



UCEA REVIEW

University Council for Educational Administration
Headquartered at the University of Missouri-Columbia

Arizona State University
Auburn University
Bowling Green State University
Brigham Young University
College of William and Mary
Duquesne University
Florida State University
Fordham University
Georgia State University
Hofstra University
Illinois State University
Indiana University
Iowa State University
Kansas State University
Kent State University
Lehigh University
Louisiana State University
Miami University
Michigan State University
New Mexico State University
New York University
Northern Illinois University
Oklahoma State University
Portland State University
Rutgers University
Sam Houston State University
St. Johns University
State University of New York at Buffalo
Temple University
Tennessee State University
Texas A & M University
Texas State University-San Marcos
The Ohio State University
The Pennsylvania State University
University of Alabama
University of British Columbia
University of California-Santa Barbara
University of Cincinnati
University of Connecticut
University of Dayton
University of Florida
University of Georgia
University of Houston
University of Illinois
University of Iowa
University of Kansas
University of Kentucky
University of Lincoln
University of Louisville
University of Maryland
University of Michigan
University of Minnesota
University of Missouri-Columbia
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
University of Nevada-Las Vegas
University of New Mexico
University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill
University of Northern Colorado
University of Oklahoma
University of Oregon
University of Pittsburgh
University of Tennessee
University of Texas-Austin
University of Texas-Pan Austin
University of Texas-San Antonio
University of Toledo
University of Utah
University of Virginia
University of Washington
University of Wisconsin-Madison
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Vanderbilt University
Washington State University
Wayne State University

Fall 2005

Vol XLVII

Number 3

Our New Era Requires a New DEEL: Towards Democratic Ethical Educational Leadership.

By:

Steven Jay Gross & Joan Poliner Shapiro
Temple University

The New DEEL Mission Statement

The mission of the New DEEL is to create an action-oriented partnership, dedicated to inquiry into the nature and practice of democratic, ethical educational leadership through sustained processes of open dialogue, right to voice, community inclusion, and responsible participation toward the common good. We strive to create an environment to facilitate democratic ethical decision-making in educational theory and practice which acts in the best interests of all students.

Introduction

Are educators in the 21st Century merely cogs in the wheel of the accountability movement or is there a bolder and much more profound path to take? This is a question that educational leaders in schools and universities across North America have started to wrestle with in an attempt to develop an alternative movement that is now called, the New DEEL (Democratic Ethical Educational Leadership). This concept promotes democratic action using a moral framework in schools, in higher education and in the wider community. Those who have begun to work on the New DEEL hope to help educators expand their concept of leadership to get in touch with the inspiration that brought them into education in the first place.

A Clear Choice for Educational Leadership

The 21st Century has provided our field of educational leadership with a number of paradoxes. For instance, on the one hand the new millennium began with the promise of serious innovation and transformation in schools, while on the other hand, the relentless drumbeat of a politically zealous accountability movement brought on a new wave of mistrust of public education in North America that now echoes in places as far away as Australia. This trend towards accountability emulates the corporate model; while even the term itself comes from an accountant's ledger (Gross, Shaw & Shapiro, 2003). Another way to frame this paradox might be to call it, democracy versus control (Purpel, 1989).

Ironically, just as educators build on the need for adaptive, creative and socially just forms of organizations (Aiken 2002; Begley, 1999; Begley & Zaretsky, 2004; Boyd 2000; Gross 2004; Reitzug & O'Hair, 2002, Sernak, 1998; Shapiro & Purpel, 2004; Shapiro & Stefkovich, 2005; Starratt, 2004; Young, Petersen, & Short 2002), the forces of the accountability movement thrust our schools, their leaders and our own institutions into more bureaucratic, more top-down and more alienating forms of management

One major reason for this condition is a narrow definition of school reform typically referred to as school improvement. In the past, we have been told that the choice for educational leadership programs was simple. We could either opt for school improvement or democratic schools or social justice as our organizing principles (Murphy, 1999). While there is a superficial logic to the construction, framing the problem of priorities in this way falsely separates social justice from democracy and pits both against school improvement. Upon reflection colleagues around the nation and around the world are coming to a different conclusion: *there is no democracy without social justice, no social justice without democracy and that these mutually inclusive concepts are indispensable ingredients to school improvement worthy of the name.*

The limits of school improvement when alienated from social justice and democracy are not difficult to see. School improvement, in isolation, has too often meant the over use of corporate culture, mores and metaphors that are ill suited for education and insufficient for our purposes. By imposing business models and values, educators find themselves running scared, ceding the field (literally and figuratively) to the forces of privatization – including our field of educational leadership.

While there is some overlap between the work of educational leaders and business leaders, Morgan's (1997) proposition that metaphors both illuminate and obscure is most instructive. In this case, the little that the corporate metaphor illuminates for our field is eclipsed by what it obscures. Simply put, those who have commit-

ted their careers to education have a very different set of values from those who focus on corporate life. Our fiduciary obligation is not to stockholders, it is to our students, their families and their communities. We do not look at our students as mere customers who exchange money for services rendered. Finances certainly are a part of our work, but our responsibilities to our students go much deeper. A corporation counts its development in quarterly earnings reports. As educators, we count our development in the lives that our students, and their students live, as well as the society that those whom we have the privilege to influence build. Our project is not simply a projection of short-term profits. Our project is the development of a democratic, ethical and socially just society. *While business is transactional, our work is transformational.*

For those aspiring to educational leadership coming to us for answers, the question is obvious: Will we prepare a generation of obedient functionaries serving a bureaucratic accountability regime, or will we prepare a new kind of leader who can build a democratic-ethical vision for the school and the surrounding community?

A Powerful Tradition to Follow

There is rich historical precedence for taking a different position in educational leadership than the current trend toward corporate imitation and top-down accountability control. Over the past century, educational leaders have recoiled from scientific-management and the cre-

ation of factory-like schools wherein leadership was a matter of hierarchical control. Ella Flagg Young, John Dewey's colleague and the first woman to become superintendent of a major American city school system, promoted teacher councils that empowered classroom faculty to share in power and decision-making (Webb & McCarthy 1998). Dewey's own work (1903), of course, centered on the vital connection between education and democratic life. George S. Counts' classic, *Dare the School Build a New Social Order?* (1932), challenged that Progressive vision of education to expand toward the construction of a more just society. During the 1930's and 1940's, as the world faced and then fought fascist Italy, imperial Japan and Nazi Germany, the future of democracy was in grave doubt. Responding to this crisis, educational leaders such as Alice Miel (1943) and Harold Rugg of Teachers College helped to build a new movement in our field called democratic school administration (Kliebard 1987). The point of this endeavor was to help the schools of their era buttress democracy by teaching leaders to model democratic behaviors. These are not mere examples of democratic-ethical administration in the past, instead, they represent a rich tradition built by the leaders upon whose shoulders we should stand.

Yet, while the Progressives and social meliorists pursued a more democratic society with passion and reason, an energized emphasis upon ethical decision making needs to be added to the mixture to meet the dynamic challenges of the early 21st Century. In his recent book, *God has a Dream*, Archbishop Desmond Tutu (2004) shares the concept of *ubuntu*, which captures a bit of the difference between a business mind and an educator's mind and illustrates the potential of democratic-ethical educational leadership.

According to *ubuntu*, it is not a great good to be successful through being aggressively competitive and succeeding at the expense of others. In the end, our purpose is social and communal harmony and well-being. *Ubuntu* does not say, 'I think, therefore I am.' It says rather, 'I am human because I belong. I participate. I share.' Harmony, friendliness, community are great goods. Social harmony is for us the *summum bonum* – the greatest good. Anything that subverts, that undermines this sought-after good is to be avoided like the plague. Anger, resentment, lust for revenge, even success through aggressive competitiveness, are corrosive of this good.

Launching of the New DEEL

In response to the challenges facing the field of educational leadership today, colleagues from leading UCEA members joined committed practitioners to take action. During the 2004-2005 academic year, faculty and department leaders from Temple University, The Pennsylvania State University, the University of Vermont, Rowan University, the University of Oklahoma, the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, Australian Catholic University, and the University Council of Educational Administration, as well as U.S., Canadian and Australian practitioner leaders have launched a new movement in the field of educational leadership. This movement, called the New DEEL (Democratic Ethical Educational Leadership) aims to change the direction of our field away from an overly corporate model towards the values of democratic and ethical behavior.

We believe that the first job of the school is to help young people become effective citizens in a democracy. Learning how to earn a living is crucial, but it is a close second, in our opinion. Democratic citizenship, in any era, is a complex task but it seems especially difficult at this time when international conflict and growing economic and social inequality are the rule. We believe that the spirit of the New DEEL is

In This Issue

- The New DEEL 1
- From the Director and President 2
- UCEA BCQ: New First Message 3
- Feature Article: Social Justice in Educational Leadership 4
- New UCEA Feature Editor Introduction 5
- RIEF Call For Proposals 6
- Interview: Peter A. Hall, NAGLE 7
- Call for Nominations for Subjunctive 8
- Innovative Programs: Dem State University 9
- UCEA Employment Resource 10
- CAV & Announcements 11
- Feature Article: Answer the Call 12
- Forthcoming UCEA White Paper 13
- UCEA Convention 2005 MO 19
- Events at a Glance 19
- Virtual Staff Sessions 19
- 2005 PSR Members 20
- 2005 BC Members 20
- Downhill Meeting Announcement 21
- Conference Speakers 21
- Women's SIG - Call for Projects 22
- Graduate Student Symposium 22
- New Gay/Straight Alliance Inaugural Meeting 22
- UCEA Conference Exhibitors 22
- Introduction to Nashville 24
- 2005 UCEA Convention Host City Information 25
- UCEA 2005 Convention Hotel Registration 26
- UCEA 2005 Convention Registration 27
- 2005-2006 UCEA Calendar 28

the same spirit that animates our colleagues throughout UCEA: the cause of a liberating education.

Achievements of the New DEEL

This is a new movement, a vigorous and energized one typified by reflection, scholarship and action. Here are some of our accomplishments to date:

- **Meeting in Barbados**, September 2004, at the 9th Annual UCEA Values and Leadership Conference to consider the possibilities of launching such an effort.
- **Meeting in Kansas City**, November 2004, at the UCEA Convention to lay plans for a winter strategy session and meet with organizers of the 2005 UCEA Convention.
- **Winter Meeting at Temple University**, February 2005, to strategize with colleagues from Temple, Penn State, the University of Vermont, Rowan University and practitioner partners from Pennsylvania and New Jersey. This meeting resulted in our mission statement and short-term goals for scholarship.
- **Meeting at the AERA Annual Meeting in Montreal**, April 2005 to begin work on UCEA proposals, UCEA Values and Leadership participation, NCPEA participation, mission statement, and agree on initiating a multi-university research project for high school student engagement.
- **NCPEA Annual Meeting in Washington, D.C.**, July 2005, to present the New DEEL to this organization. Judith Aiken represented the group.
- **Research into High School Student Engagement Project in US and Australia**, October 2004 -Present to create an international research project aligned to the New DEEL and is designed to give students across the North America and Australia an opportunity to have their voices heard and influence the design of curriculum, instruction and assessment of their own education.
- **10th Annual UCEA Values and Leadership Conference at Penn State**, October 2005 will feature a town meeting on the New DEEL. In addition, the New DEEL is the focus of a paper presented at this conference.
- **UCEA Annual Conference November 2005**: The entire conference theme has been greatly influenced by the New DEEL. In addition, there will be one town meeting, one general session and two panels devoted to the New DEEL. This is a clear example of the reach of our work to date.
- **AERA Proposals** for April 2006, two symposia were submitted. In addition, a proposal for the high school student engagement research project was submitted.
- **New International Member**, August 2005, to include Australian Catholic University.
- **4th Annual Hawaii International Conference on Education**, January 2006, to submit two panel presentations for this international conference. Both panels were accepted.

The New DEEL Moving Forward

It is inspiring to see so much movement in less than one year for the New DEEL, yet we have only made a start. In order to change the direction of our field, we must grow, deepen and dare to consider the profile of a very different kind of educational leader, at every level from those emerging from the current models. To be an educational leader in the 21st century, new skills are needed and a broader definition of leadership itself is required raising questions such as:

1. *What political and cultural understanding and skills will Democratic-Ethical Educational Leaders need?*
2. *What organizational ability will they need to show in the school? In the community? In the wide world?*
3. *How must our UCEA institutions transform to support a New DEEL? What will the curriculum contain? To whom will we turn to for ideas?*
4. *In what ways are we in the professoriate democratic actors? In other words, how do we walk the walk?*

Scholarship, activism and a powerful, positive vision for the future seem required ingredients if the ideals of the New DEEL are to take root and move educational leadership and education itself away from today's alienating values of control from above toward democratic-ethical community building. It may be a daunting challenge, but we believe that educational leaders are equal to it. One day, decades from now, we will reflect on this violent and dangerous time with the benefit of historical perspective and better understand our impact when our influence mattered and the field looked to us for wisdom and guidance. We will either look back with pride knowing that we took an ethical stand or in despair mourning a lost chance to make a critical difference when we were most needed. We are confident in our community and have faith that now, when the moment for leadership is at hand, those *teaching and writing about* educational leadership will act. This turbulent century demands no less of us.

References

- Aiken, Judith. (2002). The socialization of new principals: Another perspective on principal retention. *Educational Leadership Review* 3 (1) pp 32-40.
- Begley, P.T. (Ed.). (1999). *Values and educational leadership*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Begley, P.T. & Zaretsky, L. (2004). Democratic school leadership in Canada's public school systems: Professional value and social ethic. *The Journal of Educational Administration*, 42(6).
- Boyd, W.L. (2000). The R's of school reform and the politics of reforming or replacing public schools. *Journal of Educational Change*, 1(3), pp.225-252.
- Counts, G.S. (1932) *Dare the schools build a new social order?* Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1903). *Democracy and education*. New York: The Free Press.
- Gross, S.J. (2004). *Promises kept: Sustaining school and district leadership in a turbulent era*. Alexandria, VA: The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Gross, S.J., Shaw, K., & Shapiro, J.P. (2003). Deconstructing accountability through the lens of democratic philosophies: Toward a new analytic framework. *The Journal of Research for Educational Leadership* 1(3), pp.5-27.
- Kliebard, H. M. (1987). *The struggle for the American curriculum: 1893-1958*. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Koopman, O., Miel, A. & Misner, P. (1943). *Democracy in school administration*. New York: Appleton-Century.
- Morgan, Gareth, (1997). *Images of organization*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Murphy, J. (1999). *The quest for a center: Notes on the state of the profession of educational leadership*. Columbia, MO: University Council for Educational Administration.
- O'Hair, M.J., H.J. McLaughlin & Reitzug, U.C. (2000). *Foundations of democratic education*. Cambridge, MA: Thomson Wadsworth.

- Purpel, D. E. (1989). *The moral and spiritual crisis in education: A curriculum for justice and compassion in education*. New York: Bergin & Garvey
- Reitzug, U.C., O'Hair, M.J. (2002). *From conventional school to democratic school community: The dilemmas of teaching and leading*. In Gail Furman-Brown (Ed.). *School as community: From promise to practice*. New York: SUNY Press.
- Sernak, K. (1998). *School leadership-Balancing power with caring*. NY: Teachers College Press.
- Shapiro, H.S., & Purpel, D.E. (2004). (Eds.) *Critical social issues in American Education: Democracy and meaning in a globalizing world*. (3rd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Shapiro, J.P., & Stefkovich, J.A. (2005). *Ethical leadership and decision making in education: Applying theoretical perspectives to complex dilemmas*. (2nd ed.) Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum Associates.
- Starratt, R. J. (2004). *Ethical Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Tutu, D. (2005) *God has a dream*. New York: Doubleday
- Webb, L., McCarthy, M.C. (1998). Ella flagg young: Pioneer of democratic school administration. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 34(2), pp 223-242.
- Young, M.D, Petersen, G. J. Short P. M. (2002). The complexity of substantive reform: A call for interdependence among key stakeholders. *Educational Administration Quarterly* 38(2), pp. 136-175.

UCEA TOWNHALL MEETING

IMPLICATIONS OF LEADERSHIP REFORM INITIATIVES FOR THE PREPARATION OF DEMOCRATIC ETHICAL EDUCATIONAL LEADERS: A TOWN HALL MEETING

In this town hall meeting, several major reform initiatives are highlighted, including the revision of the Interstate School Leadership Licensure Consortium's (ISLLC) Standards for School Leaders, the development of a national advanced certification for principals, the search for a signature pedagogy, preparation program evaluations, and district partnerships. Steve Gross, Temple University, will facilitate a discussion among panelists regarding the implications of these and other initiatives for the preparation of democratic ethical educational leaders.

Session 4, Friday, 9:30 a.m. – 10:50 a.m., Magnolia Ballroom

The following sessions also focus on the New DEEL in Education:

- Townhall Conversation : *Building the Concept of Democratic Ethical Educational Leadership (New DEEL): A UCEA Values Conference Town Meeting*, Session 05.11, Friday from 11:00 to 12:20 in Hermitage CD
This session is a smaller and more participative Townhall Conversation focused specifically on the New DEEL.
- Symposium: *The New DEEL: Towards Justice and Beyond*, Session 12.02, Saturday from 10:40 to 12:00 in Cheekwood B.
- Symposium: *The Practice of Democratic Ethical Educational Leadership: Examples of the New DEEL in Action*, Session 15.02, Friday from 3:10 to 4:30 in Cheekwood B

From the Director and the President: UCEA's Work to Understand and Improve Leadership Preparation

By Michelle D. Young, UCEA Executive Director and Gary Crow, UCEA President, University of Utah

Since its inception, UCEA has worked with higher education faculty and other committed stakeholders to improve and enrich preparation and research in the field of educational leadership and to build the capacity of member institutions and programs to prepare educational leaders who can support the learning of all children. UCEA has sponsored commissions, conversations, meetings, workshops, research, standards and curriculum development, white papers, journals, monographs, and books. These practices have enabled UCEA leadership programs to have access to cutting edge research, quality standards, and the leading thinking on educational leadership preparation.

Frequently, professors are criticized for ignoring the call for preparation program reforms and for being complacent with the existence of poor programs. A critical and open acknowledgement that leadership preparation programs can and should improve is vital to our credibility to contribute to the national reform agenda. One way that UCEA influences leadership preparation programs is to provide standards and mechanisms to aid programs in evaluating and improving themselves.

UCEA has provided a set of rigorous program standards for its member institutions for over 50 years, and as the field developed, UCEA frequently evaluated and redeveloped its standards to ensure they continued to reflect excellence in the preparation of leaders for and researchers of the field of education. UCEA also participated in the development of standards for school and district leadership practice, such as the Interstate School Leadership Licensure Consortium (ISLLC). Most recently, UCEA has undertaken the task of defining excellence in program content standards and expectations for the development of educational leaders at the Masters and Doctorate level (M.Ed. and Ed.D.) and the preparation of educational researchers at the Doctorate level (PhD).

UCEA, has for many years, provided the field with high quality instructional materials. UCEA has developed or sponsored the development of simulations, case studies, problem based learning units and teaching modules. UCEA will continue to provide such materials and has plans for 1) increased technological enhancement and integration, 2) stronger alignment between UCEA's standards and other sets of leadership standards, 3) increased focus on diversity, technology and research based decision making, 4) cooperative materials development projects with strategic partners (e.g., AERA, Vermont Institute for Individuals with Disabilities and Students Placed at Risk, and 5) wider distribution.

UCEA is also in the midst of revising its program review process. The initial review involves the development of a program portfolio aligned to UCEA program standards, a site visit and reviews of these materials by the UCEA Executive Committee and Plenum. The continuing review (formerly called the UCEA sabbatical review) has followed this same pattern in the past, but UCEA now has plans to align its continuing review with the review provided by national, state and regional accrediting bodies.

Although there are valid debates regarding the use of accreditation bodies, particularly national accreditation bodies, the work of these organizations has been significant for identifying areas for reform and