justice (4)
- Program Evaluation (2)
- Cultural Responsiveness (1)
- Urban School Preparation Programs (3)
- Competencies (3)
- Certification Process (2)

One might say in observing the category of superintendency that there are more studies on the superintendency. That is true, but these included studies are only about how we are preparing superintendents or for another category-- how we are preparing instructional leaders. It is about learning and teaching in educational leadership. The concepts (e.g., theory development, outcomes related to learning and cognitive science, the program impact on students in schools), the “going beyond” of just scientific management promulgated by Drs. Bogotch and Myran will be included in the scoping analysis as these dissertations are further delineated.

Another issue that I would like to respond to is the idea of theory development. I have a developed theory in educational leadership, the Synergistic Leadership Theory (Irby, Brown, Duffy, & Trautman, 2001). It takes time to develop and test a theory. There are many concepts, models, ideas, frameworks that we tend to name as theories, when, in fact, they do not meet the definition of theory. Secondly, there are many theories that have never been tested or validated, or when they have been, the validation has not been with an inclusive group of participants. However, we tend to use theories (from business, from industry- such as the scientific management theory which has been in continuous use in education for over 100 years.) Dr. Myran, I would say the field of business and education are tethered to it. For one reason, it is as Myran also mentioned, it is a cyclical reasoning—we just keep teaching it in our business and education preparation programs and the people who hire principals and superintendents keep hiring based on those old, non-inclusive, gendered, functionalist leadership theories. Bogotch and Myran are offering us an accurate path—we, the education leadership preparation faculty, should be about developing theory for guiding practices today in schools and in leadership preparation.

There is a final additional thought I would like to leave our readers with as we all make the way forward in educational leadership preparation. Drs. Bogotch and Myran both called it a field. I would like to suggest that it is a discipline. First, I briefly introduce paradigms and disciplines. Kuhn (1962) re-introduced a most influential concept—that of a *paradigm*, which he put forward as a set of practices that define a scientific discipline at any particular period of time. Certainly, there are paradigms with sets of practices in the field of mentoring which come with their own vocabulary, operational definitions, purposes, strategies, outcomes, theoretical structures, programs, methods, and standards. Kuhn included the term, “discipline,” within the concept of paradigm. Yet, Riggio (2013) indicated that there is not a clear answer as to what specifically defines an academic discipline. However, he did state that a discipline emerges with consensus. He stated "Consensus refers to shared agreement about: (1) a circumscribed knowledge base, (2) research methodology, (3) content and procedures for training, and (4) professional, scholarly journals and association(s)" (p. 10). I say, thusly, that Education Leadership Preparation, the learning and teaching of educational leadership, is a *discipline* as it (a) has a set of practices that define it, (b) has a defined knowledge based with over 20 years of published knowledge within a journal that is focused only on the topic of educational administration/leadership and within similarly-focused published books, (c) has published studies using quantitative and/or qualitative methods grounded in the social sciences, (d) has content and procedures for training, and (e) has professional, scholarly journals and associations. Thus, I say, in addition, perhaps to being a field, educational leadership preparation is a discipline.

Selected References

- Arksey, H. & O'Malley, L. (2003). Scoping studies: Towards a methodological framework. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 8(1): 19-32.
- Irby, B. J., Brown, G., Duffy, J. A., & Trautman, D. (2002). The synergistic leadership theory. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 40(4), 304, 6, 7, 10, 12-18.
- Kuhn, T.S. (1962). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Riggio, R.E. (2006). Advancing the discipline of leadership studies. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 12(3), 10-14.

Feature Article Highlighting Best Practices in Learning and Teaching in Educational Leadership

The USLC Internship Experience: Embedding Leadership Functions in the Curriculum

Juan Manuel Niño
Encarnación Garza, Jr.
The University of Texas at San Antonio



The Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISSLC) standards (1996), and the newly developed Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (NPBEA, 2015), provided a framework for the development of principals and the internship experience. Scholars have suggested how internships in leadership preparation are essential for the development of school leaders (Fry, Bottoms, & O'Neill, 2005; Gaudreau, Kufel, & Parks, 2006; Jackson & Kelley, 2002). The National Staff Development Council (2000) called the internship an apprenticeship for aspiring school leaders where the engagement in problem-solving projects needs to be job-embedded and mentored during the experience. The Southern Regional Education Board (2008) located the internship as an opportunity for management, operations and standards based development. Furthermore, the literature on internship tends to suggest that the activities in the internship experience are critical for principals to be effective in their position and must be aligned to state guidelines (ISSLC, 1996; Southern Regional Education Board, 2008).

As such, the internship experience is a great opportunity for aspiring leaders to get an in-depth understanding of the complexities of school systems. The foundation of the Urban School Leaders Collaborative program is the development of educators as social justice leaders. Students in the USLC cohort program are introduced to an intentional but organic approach that helps them develop as leader for social justice. The USLC coordinators are former school and district leaders who have experience in school administration. Their wealth of experience in the K-12 setting guides their emphasis upon embedding internship learning experiences into coursework. Through their development as social justice leaders, students learn how to define their role in their practice during their internship experience.

The USLC Model

The Urban School Leaders Collaborative (USLC) is a unique preparation program that focuses on developing leaders for social justice in diverse communities (Garza & Merchant, 2009; Merchant & Garza, 2015). In Spring 2017, UTSA began cohort VIII with the San Antonio Independent School District. The USLC program is a “different” model of leadership preparation that is designed and customized to prepare school leaders to practice in urban schools where the student population is predominantly Latino. The USLC is a preparation program that is designed to advance interactive collaboration between students, professors and school district administrators using a social justice pedagogy. The vision of the USLC has been to prepare aspiring school principals to become transformational leaders who can work in diverse, ambiguous, and challenging school contexts. The main goal of this leadership program includes equity, excellence, social justice, democracy, risk taking, and responsiveness to community needs to practice in schools.

Selection of students. Although some scholars contend the selection process is critical in the development of effective school leaders (Gaudreau, Kufel, & Parks, 2006; Kirkpatrick, 2000), the recruitment and selection in this program is unique as it challenges the traditional processes for selecting students to participate in a preparation. While we understand that many people inherit the predispositions for social justice, the enrollment for USLC participation is open to any student willing to accept the invitation to be part of the program. It has been the philosophy and practice of the USLC, to admit all applicants who have complied with the submission of the additional required items for admission to the USLC.

If students go above and beyond to be considered for the USLC we acknowledge this effort as a positive indicator of their commitment. More importantly, if we, the program faculty, are truly social justice advocates, it is our obligation to share space with students who have historically been excluded and denied access to programs such as the USLC.

Our method of selection has proven to be very effective. We have admitted 123 students in the first 7 cohorts and 115 have graduated. Of the 8 who did not finish, 3 self-selected out, 2 withdrew for financial hardship, 1 for medical reasons, 1 married and relocated, and 1 was accepted to law school.

Field Work before the internship. As coordinators of the USLC program, we have strategically embedded fieldwork in most, if not all, of the courses in the program with real practical experiences aligned with credentialing standards. Internship experiences include activities such as principal shadowing, equity audits, case studies, action research projects, curriculum presentations, community projects, hosting community meetings, attendance at board meetings, attendance at principal’s meetings, mentor interviews, and professional portfolios. The coursework for the USLC experience is grounded in theoretically and empirically tested models of instructional reform, focused in urban school settings. These include (a) constructivist pedagogical framework (Bordas, 2012; Freire, 2000; Moll, 2014; Phillips, 2000), (b) Freire’s (2000) critical consciousness framework, (c) Valenzuela’s (1999) subtractive schooling framework, (d) Ladson-Billings’s (2009) culturally relevant teaching framework, and (e) Marshall and Oliva (2010) & Theoharis’s (2009) social justice framework. The portion of the coursework, focused on the Cultural Core, is what makes the program significantly different from the other educational leadership master’s program at UTSA.

The following, Table 1, provides the course sequence for the USLC and how classes align with State and National Standards. Also, the table indicates a critical project that requires fieldwork and aligns with the internship experience.

Table 1: USLC Program of Study

Course	Critical Project	PSEL (Formerly ISSLC)	Texas Standards (Chapter 149)
Year One			
Spring Semester			
EDU 5003 – Research Methods	Autoethnography- Personal Moments	1, 2	4
EDU 6223 – Education in a Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Society		5, 3, 8	2, 3, 4
EDL 5403 – Administration and Function of Special Programs	Equity Audit	1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10	1, 3
Summer Semester			
EDL 5003 – Introduction to School Administration	Digital Story	1, 2, 3, 4	1, 2, 3
EDL 6013 – Instructional Leadership	School Improvement Research Project	4, 10	1, 2
Fall Semester			
EDL 5403 – The Principalship	Vision Project	1, 4, 6, 7, 9	1, 3
EDL 5703 – Legal Foundations in Education	School Board Meetings	2, 6, 9	3, 5
Year Two			
Spring Semester			
EDL 5303 – Human Relations in Educational Administration)	Autoethnography – Professional Moments	1, 6, 7, 9	2, 3, 4
EDL 5203 – School and Community Relations in Education	Community Project	3, 5, 7, 8	2, 4
Summer Semester			
EDL 6023 – Supervision and Evaluation	Advancing Educational Leadership and Texas-Teacher Evaluation and Support System Certification	1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10	1, 2
EDL 5103 – School Budget and Finance	Budget Project	1, 2, 9	1, 5
Fall Semester			
EDL 6943 – Internship in Educational Administration and UCEA Convention	Autoethnography – Transformational Moments Video Documentary	1- 10	1 -5

Continued

Key Learning Experiences

Key experiences provide opportunities to embed internship experiences in the classes. All students are required to complete a project in each course, which invite students to visit communities where they work, participate in interviews, and create vision statements collaboratively and address issues of equity. All assignments are continuous projects where students enhance on their knowledge and dispositions of social equity. Following State and National standards, students are able to engage in multiple activities that incorporate social justice practices in schools.

Critical reflection. The learning experiences of this program are reflective in nature. Students are challenged to delve into their own lived experiences. They are products of the current system and are now educators in the same system. The reflective piece invites and requires each student to engage in reflection from the initial class meeting until the very last course meeting. Reflecting requires students to share concerns, fears, celebrations, comments from readings, reactions to readings, and anything they feel compelled to share. Reflection is a simple process. There is only one rule for the exercise of reflection; there is no interactive discussion until all students have shared their reflection. After each student has participated, others may react, follow-up or reflect again. Reflection is always conducted at the start of class.

Autoethnography. An important project that is also a critical part of the USLC experience is the autoethnography. This experience also starts out individually. Students begin documenting autoethnography in the first semester, but it develops over the two years. The first section of the autoethnography focuses on the students' personal life. In this experience, students are encouraged to share how their personal life has impacted their work as educators. Once the personal section is completed during the first semester, the professional section is then completed towards the middle of the program. The professional autoethnography centers on the students' professional work and how their practice has evolved over time. Finally, the transformational section is completed in the last semester. All students' autoethnography starts as an individual project, but it does not stay in that space. Students collectively analyze their stories and write academic papers they present at the University Council for Educational Administrators (UCEA) annual conference and to faculty members and to the school district leadership team. All students read each other's stories and learn about each other's lived experiences. Students learn from each other as the coordinators engage them in the Pedagogy of Collective Critical Consciousness (Garza).

Digital Story. Digital storytelling is a powerful means to reflect upon and enter conversations about students' leadership. In this case, students are invited to look at the self "as social justice leader." Digital storytelling can be as simplistic as a set of pictures accompanied by narrative and as complex as professionally produced videos. The digital story includes the factors that brought students into the educational setting and describe the type of leader they were, are, and becoming.

Continued

In the end, students state why and how they believe are a social justice leaders accounting the historical, cultural, political self to tell their story. These stories are individual projects; however, they are shared in class towards the end of the semester.

Community Project. In this experience, students start out in dyads to identify a family within their schools to work with. In focus of this experience is for students to facilitate a space where parents can present and highlight issues, concerns, or share information to others. The agenda for this meeting is constructed by the family and the meeting is led by them. A video documentation is conducted and then the students share the experience with the cohort in the last couple of meetings. This experience, also engages to learn collaboratively rather than in a competitive individualistic experience. The community project becomes a holistic experience. Everybody is a learner and everybody is a teacher, including the professors.

Equity Audit. In order to better understand the complexity of the communities' students serve, work and live, an equity audit in conducted during the USLC program. In this experience, students collect and analyze data on school profiles. Areas in which students collect and analyze data include the following: General and Social Class Data and Analysis; Status of Labeling at the School, General Achievement Data; Race and Ethnicity Data and Analysis; English Language Learners (ELL) and Bilingual Data and Analysis; (Dis)ability Data and Analysis; and Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity (LGBT support and alliances).

As a reflective experience of this assignment, students then reflect on the findings to consider ways this knowledge will influence their current professional practice and future role as a social justice leader. Furthermore, students are encouraged to identify at least two leadership recommendations they would make based on their findings that could improve campus equity and/or student achievement.

Action Research Project. As part of their instructional leadership development, students are required to explore an action research project to help address an area for school improvement. In this project, students work collaboratively to collect and analyze how the findings in the equity audit can be addressed by curricular recommendations. Special consideration is placed on theory and practice in planning for curriculum needs assessment, development, implementation, and evaluation. In this course, the student completes a paper including an action research plan designed to solve an educational equity issue identified in their equity audit.

UCEA Convention. A culminating experience for USLC students is the participation at the annual UCEA convention. All seven cohorts have presented collectively during their last semester. During this experience, students highlight their transformation in this program. As such, students present their personal, professional and transformational moments in a symposium session to discuss how the readings, discussions, assignments and reflections have influenced them. During the session, students showcase a video documentary that highlights their collective experiences. Cohort VII set a precedent by presenting their collective work during their first year of the program. We are hopeful this experience is also adopted with our current cohort VIII.

Continued

The Internship

During the last semester of the leadership development program, students are required to complete the internship. In most cases, their principals at their respective campuses are their internship sponsors, mentors and supervisors. The professor of record for the students serves as a co-supervisor with the principal. The main purpose of this course is to prepare aspiring school leaders to assume formal and informal leadership roles in schools. This course is designed to examine problems and issues of the principalship and strategies and practices for managing and leading a school organization.

Like all other courses in USLC, students meet every week for class, which serves as an opportunity to collect as a group and reflect on the experiences each student is encountering. The course expectations include internship activities, readings due prior to every class meeting and discussions of the readings during class. Class discussions focus on developing and leading schools where all students perform at high levels of achievement. When possible, guest speakers--administrators and teachers in schools who have been successful in creating schools where all children succeed, are invited to interact with the class. During this class, students are assigned an array of activities and exercises that will help them better understand the complexities of school leadership and the changing demands of the practice.

Leadership development is organized around the 7 major functions of the principal: a) Campus Improvement Plan, b) The campus budget, c) Staffing, d) Professional Development,

e) Facilities Maintenance and Operations, f) Food services and g) Special Programs. Students work closely with their principals/mentors to learn and gain experience in each of these functions.

Given the model of the internship, there is no special internal or external funding to relieve students of their teaching duties to participate in a fulltime internship. However, the school district and UTSA are committed to support their participation in several important ways such as:

School District Commitment

- Superintendent is personally committed to the success of the USLC-SAISD program.
- Principals engage candidates in leadership and internship experiences each semester throughout the duration of the program.
- Principals support candidates with flextime when they need to attend/observe activities and conduct assignments required for classes.
- Principals support candidates with funding and time to attend the annual national University Council of Educational Administrators Conference.
- Principals and SAISD administrators will be invited to mentor USLC-SAISD students.
- Principals and SAISD administrators participate as guest speakers to selected classes to share their expertise with the aspiring leaders.

Continued

UTSA Commitment

- Provide an opportunity for SAISD candidates to earn a Master's in Educational Leadership and the Texas Principal Certificate.
- Design a customized program of study to meet the unique needs of the school district.
- Offer an innovative program to prepare educators to become transformational leaders who can work effectively in diverse, ambiguous, and challenging contexts.
- Provide faculty that are strongly committed to developing collaborative and responsive relationships with area schools and communities.
- Hold all courses at designated school campus in SAISD.

Functions of the principalship. Understanding the different functions of the principalship is essential to each intern. In collaboration with their principals/mentors, each student conduct a review and study each of the functions of the principalship described below.

Discussion. Students are required to discuss each of the functions with their principals/mentors and engage in hands-on activities related to the respective function. Students (in groups) are assigned as discussion leaders for each function. Each group presents their findings and engages the rest of the class in an interactive discussion of their respective function.

Journal/Fieldnotes. To help understand the roles and responsibilities associated with the principalship, students will be expected to spend a minimum of 60 clock hours interacting with a principal/sponsor throughout the semester. This interaction should be a combination of shadowing/observation, interviewing/discussion, co-leading, assigned projects, etc. The journal entry must include a reflection about the activity or observation and

documented evidence of dates and times of internship activities. Activities should be conducted and organized by the different functions of a principal. Again, these opportunities give students a more in-depth account of what happens in the professional practice of a principal during any instructional day. Rather than giving a set of activities for students to engage in, the student will document how their own principal defines and operationalizes the function being observed.

The role of the principal. Students, in assigned groups, select two research-based articles for their assigned role and distribute to the rest of the class by posting on Blackboard. Each group leads the class discussion of their respective principal role. Students read articles and prepare to participate in the discussion based on readings. This exercise helps students better understand the multiple roles of the principal. They include: a) Principal as Visionary, b) Principal as Instructional Leader, c) Principal as Manager, d) Principal as Ethical Leader, e) Principal as Change Agent, and f) Principal as Community Leader/Culture Builder.

Professional portfolio. Students develop a professional portfolio that includes: a) Job posting of ideal position b) Letter of Intent, c) Philosophy Statement, d) Resume, e) 3 accomplishments, and f) 3 letters of recommendations. This professional portfolio is submitted at the completion of the internship to the professors. The professors note suggestions and retain a copy of the portfolio. Additionally, as part of the internship experience, USLC students are required to attend the interview workshop hosted by the department. In this interview workshop, some students may be selected to serve in a mock interview process where local district administrators come and provide insights to candidates.

Continued

Shadowing the Principal. This assignment is designed to provide a snapshot of a school administrator's responsibilities during one day. The task of the student is to observe a principal for a school day and take notes. During the shadowing experience, the student writes a behavioral account of the events, activities, and actions observed. This assignment is designed to provide a snapshot of a school administrator's responsibilities during one day. The student adopts a researcher's stance of a non-participatory observer and refrain from becoming involved in the activities or discussing them at the time with the principal. This experience gives the students an opportunity to be part of the administrative conversation, collecting data and then reflecting on the activities and behaviors they observed.

Assessment. Students demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the roles and functions of the principalship through previous course projects, class discussions and their reflective field journals. In addition, during the internship semester, students are required to participate in a state exam workshop and take a released practice state exam before they are cleared to register to take the official principal certification state exam. Additionally, USLC students are required to complete the capstone project, the completed autoethnography, all three sections. This personal assessment helps each student better understand themselves first as a person then as a leader. The focus of USLC is to develop student's mindsets then train them for skillsets.

Visits and mentorship. During the internship experience, the coordinators of the program serve as the internship supervisors. In this capacity, we visit and mentor students as they complete their learning experience. What helps us mentor the development of each student is the opportunity of having them in classes in the beginning of their program, in the middle of the program and at the end of the program. Meeting with students throughout the program facilitates the feedback process. Additionally, previous cohort member mentor the incoming students. This additional layer of support helps current students find a mentor who they can go to for assistance and friendship. Students have a phrase they like sharing with other USLC students, "You might graduate, but you never finish..."

Final thoughts. As USLC coordinators, we strongly believe in our model for developing social justice leaders. We challenge our students with reflection, readings, discussions and job-embedded projects. We understand that uniqueness of each student and embrace each student with different ways of viewing and interpreting the world. However, we also understand that if school structures and practices are to change to help all students be successful, the change we seek must begin with the self. We are honored to be part of this self-learning process our students engage in.

While the internship is only one semester, we believe the USLC experience helps students better understand the multiple and complex contexts we are part of. Of critical importance is the holistic approach of embedding critical issues at the beginning of the USLC experience. What helps USLC continue this work in SAISD is the credibility the program has established with the community. For fourteen years, SAISD leadership has been supportive of the work we do, and now we continue to expand this model to neighboring school districts in the community. The work we do during the USLC experience is not easy; it takes passion, time, and belief in its mission and purpose. We invite our colleagues who train aspiring school leaders to embrace new opportunities for learning and teaching leadership development. Our approach of embedding internship opportunities in the curriculum has been helpful in helping our students see and learn the systemic perspective of school leadership. We hope this information ignites opportunities as we continue to develop leadership programs that are more inclusive and relevant for generations to come.

Continued

Selected References

- Bordas, J. (2012). *Salsa, soul, and spirit: leadership for the multicultural age. (2nd ed.)*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.
- Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed (30th Anniversary ed.)*. New York: NY. Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Fry, B., Bottoms, G., & O'Neill, K. (2005). *The principal internship: How can we get it right?* (Report). Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board.
- Garza, E. and Merchant, B. (2009). American culture: Latino realities. In J. Collard A. and Normore (Eds.), *Leadership and Intercultural Dynamics* (pp. 131-149). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing Inc.
- Gaudreau, P. A., Kufel, A. P., & Parks, D. J. (2006). Quality internships for school leaders: meeting the challenge. *AASA Journal of Scholarship and Practice*, 3(3), 27-32.
- Jackson, B. L., & Kelley, C. (2002). Exceptional and innovative programs in educational leadership. *Educational administration quarterly*, 38(2), 192-212.
- Kirkpatrick, R. (2000). Recruiting and developing candidates for principals. *NASSP Bulletin*, 84(617), 38-44.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2009). *The dreamkeepers, successful teachers of African American students (2nd ed.)*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Marshall, C. & Oliva, M. (2010). *Leadership for social justice: Making revolutions in education*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon
- Merchant, B. & Garza, E, Jr. (2015). The urban school leaders collaborative: Twelve years of promoting leadership for social justice. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, 10(1), 39-62.
- Moll, L. (2014). *L.S. Vigotsky and education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- National Policy Board for Educational Administration. (2015). *Professional Standards for Educational Leaders 2015*. Reston, VA: Author.
- Phillips, D. (Ed.). (2000). *Constructivism in education*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Southern Regional Education Board. (2008). *Developing and assisting effective learning – centered principals who can improve schools and increase student achievement*. Atlanta, GA: Author.
- Texas Education Agency. (2014). Texas Administrators Code: Chapter 149. Commissioner's Rules Concerning Educator Standards. Retrieve from: <http://ritter.tea.state.tx.us/rules/tac/chapter149/>
- Theoharis, G. (2009). *The school leaders our children deserve*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Valenzuela, A. (1999). *Subtractive schooling, U.S. Mexican youth and the politics of caring*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.



AERA LTEL SIG SESSIONS

Time	Session Name	Session Type	Location
Thursday, April 27, 2017			
12:00pm-1:30pm	Preparing Leaders to Work for Educational Equality: Effective Feedback to Students on Leadership and Scholarship	Working Group Roundtable	Grand Hyatt, Fourth Floor, Texas Ballroom Salon C
Saturday, April 29, 2017			
10:35am-12:05pm	Educational Leadership Preparation: Propositions For More Effective Training Programs	Paper Session	Harry B. Gonzalez Convention Center, Ballroom Level, Room 303 C
2:45-4:15pm	Educational Leadership Doctoral Program Enhancement: Strategies for Improving Program Quality	Roundtable	Harry B. Gonzalez Convention Center, Ballroom Level, Hemisfair Ballroom 1
Sunday, April 30, 2017			
6:15pm-7:45pm	Learning and Teaching in Educational Leadership SIG Business Meeting	Business Meeting	Harry B. Gonzalez Convention Center, Meeting Room Level, Room 215
Monday, May 1, 2017			
8:15am-9:45am	The Pedagogy of Collective Critical Consciousness: The Praxis of Preparing Leaders for Social Justice	Symposium	Harry B. Gonzalez Convention Center, Meeting Room Level, Room 213A



Graduate Student News

Mounir Bourkiza
Florida Atlantic University



Towards a Mindset Shift from Teaching and Learning to Learning and Teaching

If education is the most powerful weapon to change the world (Mandela, 1994), then students in educational leadership programs, the future school leaders, are as vital to the security and prosperity of society as are frontline soldiers. It is, then, worth asking whether or not the education system in place adequately prepares school leaders engaged in life-long learning and capable of fostering and leading continuous progress.

One area of deficit in the current education system, is the increased focus on outcome-based education and high-stake accountability for both students and educators (Buxton, Provenzo, & Eugene 2011; H. Lee & G. Lee, 2014; Minarechova, 2012). This focus is at once the cause and the indicator of a culture of what Papert (1980) called *instructionism*. As Sawyer (2006) asserts, the notion of instructionism is based on the assumptions that 1) knowledge is the collection of facts and procedures, 2) the goal of education and the role of teachers is to transmit this knowledge to students, 3) and that success is measured in terms of students' mastery of that knowledge demonstrated through tests. Coined in the context of our Special Interest Group, the focus on instructionism is a focus on teaching and a disregard to learning.

Another area of deficit in education in general and in the field of educational leadership specifically, is the dominant culture of individualism at the expense of collective efforts and collaboration (Evers & Lakomski, 2013). The *quarterback mindset* in our field is nuanced in the use of the word *principal* to refer to the school leader. Based on its linguistic meaning, the term principal places the school leader in a pedestal of importance and authority above any other school actors.

Dewey (1931) captured both flaws of instructionism and individualism in the metaphor of the passive learner as a person standing at the end of a long pipeline receiving material from a distant reservoir. In a world marked by unprecedented break-through discoveries and advancements in widening areas and disciplines, the continued focus on instructionism and individualism is conspicuously inadequate.

Educators, and graduate students of educational leadership programs are uniquely positioned to change mindsets away from the culture of teaching to a culture based on learning and collaboration. Graduate students of educational leadership programs should be afforded opportunities to break free from the shackles of the outcome-based education system they are inbred in and educators and researchers in the educational leadership field could direct the change process towards the true meaning of education as derived from its Latin origin of drawing learning from students (Stenhouse, 1975).

I am, from this platform, inviting you, my fellow graduate students in educational leadership programs, to put on the lenses of learning and then teaching as you are navigating the sessions of this year's convention and reflect on the new meanings of traditional educational concepts revealed under these lenses. See you all in San Antonio!

Selected References

- Buxton, C., & Provenzo, J., Eugene F. (2011). "Natural philosophy" as a foundation for science education in an age of High- Stakes accountability. *School Science and Mathematics*.
- Evers, C. W., & Lakomski, G. (2013). Methodological individualism, educational administration, and leadership. *Journal of Educational Administration and History*.
- Lee, H., & Lee, G. (2014). Reconstructing education and 'knowledge' in the twentieth and twenty-first century. *Education and Society*.
- Minarechová, M. (2012). Negative impacts of high-stakes testing. *Journal of Pedagogy / Pedagogický Casopis*.
- Papert, S. (1980). *Mindstorms: Children, computers, and powerful ideas*. New York: Basic Books.
- Stenhouse, L. (1975). *An introduction to curriculum research and development*. London: Guilford.

LTEL SIG Members 2016 Awards and Publications

Congratulations to LTEL SIG Member 2016 Award Winners

Shelby Cosner (University of Illinois at Chicago) received UIC's prestigious award for Excellence in Teaching in 2016.

Donald Hackmann (University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign) received the 2016 Distinguished Teaching Career Award from the University of Illinois, College of Education.

Carol Mullen (Virginia Tech) received the 2016 Jay D. Scribner Mentoring Award, University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA).

LTEL SIG Member 2016 Publications

- Caruthers, L., & Friend, J. (2016). *Great Expectations: What kids want from our urban schools*. Information Age Publishing.
- Cosner, S., Tozer, S., & Zavitokovky, P. (2016). Enacting a cycle of inquiry capstone research project in doctoral-level leadership preparation. In V. Storey and K. Hesbol (Eds.), *Contemporary Approaches to Dissertation Development and Research Methods* (pp. 163-184). Hershey, PA: IGI Global.
- Cosner, S., & Marshall, J. (2016). Rethinking preparation program leadership in improvement-oriented contexts: Identifying new work demands, university responses and persistent challenges. *UCEA Review*, 57(3), 29-33.
- Edwards, R. & Fowler, D. (2016). An investigation of state superintendents in the United States: Ethical leadership perspectives, state leader demographics, and state education characteristics. *Ronald E. McNair Journal* 20, 23-25.
- Fowler, D., Posthuma, R., & Tsai, W. (2016). Hiring transformational leaders in education: Lessons learned from structured employment interviews. *International Journal of Education and Teaching*, 3(4), 240-260.
- Jamison, K. & Clayton, J. (2016). Exploring the experiences of administrative interns: Implications for university preparation programs. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 54(5), 514-536.
- Kensler, L.A.W. & Uline, C.L. (2017). *Leadership for green schools: Sustainability for our children, our communities, and our planet*. New York: Routledge/Taylor and Francis Group.
- Korach, S., & Cosner, S. (2017). Developing the leadership pipeline: Comprehensive leader development In. M. Young & G. Crow (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on the Education of School Leaders* (pp. 262-282). NY: Routledge.
- Hackmann, D. G. (2016). Connections among administrative licensure, provider type, and leadership quality: Recommendations for research, policy, and practice. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, 11(1), 43-67.
- Hackmann, D. G., & Malin, J. R. (2016). If you build it, will they come? Educational leadership program coordinators' perceptions of principal preparation redesign in Illinois. *International Journal of Educational Reform*, 25(4), 338-360.
- Malin, J. R., & Hackmann, D. G. (2016). Mentoring as socialization for the educational leadership professoriate: A collaborative autoethnography. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 24, 158-178.
- Mullen, C. A. (2016). Alternative mentoring types. *Kappa Delta Pi Record*, 52(3), 132-136.

Continued

- Mullen, C. A. (2016). Public university leadership on the horizon: Challenges and possibilities chairs should know about. *The Department Chair: A Resource for Academic Administrators*, 26(3), 19-21.
- Mullen, C. A. (2016). Corporate networks and their grip on the public school sector and education policy. In C. A. Mullen & C. H. Tienken (Eds.), *Education policy perils: Tackling the tough issues* (pp. 27-62). New York: Routledge & Kappa Delta Pi Publications.
- Pannell, S., Peltier-Glaze, B., Haynes, I., Davis, D., & Skelton, C. (2016). Evaluating the effectiveness of traditional and alternative principal preparation programs. *Journal of Organizational and Educational Leadership*, 1(2).
- Pannell, S., Haynes, I., Davis, D., Reynolds, L., & Fisher, D. (2016). I ain't got no pencil: Using dialogue journal writing to improve African American school-aged children's writing fluency. *The Journal of the Texas Alliance of Black School Educators*, 2(2). 56-71.
- Storey, V.A. & Hesbol, K. (Eds.). (June 2016). *Contemporary approaches to dissertation development and research methods*. Hershey, PA: IGI Global.
- Storey, V. A. (2016), (Ed.). *International perspectives on designing professional practice doctorates: Applying the critical friends approach to the EdD and beyond*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Tienken, C. H., & Mullen, C. A. (Eds.). (2016). *Education policy perils: Tackling the tough issues*. New York: Routledge & Kappa Delta Pi.
- Williams, S. (2016). What's keeping administrative license holders from becoming school leaders? In: AASA Executive Brief's top 10 Most Accessed Articles. (Ed.) *American Association of School Administrators (AASA) Executive Briefing*. Retrieved <http://www.multibriefs.com/briefs/aasa/aasa010416.php>
- Williams, S. & Harvey, M. (2016). Impact of developmental networks on careers and wellbeing of non-Native and Native leaders. In Dominguez, N. & Gandert, Y. (Eds.). 8th Annual National Mentoring Conference Proceedings: *Developmental Networks: The Power of Mentoring and Coaching*. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico.

Other:

Jennifer Friend was featured in a Faculty Spotlight article on innovative online learning practices at the University of Missouri-Kansas City: <http://online.umkc.edu/faculty-spotlight-jennifer-friend-phd/>

Congratulations to Dr. Sonya Hayes LTEL-SIG Kottcamp Dissertation of the Year Award Recipient!



Dr. Sonya Hayes is an Assistant Professor at Louisiana State University. She is a Distinguished Honors Graduate of Texas A&M University where she earned her PhD in May 2016. Her dissertation, *UCEA Professors' Perceptions of Principal Preparation Program Challenges in Developing Candidates for the Instructional Leadership Role*, has been selected for the 2017 LTEL-SIG Kottcamp Dissertation of the Year Award. Dr. Hayes will provide an overview of her dissertation at the LTEL-SIG Business Meeting on April 30. The Kottcamp Award winner is presented with \$250 and a plaque. Her dissertation chair is Dr. Beverly Irby.

Congratulations to Dr. Carol Mullen 2017 LTEL-SIG Distinguished Faculty Achievement Award in Service Recipient

The Learning and Teaching in Educational Leadership (LTEL) SIG is pleased to announce that the recipient of the 2017 Distinguished Faculty Achievement Award for Service is Dr. Carol Mullen. This award is given annually to recognize a distinguished record of research or service to the field related to learning and teaching in educational leadership and administration.

Carol A. Mullen, PhD, is Professor of Educational Leadership at Virginia Tech and a U.S. Fulbright Scholar. She specializes in mentoring theory and practice across university and K-12 settings and social justice leadership approaches to developing educational leaders and systems. She is an award-winning teacher, supervisor, and scholar, both a prolific scholar and experienced higher education administrator.

To date, she has published 225 refereed journal articles and book chapters, 15 special issues of journals, and 21 books, (co)authored and (co) edited. Recent books are *Education Policy Perils* (2016, coedited with C. H. Tienken) and *Creativity and Education in China* (2017), both Routledge/KDP publications. Currently, she serves as a Plenary Session Representative for the University Council for Educational Administration. She served as the 67th President of the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration. She is recipient of the 2016 Jay D. Scribner Mentoring Award from the University Council for Educational Administration and the 2017 Living Legend Award from the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration. Her doctorate is from The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto, Canada.



LTEL-SIG Executive Committee

Chair – Daniel Reyes-Guerra, Florida Atlantic University

Newsletter Editor – Sonya Hayes, Louisiana State University

Past Chair – Liz Hollingworth, University of Iowa

Associate Newsletter Editor – Erin Anderson, University of Denver

Secretary – Karen Sanzo, Old Dominion University

At-Large Member – Ed Fuller, Pennsylvania State University

Treasurer – Brad Porfilio, California State University

At-Large Member – Vicki Park, San Jose State University

Program Chair – Tiffany Wright, Millersville University

At-Large Member – Mariela Rodriguez, University of Texas San Antonio

Program Co-Chair – Jerry Burkett, University of North Texas at Dallas

Graduate Student Representative – Mounir Bourkiza, Florida Atlantic University

Visit the LTEL-SIG on Facebook to see photos of our members at the UCEA and AERA annual meetings: <https://www.facebook.com/LTELSig>