

SYMPOSIUM

INTERIM REPORT

**THE JOINT RESEARCH
TASKFORCE ON
EDUCATIONAL
LEADERSHIP
PREPARATION**

SPONSORED BY:
UNIVERSITY COUNCIL FOR EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION
DIVISION A - AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATION
TEACHING IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION SPECIAL INTEREST GROUP
NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR PROFESSORS OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

THE JOINT RESEARCH TASKFORCE ON EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP PREPARATION

The Joint Research Taskforce on Educational Leadership Preparation was formed as a collaborative effort of four professional associations: UCEA, TEA-SIG of AERA, Division A of AERA, and NCPEA. Officials of these four associations coordinate the taskforce's work and facilitate their members' participation and support the work products of the taskforce.

The primary impetus for the taskforce has been to stimulate more and better research in our field focused on the preparation of leaders. UCEA and TEA-SIG's collaborative taskforce on evaluating leadership preparation program effectiveness has shown that an organic taskforce process could effectively review the state of research, identify gaps, and support new research, development, and publications. That taskforce has successfully drawn in a wide range of researchers' on its evaluation questions and mentored junior faculty.

The Research Taskforce shares these same goals, while focused broadly on the field of leadership preparation as a whole: to stimulate new research, development and publications in all core areas of the field; to advance the field conceptually and methodologically by building on existing research and theory; and to engage new and experienced scholars to establish research agendas around foundational questions on leadership preparation. The taskforce structure-- with its work groups and conference convening opportunities—facilitates a research community of practice that facilitates collaborative learning and supports research conceptually and methodologically over time.

Thus, the primary aims of the taskforce are:

1. to provide a foundation about existing research and theory in the field of leadership preparation
2. to identify gaps and new directions for research on leadership preparation
3. stimulate more, better quality research in the field of leadership preparation
4. to encourage new and experienced researchers to undertake research in the field.
5. to provide a community of scholars for on-going conceptual and methodological work.

The taskforce is expected to be a 3-5 year process, which will be reviewed by the four associations' officials annually on its direction, vitality and success and by the domain leaders. Over time, the domain areas may be reorganized, particularly as new research directions emerge. Currently, the domains areas are listed below along with contact information for the individuals currently facilitating the work of these groups:

Domain 1- Leadership Education as a Field of Study

John Hoyle, Texas A&M University, jhoyle@neo.tamu.edu

Domain 2- The Context of Leadership Education

Dianna Pounder, University of Utah, pounder@ed.utah.edu

Domain 3: Models and Theories of Leadership Education

Edie Rusch, UNLV (rusche2@unlv.nevada.edu) and Fen English, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill (fenglish@attglobal.net)

Domain 4: Recruitment, Selection and Development of Leadership Candidates:

Theodore Creighton, Sam Houston State University (creitheo@unxmail.shsu.edu) and Tricia Browne-Ferrigno, University of Kentucky (ferrign@pop.uky.edu)

Domain 5: Providers of Leadership Education

Martha McCarthy, Indiana University (mccarthy@indiana.edu) and Nelda Cambron-McCabe, Miami University (cambron@muohio.edu)

Domain 6: Curriculum and Pedagogy in Leadership Education

Robert Kottkamp, Hofstra University, edarbk@hofstra.edu, and Marilyn J. Bartlett, University of South Florida, bartlettm@earthlink.net

Domain 7: The Delivery of Leadership Preparation

Margaret Grogan, University of Missouri-Columbia, groganm@missouri.edu

Domain 8: Student Assessment and Program Evaluation

Terry M. Orr, Teachers College-Columbia, mto10@columbia.edu

Domain 9: Professional Learning

Fran Kochan, Auburn University, kochafr@auburn.edu

Domain 10: Leadership Education Around the Globe

Miles Bryant, UNLV, bryant@unlserve.unl.edu

At this point each of the domains have developed a fairly strong sense of what research and conceptual work has been accomplished in each of the domain areas. This was the first important step of the taskforce, as a review of the literature is one of the first important steps in any research endeavor.

In preparation for the April 7th, taskforce meeting, domain leaders have been asked to put together a presentation that shares the following information:

1. Dominant themes in their domain area
2. Sources/Types (e.g., dissertations, journals, ERIC documents, book chapters) of literature reviewed
3. A snap shot of the type and amount of research that has been conducted in each sub-area of their domain
4. Important gaps in the research literature and/or our knowledge of the domain area, and
5. An agenda for research that addresses those gaps

On the following pages, are overviews of the work of each domain taskforce. Following the April 2006 meeting at AERA, each group will be asked to:

1. propose 1-5 research projects to initiate
 - a. present research plan and methodology (UCEA 2006)
 - b. workshop on research grants and funding (UCEA 2006)
 - c. discuss research in progress (AERA 2007)
 - d. present preliminary new research findings (UCEA 2007)
 - e. participate in press conference (UCEA 2007)
2. publicize research findings
 - a. professional publications for the research products
 - b. association newsletters
 - c. conference reports

As we move forward, we would like to extend more opportunities for taskforce leadership. If you are interested in taking on a leadership role with regard to the taskforce, a domain area, or a research project, please let me or one of the domain or taskforce organizers know of your interest. All are welcome to attend this session, and we encourage your involvement in the next phase of the taskforce's work, regardless of whether you were involved in initial stages or not.

DOMAIN 1- LEADERSHIP EDUCATION AS A FIELD OF STUDY
DOMAIN LEADER: JOHN HOYLE, TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY, JHOYLE@NEO.TAMU.EDU

This domain will explore the bases and issues in leadership education research, as well as its philosophical contexts, historical approaches, and futurist studies. Potential areas to explore within this domain would include: 1) one that explored the context of conducting research on leadership education, including issues of legitimacy, need, as well as interest in conducting and the level of support available to conduct such research; 2) one on the methodological and theoretical approaches used to research leadership preparation, identifying themes over and critical moments within that history; 3) a general overview of the areas in which research has been conducted concerning leadership education (e.g., student recruitment, cohorts, use of cases, internships); 4) one offering a critique of the research that has been conducted so far on educational leader preparation, highlighting areas for improvement or expansions concerning theory, method and focus; and 5) perhaps one on the Danforth Schools and where they are now.

Interim Report Submitted by *John Hoyle*

Romantic Era

Leadership Theory Development

- ◆ Viewing Educational Administration Through an A-Theoretical Lens
- ◆ Management by Virtue
- ◆ Early Research

Modern Era

Shift in Fundamental Presuppositions Informing Management of Schools

Scientific Management and the Quest for Efficiency

Leading Schools: A Science?

- ◆ Positivism
- ◆ Logical Positivism
- ◆ Post-Positivism

Theory Movement

A Challenge to the Modernist Paradigm

Post Modern Era

Multiple methods of Inquiry

Qualitative Research Movement

- ◆ Humanistic understanding beyond absolute truth
- ◆ Description to further knowledge

Post Modern Era -Continued

Emerging Philosophies of Research in Educational Administration

- ◆ Hermeneutics
- ◆ Phenomenology
- ◆ Critical Theory

A Challenge to the Scientific Method

Relativism versus Single, Objective Truth

Embracing Change: Organized Chaos over Bureaucratic Order

New Thinking in Educational Administration

- ◆ The Goal of Theorizing
- ◆ Methodological Pluralism

Focus on Practice over Theory

Pragmatism and the New Philosophy of Educational Administration

Accountability Movement: A Transition Period?

Ethical/Moralistic, Policy, and Legal Issues in Academic Inquiry

Research-Based, Data-Driven Decision Making

Current Research Methods

Promising Research Methods in Educational Administration: What is over the Horizon?

Domain Members:

John Hoyle, Texas A&M

Connie Fulmer, U. Denver

Patricia Furst, U. Arizona

Jimmy Byrd, Tarleton State University

DOMAIN 2- THE CONTEXT OF LEADERSHIP EDUCATION

DOMAIN LEADER: DIANNA POUNDER, UNIVERSITY OF UTAH, POUNDER@ED.UTAH.EDU

This domain will explore research on university contexts, fiscal affairs, standards, policy-making and issues within the K-12 environment that impact, either directly or indirectly, educational leadership preparation. Potential areas to explore within this domain would include: 1) the emergence of leadership standards and their impact on program content, accreditation, and program approval; 2) the impact of state certification and licensure policies on leadership preparation programs; 3) contextual issues of the university, including institutional prestige and economic issues; 4) the role of advisory boards and school partnerships in developing and delivering leadership preparation, 5) the issue of PreK-12 accountability and its impact on leadership preparation programs specifically and Higher Education generally, 6) partnerships.

Interim Report Submitted by *Dianna Pounder*

Context of Leadership Education – Leadership education programs serve multiple publics and constituent groups. As a result, they are subject to multiple influences. This domain explores the many internal and external influences on leadership education (in the United States).

1. Influences on leadership education that are internal to the university – e.g. faculty or university norms/culture, academic standards, university reward systems, fiscal issues, ...
2. Influences on leadership education from regulatory, licensure, or accreditation agencies (such as state offices of education, professional accrediting bodies) e.g. bureaucratic structures & processes, state &/or national professional standards, accountability expectations, ...
3. Influences on leadership education from the practitioner arm of the profession such as state &/or national professional administrator associations (such as AASA, ASCD, NASSP, NAESP), local school districts, partner schools or districts, the local education community).....e.g. administrator supply needs, field experience & internship support, placement & selection practices, ...
4. Influences on leadership education from broader political or market forces --- e.g. state or federal political or policy groups or ideologies, market competition from 'for-profit' agencies, labor market forces,

5. Synergistic influences on leadership education from the interaction of above forces --- the synergistic effect of above forces &/or a synthesis of influences & implications for leadership education.

Joint Task Force Domain Two Members: Diana Pounder (Chair/Domain Editor), Don LaMagdeleine (St. Thomas U), Diane Taylor (LSU), Faye Patterson (U of Tennessee), Gail Schneider (U of Wisconsin-Milwaukee), Brendan Maxcy (U of Missouri-Columbia), David Arsen (Michigan State), Nan Restine, Texas Women's U), Cindy Reed (Auburn)

DOMAIN 3: MODELS AND THEORIES OF LEADERSHIP EDUCATION

DOMAIN LEADER: EDIE RUSCH, UNLV (RUSCHE2@UNLV.NEVADA.EDU) AND FEN ENGLISH, UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA-CHAPEL HILL (FENGLISH@ATTGLOBAL.NET)

This domain considers models of pre-service and advanced university-based leadership education and the underlying theories of leadership education. Potential areas to explore within this domain would include: 1) the historical development leadership education, 2) theories of leadership education both for ed leadership and in other fields; 3) the organizing theories that programs use to construct their programs (e.g., ethics, social justice, management, transformational leadership); 4) various university-based preparation models; 5) preparation programs that are designed and delivered by school districts, either alone or in collaboration with universities; 6) alternate paths that states make available to leadership candidates; and 7) leadership preparation programs, like New Leaders for New Schools, that provide an alternative to university programs.

Interim Report Submitted by *Edith Rusch*

Our discussion at AERA 2005 resulted in a reframing of our domain into 6 potential themes, each of which has a history, theories, and models. General Information: We will address this domain using themes as opposed to a chronological history. Within each theme, authors should address:

- (a) relevant historical events and facts that led to
- (b) formation or evolution of theoretical perspectives (in education and other fields) that, in turn, informed
- (c) program and instructional models for educating school leaders. .

Introduction/Overview Brief section on history of university-based leadership education with an introduction to the thematic essays.

A. Pathways of/to Power—positional; personal; organizational

Power, in all its forms, is a central element of leadership theories. James MacGregor Burns accused many disciplines (political science, economics and history) of defining leadership based on accumulations of power via guns and money (Sorenson, 2000). On the other hand, in 1918, another political scientist, Mary Parker Follett' described "the power of leadership [as] the power of integration (Follett, 1918, p. 229).

This section should provide the reader with picture of how the evolution of theories about power influence and appear in educational leadership program models. I believe the section should address more than curriculum issues-i.e. in what ways have theories about power played out in

the organizational structure of programs, in faculty-student relationships, or in mentoring. For example, formal leadership programs organized by Cubberly and his network of big-city superintendents assumed the power of selection and placement. The power of the “kingmaker” was (and in some cases, still is) a major barrier for underrepresented groups in school administration. To what degree do leadership program models sustain or interrupt this expression of power?

B. Disciplinary structure: certification; accreditation; accountability models (Praxis; ISSLC)

C. Pedagogical themes: Personal development; adult development; training vs. learning; problem-based

D. Professional Isolation—from other parts of the educational profession; isolated coursework—address emerging Teacher Leadership programs.

E. Community Development (social reproduction; social justice; evolving democracy)

F. Entrepreneurism (response to markets) Leadership Academies; distance learning; alternative programs

Conclusion/Overview: An integrated look at the themes—common perspectives & anomalies

A critique

Future directions

Domain Members:

Louise Allen Lallen@gsu.edu Georgia State University Atlanta GA
JoAnn Barbour profbarbour@mindspring.com Texas Women’s University Denton, TX
Pat Bauch Pbauch@bama.ua.edu University of Alabama Birmingham AL
Jeff Brooks Jbrooks@mail.coe.fsu.edu Florida State University Tallahassee FL
Peter Cistone cistonep@fiu.edu Florida International University Miami FL
Fenwick English fenglish@attglobal.net University of No. Carolina Chapel Hill NC
Andrea Evans aeevans@niu.edu Northern Illinois University DeKalb IL
Susan Everson eversons@slu.edu St. Louis University St Louis MO
Pam Flood floodps@yahoo.com Florida State University Tallahassee FL
Doug Furey doug@cdli.ca Memorial University of Newfoundland
Roel Garcia roelg@educ.umass.edu University of Massachusetts Amherst, Ma
Laura Hassler lhassler@mail.fsu.edu Florida State University Tallahassee FL
Brenda Hood hood@u.washington.edu University of Washington Seattle WA
Jen Katz-Buonincontro Jenela@uoregon.edu University of Oregon Eugene OR
Yvonne Martin martiny@uvvm.uvic.ca University of Victoria Victoria, BC
Rod Muth Rodney.Muth@cudenver.edu University of Colorado Denver CO
Susan Printy sprinty@msu.edu Michigan State University Lansing MI
Diane Ricciardi pdr@clemson.edu Clemson University Greenville, SC
Edith Rusch edith.rusch@ccmail.nevada.edu University of Nevada Las Vegas NV
Stacey Rutledge rutledge@mail.coe.fsu.edu Florida State University Tallahassee FL
pam Salazar salazar@unlv.nevada.edu University of Nevada Las Vegas NV
Natza Schuabsky nitza_schwabsky@yahoo.com University of Haifa Israel
Helen Sobehart Sobehart@mailbox.cr.duq.edu Duquesne University Pittsburg PA
Jerry Starrett starrett@bc.edu Boston College Boston MA

DOMAIN 4: RECRUITMENT, SELECTION AND DEVELOPMENT OF LEADERSHIP CANDIDATES

DOMAIN LEADERS: THEODORE CREIGHTON, SAM HOUSTON STATE UNIVERSITY
(CREITHEO@UNXMAIL.SHSU.EDU) AND TRICIA BROWNE-FERRIGNO, UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY
(TRICIA.FERRIGNO@UKY.EDU)

This domain focuses on research about leadership candidates. Potential areas to explore within this domain would include: 1) recruitment and selection procedures, 2) processes used to develop individual candidates; 4) candidate learning and adult learning in general; 5) candidate engagement; 6) development of candidate leadership identity, and 7) how programs connect to students following graduation and how they sustain them as leaders (i.e., mentoring and inducting).

Interim Report [2005 AERA] *Tricia Browne-Ferrigno*

During the 2005 AERA session, each domain group was asked to discuss and respond to five areas:

- a. Define the domain;
- b. Provide a history on the domain in the field;
- c. Identify the policy context, if relevant;
- d. Identify the lines of research that have been pursued; and
- e. Identify current gaps, conceptual debates, convergence, opportunities for further research.

Definition of Domain 4

During the AERA session, our group reviewed the content of three other sections (e.g., Domain 6: Curriculum and Pedagogy in Leadership Education; Domain 7: The Delivery of Leadership Preparation; and Domain 9: Professional Learning) and determined that portions of Domain 4 overlapped that work. Thus, we crafted a minimized definition for our domain:

This domain focuses on research about leadership candidates including (a) identification, recruitment, and selection; (b) role-identify transformation during preparation programs; (c) placement assistance for aspiring educational leaders (superintendents, principals, teachers); and (d) succession planning.

This narrowed focus would mean that the title for Domain 4 would become “Recruitment, Selection, Placement, and Succession Planning for Leadership Candidates.”

History and Policy of Domain 4

Several members of our group have authored historical reviews of candidate recruitment policies and recommendations that can be revised for inclusion in this section of the Handbook. The AERA group recommends that we conduct additional literature reviews to explore more recent presentations, publications, dissertations, and monographs about the history and policy of Domain 4 topics: (a) identification, recruitment, and selection; (b) role-identify transformation; (c) placement assistance; and (d) succession planning.

Research in Domain 4

Several members of our group have authored research papers about Domain 4 topics that may be suitable as resources for a comprehensive review of research in this area. The group recommends that we explore research and evaluation conducted by various groups (e.g., U. S. Department of Education/WestEd’s recent publication, *Innovative Pathways to School Leadership*; NASSP Task Force on Principal Preparation; Institute for Educational Leadership) and exemplary practices by

leadership development initiatives (e.g., Broad Foundation; AASA, NAESP, NASSP; New Leaders for New Schools; The Omnia Group and Broward County, FL). Additionally, this section needs to include information about program requirements for selection of participants identified by NCATE/ELLCC.

Gaps in Domain 4 Research: Need for Clarity

Our group could not resist reference to the recently published Levine report about leadership preparation, *Educating School Leaders*. In his Executive Summary, he identifies “Nine Criteria for Judging Program Quality” (p. 2). His fifth item provoked an interesting discussion among the group at AERA: “5. Admission criteria are designed to recruit students with the capacity and motivation to become successful school leaders [underline emphasis added].” We wondered what criteria identify potential for educational leadership “capacity” and “motivation.”

We perceive that a tension exists concerning inputs (i.e., admission of candidates to programs) and outcomes of leadership preparation programs (i.e., what graduates do in their careers after program completion). Our group then discussed responses to the question, What are leadership preparation program outcome expectations? It seems that our field uses the phrase “leadership preparation programs” more often than “principal or superintendent preparation.” Hence, we thought we need to discuss further the breadth of the domain: Do we focus narrowly on principal preparation? Or do we expand our domain to include preparation of superintendents? What about teacher leadership? We agreed that we need to clarify “what” this domain covers.

Further, we perceived that gaps exist in how preparation programs identify selection factors, prerequisite attitudes or personal qualities, group membership skills (important for participation in closed cohort programs), understanding of program as self-development, use of technology as assessment tools.

Thus far, the membership of this subgroup of the Task Force is best described as a “dynamic mix of individuals,” rather than a cohesive group. Despite the fluidity of our membership, we have made progress toward defining student characteristics. To accomplish our next steps, we need and welcome assistance from those interested in this important topic.

Interim Report [2006 AERA] *Tricia Browne-Ferrigno*

Domain 4 Themes: Recruitment, Selection, Development and Placement of Leadership Candidates

These themes represent an input-output continuum focused on those actively engaged in leadership development: the candidates. The themes emerged from brainstorming and wonderings about the students in educational leadership preparation programs, namely

- Who are they?
- What prompted them to enroll?
 - Did others recruit the candidates because they displayed leadership talent or potential?
 - Did the candidates enroll because they are passionate about improving schools? Or convinced they could do a better job than current principals?
 - Did they enroll specifically to complete requirements for their next career step(s)?
 - Did they enroll to learn about educational leadership to enhance their current practice?
 - Did they enroll to earn a graduate degree? Or merely to increase their salary?
- How are they—the potential future educational leaders—selected?
 - What admission processes do programs use to select candidates (i.e., open enrollment vs. selection)?
 - Who is involved with admission processes (e.g., committee vs. individual decision, university vs. district selection, rigorous standards vs. self selection)?
 - What influence do admission processes have on the quality of candidates?

- What types of support do university-based programs provide candidates concerning job-placement before and after graduation?
 - Career counseling and development
 - Networking and job fairs
 - Application preparation
 - Interviewing skills
 - First-year induction
- What strategies do programs use to follow career paths of candidates following graduation?
 - Longitudinal studies of graduates' careers and performance
 - Networking, reunions
 - Newsletters
- What are non-university leadership preparation programs doing about candidate?
 - Recruitment and selection
 - Career development
 - Placement support
- Are we preparing candidates ready—and willing—to assume leadership of contemporary P-12 schools and systems?
 - Applicant shortages for open positions
 - Certified but not seeking placements
 - Critiques by outsiders about effectiveness of university-based programs

Domain 4: Literature Reviewed: Candidate Selection

- Our initial step was a review of literature about admissions to educational leadership preparation programs. The first draft was presented at the 2002 UCEA annual meeting; a revised version was published.
 - Browne-Ferrigno, T., & Shoho, A. (2002, November). *An exploratory analysis of leadership preparation selection criteria*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Pittsburgh, PA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED472145)
 - Browne-Ferrigno, T., & Shoho, A. (2004). Careful selection of aspiring principals: An exploratory analysis of leadership preparation program admission practices. In C. S. Carr & C. L. Fulmer (Eds.), *Educational leadership: Knowing the way, showing the way, going the way* (pp. 172-189). Twelfth Annual Yearbook of the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration. Lanham, MD: ScarecrowEducation.
- Important sources (e.g., publications by professional organizations, journal articles, book chapters, conference papers)
 - American Association of School Administrators. (1960). *Professional administrators for America's schools* (Thirty-eighth AASA yearbook). Washington, DC: National Educational Administration.
 - Creighton, T. (2001). Lessons from the performing arts: Can auditioning help improve the selection process in university administration preparation in the 21st century? In T. J. Kowalski & G. Perreault (Eds.), *21st century challenges for school administration* (pp. 101-112). Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.
 - Creighton, T. B., & Shipman, N. J. (2002, Fall). Putting the H.O.T.S. into school leadership preparation. *Educational Leadership review*, 3(3), 26-31.
 - Milstein, M. M. (1992, October-November). *The Danforth Program for the Preparation of School Principals (DPPSP) six years later: What we have learned*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Minneapolis, MN.
 - Milstein, M. M., & Krueger, J. A. (1997). Improving educational administration preparation programs: What we have learned over the past decade. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 72(2), 100-106.
 - National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration. (1987). *Leaders for America's schools*. Tempe, AZ: University Council for Educational Administration.

- National Policy Board for Educational Administration. (1989, May). *Improving the preparation of school administrators: The reform agenda*. Charlottesville, VA: Author.
- Ortiz, F. I. (1982). *Career patterns in education: Women, men and minorities in public school administration*. New York: Praeger.
- Peterson, K. (2002). The professional development of principals: Innovations and opportunities. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 38(2), 213-232.
- Pounder, D. G., & Young, I. P. (1996). Recruitment and selection of educational administrators: Priorities for today's schools. In K. Leithwood, J. Chapment, D. Corcon, P. Hallinger, & A. Hart (Eds.), *International handbook of educational leadership* (pp. 279-308). Boston: Kluwer.
- Stout, R. T. (1973). *New approaches to recruitment and selection of educational administrators*. Columbus, OH: University Council for Educational Administration

Domain 4 Types of Research Conducted

- Candidate selection: University-based programs (timeline)
 - Creighton, T., & Jones, G. (2001, August). *Selection or self-selection? How rigorous are selection criteria in educational administration programs?* Paper presented at the annual meeting of National Council of Professors of Educational Administration, Houston, TX.
 - Browne-Ferrigno, T., & Shoho, A. (2003, April). *Do admission processes in administrator preparation programs assure students with potential to become effective principals?* Paper presented at the annual meeting for the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.
 - Lad, K., & Gulek, J. C. (2005, April). *Leadership preparation admission criteria: Selection or open enrollment?* Paper discussed at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.
 - Browne-Ferrigno, T., Lad, K., Shoho, A., & Gulek, J. C. (2006). *Admission to university-based programs: Will professors ever implement recommendations for careful selection of future school leaders?* Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Candidate placement
 - Browne-Ferrigno, T. (2003). Becoming a principal: Role conception, initial socialization, role-identity transformation, purposeful engagement. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39(4), 468-503.
 - Browne-Ferrigno, T., & Muth, R. (2004). Leadership mentoring in clinical practice: Role socialization, professional development, and capacity building. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 40(4), 468-494.
 - Crow, G. M., & Glascock, C. (1995). Socialization to a new conception of the principalship. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 33(1), 22-31.
 - Hart, A. W. (1993). *Principal succession: Establishing leadership in schools*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
 - Matthews, L. J., & Cow, G. M. (2003). *Being and becoming a principal: Role conceptions for contemporary principals and assistant principals*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Candidate selection: Critiques and recommendations
 - Bottoms, G., & O'Neill, K. (2001, April). *Preparing a new breed of school principals: It's time for action*. Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board.
 - Bottoms, G., O'Neill, K., Fry, B., & Hill, D. (2003). *Good principals are the key to successful schools: Six strategies to prepare more good principals*. Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board.
 - Educational Research Service, National Association of Elementary School Principals, & National Association of Secondary School Principals. (2000). *The principal, keystone of a high-achieving school: Attracting and keeping the leaders we need*. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.

Hale, E. L., & Moorman, H. N. (2003). *Preparing school leaders: A national perspective on policy and program innovations*. Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership.

Hess, F. M. (2003). *A license to lead? A new leadership agenda for America's schools*. Washington, DC: Progressive Policy Institute, 21st Century Schools Project.

Institute for Educational Leadership. (2000, October). *Leadership for student learning: Reinventing the principalship*. Washington, DC: Author.

National Commission for the Principalship. (1990). *Principals for our changing schools: Preparation and certification*. Fairfax, VA: Author.

National Staff Development Council. (2000). *Learning to lead, leading to learn: Improving school quality through principal professional development*. Oxford, OH: Author.

Norton, J. (2002, Fall). *Preparing school leaders: It's time to face the facts* [Conference report]. Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board.

United States Department of Education. (2005). *Innovative pathways to school leadership*. Washington, DC: Office of Innovation and Improvement. Retrieved March 1, 2005, from <http://www.edpubs.org/>

- Candidate placement: Situational principal shortages
 - Gates, S. M., Ringel, J. S., Santibanez, L., Ross, K., & Chung, C. H. (2003). *Who is leading our schools? An overview of school administrators and their careers*. Retrieved June 9, 2003, from <http://www.rand.org/publications>.
 - Roza, M. with Cello, M. B., Harvey, J., & Wishon, S. (2003). *A matter of definition: Is there truly a shortage of school principals?* Seattle: Center for Reinventing Public Education, Daniel J. Evans School of Public Affairs, University of Washington.

Domain 4 Gaps in Research Literature

We have not yet actively sought an answer to question, Who are the candidates in our programs? A recent literature review suggests that research is limited, but two promising sources need to be explored:

- In Kentucky, funds available through State Action for Evaluation of Leadership Preparation (SAELP) grant supported statewide survey studies about groups, which may provide a snapshot of the candidate pool back in 2001. Other SAELP grantees may have conducted similar studies.
- The UCEA/TEA SIG Taskforce on Evaluating Leadership Preparation Program Effectiveness recently conducted survey studies in several states, which may be a viable resource for describing student characteristics.
- Independent researchers have published manuscripts that provide “demographic snapshots” of students participating in specific programs.

Domain 4 Agenda for Research to Address Gaps

Recruit a team of researchers to

- Design and implement a study about student characteristics
- Define clearly what is meant by “development and placement” and then design and implement a study about career-placement for candidates
- Conduct longitudinal studies about graduates’ career paths

Domain 4 Interested Parties and Potential Resources

Following is a list of individuals who responded to our initial call for assistance with this writing project. Also included are individuals who have written about topics within Domain 4 whom we hope might be interested in joining our group or be willing to provide assistance as reviewers.

Ted Creighton <creitheo@shsu.edu>

Tricia Browne-Ferrigno <tricia.ferrigno@uky.edu>
Julie Edmister <ejulie@bgnet.bgsu.edu>
Kathleen Jorrisen <ktjoris@bgnet.bgsu.edu>
Estelle Kamler <estelle.kamler@liu.edu>
Gary Kiltz <gary.kiltz@asu.edu>
McDowell <mcdowellej@mail.ecu.edu>
Megan Tschannen-Moran <MeganTM@aol.com>
Megan Tschannen-Moran <mxtsch@wm.edu>
Anthony Normore <normorea@fiu.edu>
Alan Shoho <ashoho2001@yahoo.com>
Alan Shoho <alan.shoho@utsa.edu>
Kaetlyn Lad <klad@stmarys-ca.edu>
Janell Drone <jdrone@hunter.cuny.edu>
Ron Oliver <roliver@fullerton.edu>

DOMAIN 5: PROVIDERS OF LEADERSHIP EDUCATION

DOMAIN LEADERS: MARTHA MCCARTHY, INDIANA UNIVERSITY (MCCARTHY@INDIANA.EDU) AND NELDA CAMBRON-MCCABE, MIAMI UNIVERSITY (CAMBRON@MUOHIO.EDU)

This domain is concerned with the individuals involved in teacher educations. Potential areas to explore within this domain would include: 1) characteristics of university faculty; 2) the preparation and professional development of leadership faculty; 3) the contributions of adjunct and clinical (non-regular) faculty vis-à-vis tenure-track (regular) faculty; 4) the characteristics and preparation of non-regular faculty members; 5) the work life and evaluation of regular faculty; 6) partnerships with districts and communities and inclusion of district practitioners in preparation.

Interim Report Compiled by: *Martha McCarthy & Nelda Cambron-McCabe*

Domain V pertains to the providers of educational leadership preparation. We divided the domain into four areas, each with a team leader listed below. Others volunteered or were recruited to work with the team leaders in investigating research in the respective areas. The topics and team leaders are:

Lines of Research About Providers of Leadership Education: Maria Luisa Gonzalez
Preparation and Professional Development of Full-time Leadership Faculty: Rod Muth
Characteristics, Preparation, and Contributions of Clinical, Adjunct, and Other Non-Regular Faculty: Don Hackmann
Current Gaps, Conceptual Debates, Convergence; Reframing the Conversation About the Role of Providers; Opportunities for Further Research: Jerry Starratt

What follows are notes on initial findings from our quest to identify research pertaining to providers of educational leadership preparation. These notes are incomplete as our quest continues. Although the co-chairs have made some minor changes and/or additions, the individuals whose names appear in the respective sections prepared most of the material. We purposefully did not try to eliminate the inevitable overlaps across the subgroups, because these redundancies may strengthen some of the recommendations for additional research. Similarly, we realize that some of the points made here pertain to other task force domains as well as to ours, which cannot be avoided when groups are working independently. This does not trouble us, as we hope all domains will benefit from our collective efforts. We would like to take this opportunity to thank the team leaders in our domain, because we could not have asked for a more conscientious and congenial group.

Preparation and Professional Development of Educational Administration Faculty

The subgroup on preparation and professional development has found nothing of consequence to warrant anything but a full-scale research effort. We found some literature/research focusing on the experiences of early career faculty (pre-tenure) who are practicing education professionals and who choose higher education as a second career (LaRocco & Burns). This "paucity of literature," exclusive of the early work by Campbell and Newell, the more recent efforts of McCarthy, and a very new chapter on doctoral education by Richardson, leaves our group with but one course of action, one which is too large to be developed and implemented quickly, and that is to conduct the very research that is missing in the field on "the preparation and professional development of leadership faculty." Even preliminary searches of a few data bases (e.g., Academic Search Premiere, ERIC) locate virtually nothing except the work of McCarthy or research on the preparation of school administrators. To understand what constitutes "preparation and profession development" of faculty in educational leadership programs will require the commitment of several faculty over a period of time to build on the beginning work of LaRocco and Bruns in the context of prior studies of the professoriate.

Questions for future research about educational leadership faculty that would provide us with basic information:

- Who are they?
- Where do they come from (previous career, educational background)?
(The two above are addressed in McCarthy and elsewhere but could be updated.)
- What are they doing professionally related to their faculty roles (research, teaching, engagement)?
(The three above are addressed in McCarthy and elsewhere but could be updated.)
- What are their perceptions about how they are managing these roles and responsibilities?
- What do they know now about how they were (or not) prepared to meet the job-related challenges inherent in academic life (lessons learned to inform doctoral preparation programs)? Is there a match?
- How do they describe the supports that they receive (who—people—and what—tangibles)?
- For those who enter the academy as experienced practitioners, how is this “life” the same or different?

Following are questions about the programs that prepare educational leadership faculty:

- Do doctoral programs specifically prepare faculty to work in educational leadership programs?
- On what aspects of faculty responsibility do they focus?
- What are the characteristics of these programs?
- How are they the same as or different from other doctoral programs?

These questions could be answered in the following ways:

1. Conduct national research that gathers some basic information (education, demographic, and background) about current educational leadership faculty:
 - Where they obtained their degrees
 - The type of coursework in their programs
 - Their previous careers and prior work experiences
 - Their current research and public products
 - Their felt need for help and their areas that they consider important
 - and so on

The above points address the characteristics of today’s “who.” Survey research could be conducted on the web with software such as Survey Monkey or Zoomerang.

2. A cohort of respondents could be randomly selected to participate in an in-depth phone survey to add richness to the data from the web-based survey. The cohort should include all variety of faculty (tenure, non-tenure, adjuncts) and could be followed for a couple of years to examine trends.
3. We could conduct surveys that look at the institutions that prepared these faculty members. Regardless, a group of interested researchers, starting with those below, might be conscripted to undertake this study for the profession.

Rodney Muth (lead), University of Colorado at Denver and Health Sciences Center,
rodney.muth@cudenver.edu

Tricia Browne-Ferrigno, University of Kentucky, ferrign@uky.edu

Deborah A. Bruns, Southern Illinois University Carbondale, dabrunsi@siu.edu

Connie Fulmer, University of Colorado at Denver and Health Sciences Center,
connie.fulmer@cudenver.edu

Dorothy Garrison-Wade, University of Colorado at Denver and Health Sciences Center, Dorothy.garrison-wade@cudenver.edu

Diana J. LaRocco, University of Hartford, dlarocco@hartford.edu

Diane Ricciardi, Clemson University, priccia101@aol.com

Characteristics, Preparation, Contributions, Work Life and Evaluation of Regular and Non-regular Faculty Members

Part A: Characteristics, Preparation, Work Life, and Evaluation of Regular Faculty

1. Existing Research

We have compiled a fair amount of research on general topics relating to the quality of work life and working conditions of college faculty. As an example, there is literature on the conditions and working conditions junior faculty tend to face at research universities (mentoring and peer support; surviving tenure); tenure and evaluation systems; and so on. The compiled research will be posted on a website soon.

The research focusing on education administration or leadership faculty is comprised, for the most part, of four studies: Campbell & Newell's (1973) comprehensive survey of administration faculty; Newell & Morgan's (1980) follow-up to this study; the McCarthy et al. (1988) study, *Under Scrutiny*, and McCarthy & Kuh's (1997) *Continuity and change*. [An additional source of some data may be the federal governments longitudinal *IPEDS* study]

2. Areas in Need of Attention

The latter two studies above are clearly the most useful for our Task Force purposes, and offer a wonderful framework to guide any future inquiry. It would be wise to consider replicating these to obtain more current data.

A lot has changed in the past decade that affects the context in which we work, both in terms of the general pressures on the folks we're training and on faculty in our programs. There appear to be certain gaps that we could easily fill should we take on a like project, which would enable us to more fully describe the working conditions and work life of educational leadership faculty.

- The department-level data collected in previous studies were fairly modest – characteristics and numbers of f/t faculty; characteristics of recent hires; types of degrees offered, and so on. Given the importance of P&T, evaluation, and faculty support practices (as well as the relatively recent burgeoning of interest in such things as post-tenure evaluation & mentoring of pre-tenure faculty), it would be useful to expand this survey to collect data on such things as criteria used for promotion and tenure; criteria used for contract renewal of term faculty; criteria and processes associated with post-tenure review; categories of faculty employed (f/t research, f/t teaching, p/t research, p/t teaching, clinical, adjunct); and the existence of mentoring and teaching support services.
- For the individual-level data, existing instruments can be updated to reflect present concerns and conditions. Depending on how the content area is defined, the instrument could be adjusted to reflect more quality of work life issues; at present, a large proportion of the opinion items are focused on faculty views of the professoriate in education leadership rather than on such things as faculty voice in decision making, support for faculty development, etc. Given the pressures of changes in NCATE regulations and the various cries for accountability, it also seems wise to gain a perspective on such things as shifting expectations on faculty time (e.g., time spent on supervising field work, advising duties, time spent on curriculum development, time spent on assessment of student learning).

At the risk of being accused of putting carts before horses, it would be fairly simple to collect the kinds of data needed to provide an up-to-date and fuller picture of the work life and conditions of leadership faculty. In terms of updating opinion items on the surveys, a sufficient number of focus groups (or online chat sessions) could be conducted to derive theme areas that deserve prominence on a revised survey instrument. Any surveys can be easily be implemented over the web. Data on topics like P&T or post-tenure review criteria can be derived from policy documents that can be accessed fairly easily from websites.

Part B: Characteristics, Preparation and Contributions of Clinical, Adjunct and Other Non-regular Faculty Members

Although a fair amount of research has been conducted to determine characteristics of tenure-track faculty members, the research base on clinical, adjunct, and non-regular faculty members in educational leadership programs is exceedingly sparse. The literature base notes numerous concerns that educational leadership faculties are perceived as being too theoretical and disconnected from the challenges and demands of leading and reforming 21st century schools (Bredeson, 1996; Levine, 2005), primarily because relatively few tenure-track faculty have recent administrative experience. Young, Petersen, and Short (2002) noted that changing state licensure requirements are mandating that programs include more intensive internship experiences, which demand that faculties must restructure to connect more fully with the field. Nearly two decades ago, the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (NCEEA, 1987) acknowledged the need to have a balanced faculty composition that reflected diverse experiences and academic backgrounds, faculty who not only would direct the program's field-based elements but also would be engaged in applied research activities.

Relatively little research has been conducted on non-tenure-track educational leadership faculty members, either in clinical appointments (full- or part-time) or part-time adjunct faculty roles. Hackmann (2005) conducted a qualitative study of eight full-time clinical faculty members, discovering that few of these individuals were engaged in applied research activities. Generally, clinical faculty perceived that they were employed to supervise field experiences, teach graduate courses, establish and maintain relationships with local school districts, and assist with student recruitment. Conducting a survey of individuals who applied for part-time clinical appointments, Pounder (1994) determined that many applicants were motivated by their desire to prepare future leaders and for their own intellectual growth.

An area that is receiving increased attention—and a fair amount of criticism—is the use of practicing administrators as adjunct faculty, or *invisible faculty*, as Schneider (2003) calls them. Schneider (2003) surveyed 295 superintendents who served as adjuncts, determining that many taught courses for which they did not feel fully prepared, most were not formally evaluated by the faculty, and many did not receive regular communications from the department. Levine (2005) expressed concern that adjunct faculty in educational leadership programs were contributing to a lack of quality in leadership preparation programs. According to Levine (2005), “Their dominant mode of instruction, according to faculty and student reports, was telling war stories” (p. 36).

Areas in need of attention:

It is apparent that the research base on clinical and adjunct faculty in educational leadership programs is sketchy, at best. Given that no national studies have been conducted in this area, as a first step, survey research should be conducted (hopefully simultaneously with surveys of tenure-track faculty) to learn some basic information of clinical and adjunct faculty. This research easily could be conducted through the use of web-based survey instruments. Among the information that should be collected is:

- Demographic profiles of clinical/adjunct faculty (age, gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, etc.)
- Academic preparation and experience base
- How clinical/adjunct faculty perceive their roles within the educational leadership programs
- Types of institutions in which these individuals are employed, and percentage of courses taught by clinical/adjunct faculty
- Research activities of clinical/adjunct faculty, if any
- Concerns/recommendations of clinical/adjunct faculty, related to how their roles can be enhanced

In addition to survey research, telephone interviews or focus groups could be conducted with clinical and adjunct faculty, to enrich the data obtained from the survey

Don Hackmann (lead), University of Illinois (dghack@uiuc.edu)
Scott Bauer, George Mason University (sbauer1@gmu.edu)
S. David Brazer, George Mason University (sbrazer@gmu.edu)

David Quinn, University of Florida (dquinn@ufl.edu)

Preliminary Considerations of Conceptual Debates and Potential Gaps in the Research on “Providers” of Graduate Educational Leadership Programs

The subgroup on conceptual debates and potential gaps in the research addressed three arenas. First, an attempt was made to articulate various tensions among existing providers. These tensions suggest issues to consider when recruiting new faculty so that there will be consistency between program goals and providers' capacities and interests. Second, we think that there remain large unexplored issues to take into consideration when reviewing the background, capacities, and dispositions of present providers as the program prepares to recruit new faculty, so that there will be consistency between program goals and the personnel who work in the program. Each area is summarized briefly below.

I. Tensions Among the Spectrum of “Providers”

- Definition: A Provider is the program (usually offered by a university) and faculty who provide the professional preparation and continuing education of educational leaders in the field.
- Tensions: When we say that there are tensions among providers, we intend that there are internal tensions in a given program due to the makeup and background of the program faculty; we also intend that there are tensions between different providers, in terms of their criteria for hiring, the consistency between the capacities of those hired and the program goals of the providers, and their views of what educational leadership really entails.
- Tensions among providers exist with the range of interests, backgrounds, role expectancies, and the integration or dissonance with program goals.
- Types of orientations, roles, and backgrounds of providers must be assessed (imagine a three-dimensional matrix:
 1. Orientation: Research Orientation; Reflective Practice Orientation; & Practice Orientation.
 2. Focus: Focus on Transactional Leadership; Focus on Transformational Leadership; Focus on Radical Leadership.
 3. Background: Tenure-Track Faculty with Doctorates in Educational Leadership; Tenure-Track Faculty Who Supplement Instruction But Hold Doctorates in Other Fields; Clinical Faculty Who Have Doctorates but Careers in Practice.

The typology may also be useful to identify the orientation or focus of the preparation programs themselves. One question that flows from the construction and use of these typologies is whether the composition of the program faculty is consonant with the espoused program orientation. Another question deals with recruitment and hiring of new faculty that match the program orientation, or that will challenge a program orientation that has grown complacent and self-sufficient. A third question arises concerning the desirability of a mix of these types within a program faculty, provided they genuinely complement each other's strengths and continue to learn from one another.

II. Issues that May be Overlooked by Providers

- Given the focus on *quality learning for all* students, educational leaders need to be much more involved with teachers in addressing issues affecting *quality learning for all* students.
- School leaders need a serious dose of "real politik" in order to understand what they're up against, and a serious exploration of how their schools will educate poor and minority children to face that world, and indeed how to help their teachers recognize the enormity of the social justice agenda in their classrooms.
- A form of emancipatory pedagogy is crucial to serve the democratic and moral purposes of public schools. That form of pedagogy is absent from most educational leadership and teacher preparation programs.

- Leadership candidates need to be exposed to the complementarity of both psycho-social and cognitive learning perspectives, and the implications for curriculum and pedagogy, so that they will be leading schools that attend to the full range of human developmental needs, not simply the training of minds to produce right answers for those in positions of authority.
- An area that has been receiving increased attention is Ethics in Leadership, or Moral Leadership. For the most part, those recent treatments have tended to deal with what ethicists would consider General Ethics. What is neglected is a treatment of the Special Ethics of education. What is needed is Democratic Ethical Educational Leadership that involves the proactive pursuit, cultivation, and support of those goods of learning in and for a democratic community and polity. What our society needs most of all are fully functioning human beings who can participate, contribute, and find fulfillment in various dimensions of democratic public life. That should be the ultimate good pursued by democratic ethical educational leaders when they consider the special good of learning.

Robert Starratt (lead), Boston College, robert.starratt.1@bc.edu
 Martha McCarthy, Indiana University, mccarthy@indiana.edu
 Nelda Cambron-McCabe, Miami University, cambron@muohio.edu

DOMAIN 6: CURRICULUM AND PEDAGOGY IN LEADERSHIP EDUCATION

DOMAIN LEADER: ROBERT KOTTKAMP, HOFSTRA UNIVERSITY, EDARBK@HOFSTRA.EDU, AND
 MARILYN J. BARTLETT, UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA, BARTLETTM@EARTHLINK.NET

This domain examines the content of leadership preparation programs including the content taught in courses and the pedagogy (cases, action-research, problem-based learning, portfolio development) used to facilitate learning. Potential areas to explore within this domain would include: 1) the evolution of program content overtime; 2) the use of reflection, journaling and storytelling within the leadership curriculum; 3) the use of cases and problem based learning in the leadership classroom; 4) the use of portfolios as a learning tool; 5) internships and other practicum experiences, and 6) a comparison of preparation in educational leadership programs to preparation in other professions.

Interim Report Submitted by *Robert Kottkamp*

Delimited Focus

I put my energy into search in the areas of curriculum, pedagogy and internships/clinical experiences. I did not search specifically in the areas of history/evolution of development of curriculum and pedagogy nor comparison of preparation in our field with other professions. My assumption is that some of the history is already in some older texts which I did not search, and I question whether we have a solid empirical understanding of the state of curriculum and pedagogy currently. Such information would seem to come from actual studies of program descriptions and syllabi assessment. I did recently take a short time to search for comparisons of preparation across professions. The yield was very small. These two areas I still consider minor.

My Method

I began by culling the empirical articles dealing specifically with curriculum, pedagogy and internships from four leading educational leadership journals for the period 1975 to 2002 from the total list of empirical articles on leadership preparation reported in Murphy and Vriesenga (2004). The result was 17 articles: 9 for curriculum, 4 for pedagogy, and 4 for internship. Using their method, I then extended the search for the period since 2002 in the same four journals. This yielded 6 additional empirical studies: 1 for curriculum, 4 for pedagogy and 1 for internship.

I then searched *Dissertation Abstracts International* for empirical studies completed in the 20 year period of 1985-2005. That search yielded 41 empirically grounded dissertations among the three areas. I have the abstracts but have done no further analysis of them except to report that the vast majority concern a single program.

Upon return from Nashville I conducted an analysis of all sessions in all AREA and UCEA meeting programs I had saved. The inclusive years for the AREA programs were: 1995, 1997-2005 and for the UCEA programs: 1994-1999, 2002-2005. The AERA program contained all the sessions allocated to DIVISION A and to TEA/SIG. The total sessions for those years was 1217 for DIVISION A and 60 for TEA/SIG. The years for which I had UCEA Convention programs yielded 1217 total sessions. This is clearly an incomplete set of programs, but I believe sufficient in attempting to assess a general lay of the land in terms of the areas of interest. I coded and kept separate records for each of these three professional associations. Coding was done from titles of presentations with the exception of a few most recent UCEA programs which contain short abstracts. I coded the smallest units I could find: papers within sessions, posters or individual presentations within poster and roundtable sessions. Symposia, and some pre-sessions, while they had multiple participants were typically not specific as to individual specific presentations, nor whether there were actual written artifacts produced for the sessions. So papers, round tables and posters were weighted more heavily than symposia in the counts. I color coded each smallest unit in terms of: curriculum, pedagogy, internship/clinical experience while leaving the vast majority of units blank because the content I was trying to locate is a minor part of the total content of these meetings. I also double coded a number of sessions in both curriculum and pedagogy. Attempting to differentiate these two dimensions I found difficult and address below in a separate section. My coding for these three professional organizations in their meetings yielded a total of 497 coded units (some of them counted twice as they covered two of the three categories I was coding for). The proportions of the three areas yielded in this analysis was different than the empirical proportions of empirical articles in four major journals. Curriculum had 106 coded units, pedagogy 341, and internships/clinical experiences 50. In the meetings pedagogy was first, curriculum second; for the small number of empirical articles the greater/lesser numbers were reversed.

The record of this coding is on an appended Excel file. On subsequent passes through the 497 codes, I noted brief descriptions of content and authorship. There is a Word file appended that contains the more specific information on the coded units. It includes a general content description and a code for the organization, year and total N for that year. Numbers of these are clustered together and indicate areas of relatively high and low interest and productivity. I made another run to record cumulative authorship counts and noted areas (curr, ped, internship). These data are presented and discussed below in the section on suggesting authors.

I was also able to obtain 8 of the NCPEA Yearbooks. In addition I talked with Ted Creighton and he will be able to supply me with many of the actual NCPEA Programs, which I am assuming are more extensive than the contents of the yearbooks in terms of sessions. I subsequently coded the contents of the NCPEA Yearbooks in the same way that I did the professional meeting programs. Given the time crunch I have not made a nice table of the NCPEA findings. But I do indicate below the clusters in which I found NCPEA contribution, though not the N of them. A major difference is that with the Yearbooks I could make an empirical/non-empirical judgment about the article. Working only from titles in the professional meeting programs that was largely an impossible task. This is an important issue that needs underlining.

Curriculum has three typical embodiments:

- Written, as in a formal curriculum
- As an assessment piece with some kind of rubric based on standards
- Areas taught as in a disciplinary subdivision or subject matter

Curriculum is typically **content**, something that is or can be **read** as opposed to observed.

Pedagogy/Instruction is a **process**. It is not read, rather **observed**. It would be seen in a classroom observation. We also talked about projects designed by a teacher/professor for students to do in their own school settings as a form of pedagogy.

Differentiating Internships and Clinical Experiences: **Internships** tend to be narrow: goal focused, standards based, involving supervision and observation, and cohesive with job focus. **Clinical Experiences** tend to be broader, less specifically job focused and not always employing a rubric.

Major Clusters of Activity Concerning Curriculum, Pedagogy and Internships/ Clinical Experiences in Leadership Preparation

Below are the major clusters of professional presentation activity that I derived from the Division A, TEA/SIG and UCEA meeting programs with notes to indicate areas in which NCPEA Yearbooks also showed activity. The clusters are presented by the three major content divisions. The numbers attached to clusters indicate the N of coded units under each across professional organizations. The clusters are also arranged in descending order on N of units or of interest/production. Note that the units represented are smaller than the total of 497 codes. My attempt here was to identify a smaller number of clusters that represent major areas of professional thought, writing and in some cases empirical research in the field. The clusters are also indicated in bold print in the appended Word document that, which also identifies the N of presentations made in each professional organization in that cluster by year. These data allow for the kind of analysis Ira Bogotch (2002) applied in his analysis of TEA/SIG presentation in terms of whether the topic area was growing or diminishing over time.

Major Topical Areas for Curriculum, Pedagogy, and Internships/Clinical Experiences from Meetings: AERA Division A, TEA/SIG, and UCEA

Major Curriculum Clusters

1. Restructuring Administrator Training: 22 (also NCPEA)
2. Social Justice Curriculum: 11
3. Technology: 8
4. Ethics: 6
5. Practitioner Needs Inform Prep Programs: 3

Major Pedagogy Clusters

1. Social Justice Pedagogy: 27 (Note one UCEA Convention has this as the central theme)
2. Case Development: 21 (also NCPEA)
3. Transforming Programs: 21
4. Preparing Reflective Administrators: 17 (also NCPEA)
5. Instructional Technologies: 16 (also NCPEA)
6. Web-Based/Online Courses/Distance Learning: 16
7. Linking Theory/Research and Practice: 15
8. Preparing Ethical/Moral Administrators: 13
9. Portfolios: 13 (also NCPEA)
10. Problem Based Learning: 12 (also NCPEA)
11. Preparation: Action Research/Practitioner Research/Qualitative Research: 12
12. Teaching: Managing Diversity: 9
13. Technology Training for Leaders: 7

Major Internship/Clinical Experience Clusters

1. Mentoring: 17
2. Administrative Internship: 12 (also NCPEA)
3. Restructuring/Reforming Internships/Clinical Experiences: 10 (also NCPEA)
4. Assessment of Internships: 3

Major Topical Areas for Curriculum, Pedagogy, and Internships/Clinical Experiences from Dissertations

As to content of dissertation abstracts, most were descriptive (though many then offered prescriptions for program development or curriculum components); 3 were quasi-experimental. Eighteen were grounded in surveys, 10 used naturalistic methods, mostly interview and focus group, 3 were described as case studies, one as a critical ethnography. Several used mixed methods including some combination of survey, interview, document analysis, ethnography, and syllabus analysis. Several were replications of prior studies in different locations. ANOVA, ANCOVA, t-test and discriminate analysis were used as inferential statistics. The samples ranged as: 3 national, 7 large, 11 small, 8 single program or person, and 5 not described. Units of analysis included roles (e.g. bd member, superintendent, principal, professor, program director) in studies looking at perception alignment or dissonance (8), programs, cohorts/non-cohorts, and individuals. There were specific program to standards analyses: ISLLC 5, NAASP 2, SREB 1, and state standards from CO, MN and PA. Theory did not play a large role, though it was heartening to see that the proportion of studies using some form of standards as a comparison anchor was much higher than the studies produced by professors as a group. Finally, by Section 6 content they were pedagogy 5, curriculum 25 and internship (including mentorship, clinical experience) 4.

It is in proportional allocation of content that the dissertations looked similar to the articles in journals. Specifically, curriculum was by far the largest category, followed by pedagogy, with internship/clinical the smallest. By comparison the counts from 4 different professional group meetings reversed the first and second place compared to the empirical studies: pedagogy 64%, curriculum 24%, and internship/clinical 12% of the 552 coded units. Why the proportions are reversed and so different in empirically based research as opposed to professional meeting presentations (many of which are also empirically grounded also but cannot be coded accurately from titles alone) needs some probing. When I sent Terry Orr the spread sheet on professional meetings, she responded: "I think it is easier to think about how to research pedagogical practices than curriculum, which is why we see so little on curriculum..." Alternatively, my current thinking starts with the definition I gave after conversation with my colleague: curriculum may be identified, counted, coded through **reading**; pedagogy is a **process** that you must either take the word of the pedagogue about or go **observe** it. Observation is a costly undertaking and only suited to small samples. What we tend to get the most of in the articles and dissertations is survey research resulting in descriptive statistics concerning what some group or an array of groups **perceives** is important for the curriculum, missing, or adequately provided. To reiterate, in the articles by professors there is seldom mention of a comparative standard for curriculum, while in the dissertations this is more frequent. Pedagogy is mostly dealt with as a first person description of a single course taught by the author.

DOMAIN 7: THE DELIVERY OF LEADERSHIP PREPARATION

DOMAIN LEADER: MARGARET GROGAN, UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-COLUMBIA,
GROGANM@MISSOURI.EDU

This domain will analyze research on the delivery of leadership preparation. Potential areas to explore within this domain would include: 1) a description of how programs have been delivered overtime; 2) a comparison of the delivery of leadership preparation to that of professionals in other fields; 3) the use of distance technology; and 4) the use of cohorts in the delivery of leadership preparation.

Interim Report Compiled by *Margaret Grogan and Stacey Priese*

We have divided Domain 7 into three sections based on the research literature that addresses the delivery of leadership preparation programs. Those three sections are 1) features and structures typically found within leadership preparation programs (e.g., cohorts), 2) use of technology in program

delivery, and 3) a comparison of leadership preparation programs in educational administration with those in other fields.

Structures and Common Features of Leadership Preparation Programs

As a way of introducing this section, we will discuss influences on methods of delivery such as state licensure standards and market demands.

A significant portion of this section will be devoted to cohort models. The use of cohorts in delivery of educational leadership preparation came up repeatedly in the research literature, and so we will examine the various features present in most cohort models, the strengths of this model, ways in which the model could be further developed, and suggestions for continued research.

In addition to delivery systems such as cohorts which encompasses an entire program, many individual features are noted frequently as key elements of good educational leadership preparation programs. Internships, mentoring, and authentic assessment are a few of those features.

We will continue in this section with a discussion of school/university partnerships and the benefits of strong, functional partnerships, and some of the difficulties to be avoided that can jeopardize a partnership.

Although there is not a great deal of research on leadership preparation programs offered outside of universities, we did include what information is available from the research literature as well as the questions raised by the emergence of these new programs and the implications for university-based leadership preparation programs.

Finally, this section will identify those features most often noted and recommended for a strong preparation program in educational leadership. To some extent this will reiterate the information from earlier in the section where we discussed features and structures of programs, but we will also highlight the direction of current research and areas where more research is needed.

Technology

Recently, *distance education* was a term used to denote paper-based class correspondence (a practice that has existed in public education almost since its inception in the United States) as well as traditional courses being held at off-grounds locations (where the instructor goes to a location more convenient for specific groups of students, but where the instruction is still face-to-face). More recently, however, computer technology has become a vital part of distance education; hence the new term *distance technology*. Thus, to clarify, *distance education* focuses on one of two things: the distance between instructor and learner (as in a paper-based class correspondence) or the distance between classroom setting and both the instructor and students (as in traditional course delivery offered in an off-grounds location). *Distance technology*, on the other hand, focuses on both of the following: the distance between instructor and learner *and* the use of technology in a course delivery format alternative to the traditional classroom setting.

Due to the lack of literature on the use of distance technology in leadership preparation programs, we conducted an exploratory study of how UCEA member institutions utilize distance technology in the preparation of educational leaders. The primary research questions were: 1) What types of distance technology are utilized by UCEA institutions to prepare educational leaders?; 2) What are the primary goals for the use of distance technology?; and 3) What are the factors that prevent institutions from expanding the use of distance technology? During the November, 2005, annual meeting in Nashville, Tennessee, members of the UCEA plenum (representing each of the member UCEA institutions) were administered surveys asking for descriptions of and goals for the use of distance technology in leadership preparation courses at all levels (M.Ed., Ed.S., Ed.D., and Ph.D) at their institutions. Responses were managed with SPSS 14.0 and tabulated and reported as percentages and frequencies.

Literature supports the notion that distance technology can indeed shatter traditional assumptions about how we educate and prepare educational leaders. However, data gained from this project indicate that there is much work left to be done for distance technology to be used as a quality

medium for reaching and preparing a new generation of school and district administrators. Particular attention should be given to faculty development in the general use of technology as well as in the development of technology-driven courses. And, it may prove helpful to begin developing the most widely used forms of distance technology first and then venture into other arenas as quality control measures are used down the line. In addition, programs that wish to use distance technology must plan for supportive infrastructures, develop guidelines for quality control, orient students to the use of technology, develop evaluation tools to measure success, and collect data. Further, an effort to explore and tighten how distance technology can be used to actually transform leadership preparation through alternative content delivery methods and attention to meeting the needs of a more inclusive population of aspiring leaders should be made.

Other Fields

We are in the process of a literature review in this area. To date we have located research on leadership development programs in business, health care, ministry, higher education, and library science. At this early stage, it is difficult to say what shape this section will take. We anticipate being able to examine similarities and differences, and identify delivery models that could be effectively translated into the field of educational leadership.

DOMAIN 8: STUDENT ASSESSMENT AND PROGRAM EVALUATION

DOMAIN LEADER: TERRY M. ORR, TEACHERS COLLEGE-COLUMBIA, MTO10@COLUMBIA.EDU

This domain examines assessment of individual leadership candidates as well as program evaluation strategies for institutional change. Potential areas to explore within this domain would include: 1) strategies used in evaluating student learning; 2) procedures used for course assessment; 3) the use of assessment centers; 4) state wide reviews of educational leadership preparation programs; and 5) past trends and new developments in program assessment.

Interim Report Compiled by *Terry Orr, Tom Alsbury, Susan Korach, and Joy Phillips*

Evaluation Domain Organization And Work

During the AERA 2005 conference and the UCEA 2005 conference, a small domain group formed to discuss and review the research on evaluation in leadership preparation. In the initial meeting, we brainstormed our focus on evaluation as being at multiple levels:

1. individual students
 - Assessments and evaluations of students in courses and in program completion.
 - Feedback from employers and subordinates on graduates' performance as leaders
2. program evaluations
 - preparation programs
 - in-service and leadership development programs
3. institutions (institutional research)
4. region or state or federal policy and perspectives
 - institutional data systems
 - accreditation and program review
 - policy analysis

From our initial group of 8 people, we divided up areas of interest and kept in touch informally.

For the second meeting, three individuals of the initial group brought their preliminary reviews of the literature. They were joined by four others. Together, we discussed the initial analyses that were presented on:

- types and potential use of institutional research (Joy Phillips)
- program evaluation studies (Terry Orr)
- principal mentoring program evaluation (Tom Alsbury).

From this meeting, we agreed to use a common study analysis grid to facilitate comparisons of research studies within and across the domain. In addition, other group members volunteered for additional areas of research:

- state assessments of leadership (Maggie Barber)
- evaluation studies of doctoral programs (Kaetlyn Lad)
- principal evaluation research (Susan Korach)
- student assessment research. (Ruth Silverberg)

All agreed to provide research summaries for the AERA meeting. Each reviewed the available research literature, exploring unpublished as well as published sources.

Perspectives On The Wealth Of Research In The Evaluation Domain

Generally, there is limited research in our evaluation domain, and most of it is single case based, lacking comparison. Most of the research is limited to analysis of initial impacts (such as satisfaction) of program design and delivery, with limited outcome measure development.

Murphy and Vriesenga (2004) did an extensive analysis of evaluation research as published in four journals between 19xx and 2003. We expanded this initial analysis to include other published and unpublished sources, including governmental reports, program case study profiles in publications like *UCEA Review*, and peer-reviewed conference presentations (like AERA and UCEA). Through this work we found a wealth of case studies and more attempts at conceptualizing evaluation research, but limited research designs beyond the single case, post-hoc design.

We also did not want to duplicate the conceptual and methodological work already underway by the Taskforce on Evaluating Leadership Preparation Programs. So we used this opportunity to look broadly at new areas. Thus, our review has helped us expand how to frame future research, substantively and in terms of frames of reference (unit of analysis) and conceptual perspectives.

Finally, in this round of literature review, we looked primarily at the research within our field. In future literature review rounds, we propose to look more deeply at related fields, such as teacher education and management research for conceptual and methodological direction.

Individual students

By looking at evaluation research at the student level, we found limited research but framed this area of investigation as the study of knowledge attainment and knowledge transfer and application.

- Student assessment. (still being investigated)
- Measurement of leadership knowledge through formal assessments. There was a content validation study of the ISLLC test by ETS (Tannenbaum, 1997), but little other research exists. While there are some limited studies of state test score results as related to other student performance measures (e.g. Willmore, 1999), the knowledge assessed by the tests was not clarified, only the scores.

- Study of knowledge and skills that transfer into the work environment and the job performance expectations of principals. Guskey (2000) provides a framework for determining knowledge and skill transfer at five levels of reflection: participants reactions, participants' learning, organization support and change, and participants' use of new knowledge and skills. Leithwood, et.al (2003) applied this framework for their study of the Greater New Orleans School Leadership Center's effects on student learning.
- Relationship between knowledge and its application. Much of the research on the relationship between preparation, knowledge and use has focused on currently practicing administrators about what they know and do. One study, *Principals and assistant principal's self –assessment* conducted by The North Carolina Center for School Leadership Development, surveyed principals and assistant principals on their knowledge/value and job application of components of leadership. The results revealed significant “gaps between what leaders know and what they do.” The only area without a gap was procedures and discipline. In addition, a few studies have tried to correlation formal preparation and the skills principals found that they needed to cope with the day-to-day demands of the job (Carillo, 2002; Daresh, 1986; Small, 1994).

Program evaluation

We concentrated on program evaluations that assessed outcome measures of leadership advancement and practice. Most of the available research is based on feedback from graduates about their programs, what they learned, and their leadership aspirations and advancement (e.g. Orr & Barber, 2005).

A few studies exist that relate teachers' assessments of leadership practices to leadership preparation. These include Leithwood's, et al comparative evaluation of 11 programs which found that some innovative program features—instructional strategies, cohort membership and program content—were most predictive of teacher perceptions of principals' leadership effectiveness. These also include correlational studies of teacher perceptions of leadership effective and their principals' leadership degrees (Ballou & Podgusky, 1995; Brent & Haller, 1998). These results found an inverse relationship between having graduate degrees and teacher ratings. Conversely, Valentine (2001) found that principals who participated in a preparation program that was concept driven, cohort based and consisted of a yearlong and mentored field-based internship scored higher on the School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA) received higher performance evaluation ratings by supervisors, and were perceived by teachers as being more effective in managing their schools than other principals.

Despite the emphasis on program accreditation and national recognition (NPBEA, 2005), there is no research on the predictive validity for accredited programs for graduate outcomes.

Mentoring evaluation

While much has been written on mentoring of first-year principals and superintendents, most are expert recommendations, reviews of research or single case studies. Only two studies (Alsbury, 2004 & Neal, 2005) contained more than 20 participants, and most students are from a few geographic locations (Ohio, Texas, Iowa) where grant-funded mentor programs have been piloted. Much of the research has focused on design and implementation issues (e.g. quality of the mentoring relationship) and very little has looked at outcomes. All research has been based upon surveys of the self-assessments and perceptions of novice and mentor principals. Only the Iowa Mentoring program study is on superintendents.

Principal evaluation.

Korach and others explored the principal evaluation research area for possible studies on how to assess principal performance and possible correlates to leadership preparation. This research, however, is quite thin and is comprised primarily of recommendations for how to evaluate principals, proposed innovative models, and policy studies. There has been some limited research conducted on the relationship between principal ratings on the ISLCC leadership standards and job performance as

rated by their superintendents (McCowan, Arnold, Miles & Hargadine, 2000; Coutts, 1997). The research literature on superintendent evaluation is even thinner and more recently explored. (key words for search are “administrator evaluation”).

Institutional research.

Phillips and her colleagues looked at the broader higher education institutional effectiveness field for conceptual direction and empirical research and their potential application to leadership preparation programs. While they found considerable conceptual discussion and planning guides over the past 20 years, they found no empirical studies, qualitative or quantitative. Nonetheless, they noted the existence of several large scale national higher education data bases, particularly IPEDS, that may be useful to mine.

Potential Research Agenda To Address The Gaps

First and foremost, this area of research needs conceptual grounding and well designed studies. Much of the existing work in the field provides useful direction, but often lacks theoretical underpinnings that would be useful for construction of measures and their relationships.

More important, the field needs to support large scale research studies to comparative investigate the relationships suggested in existing research and conceptual writing. Well designed case study research of assessment systems, evaluation models and programs could be a useful starting point. The growing literature on leadership knowledge and skills that positively impact school performance and student achievement is a useful foundation for further evaluation work in this field.

Some possible priority questions for further research are:

Learning Assessment—What is the empirical evidence on measures of student learning in leadership preparation programs? How effective are available assessment systems at assessing student learning?

Learning Transfer –What skills and knowledge transfer from a preparation program to a work context? What was the delivery model of principal preparation for the transferable skills and knowledge?

Program evaluation—How to expand evaluation research on leadership preparation programs to exploring stages of leadership outcomes and draw evidence from sources other than graduates? What is the relationship between accreditation and graduate outcomes?

Professional Development – What research designs about learning transfer can be used in professional development?

Principal Preparation Programs and Principal Evaluation –What relationship exists between principal preparation program expectations for students and principal evaluation practices?

Mentoring—How can mentoring programs be evaluated? What would appropriate outcomes be and what are the mentoring experiences that should be measured?

Institutional research—What are current policies at the state, institutional, or unit (college, school, or department) level for assessing institutional effectiveness? How to undertake exploration at the institutional or unit level on “fine-grained analysis of effects” (Cameron, 1978) of organizational effectiveness?

DOMAIN 9: PROFESSIONAL LEARNING

DOMAIN LEADER: FRAN KOCHAN, AUBURN UNIVERSITY, KOCHAFR@AUBURN.EDU

This domain examines leadership education within the larger context of professional learning. Potential areas to explore within this domain would include: 1) mentoring and induction programs; 2) how leaders are socialized into their roles; 3) research on continuous professional learning; 4) the types and quality of professional learning available; and 5) the role of professional associations in professional learning.

Interim Report Compiled by *Frances Kochan and Kathleen Topolka Jorissen*

Meetings and Communication

The primary means of communication has been through email. Initially the group developed a list of topics of interest and identified some they would be interested in. At its meeting at AERA in 2005, the group developed a list of potential resources, guiding questions, and an outline of potential areas for study. The broad categories suggested were: framing the conversation; primary strategies; best practices; the context; the future.

Sources/Types of materials examined

Our initial ideas were expanded at our 2005 UCEA meeting and we began to consider how we might begin to engage in research studies and disseminate findings. Sources examined were:

- Dissertation abstracts
- EBSCO- journals and books
- NSDC and materials on professional development standards and processes for best practice
- UCEA Website
- Division A –Study of Education Leadership/ Research issues

Guiding Questions

A set of guiding questions were created to frame our research.

1. What is professional learning and development for educational leaders as it is presently practiced?
2. Is professional learning being implemented to maintain the status quo or foster transformation?
3. What is the relationship/impact of professional learning and development upon context, practice and student learning?
4. How can the effectiveness of professional learning experiences be assessed?

Dominant Themes

Dominant themes in the literature were compiled by the group and organized into six categories as outlined below.

Defining and Describing Professional Learning and Development

- Historical perspective
- Value and importance
- Relationship to other professions
- Relationship to career stages
- Current practice
- Problems

Programs and Strategies

- Characteristics of high quality programs
- Methods and programs are being used for socialization, induction, and mentoring
- Strategies are being used to foster embedded learning

Strategies are being used to foster organizational learning
Types of technological and personal communities and networks are being implemented

Delivery Modes

University classes
School and school system
Associations and professional groups
Private consultants, programs, and companies
States, federal and other public governmental entities
Professional collaboratives and partnerships

Outcomes Assessment

Procedures and processes
Relationship to practice, school improvement, context and culture, and student learning

The Future

Emerging trends
Potential problems and possibilities

Gaps In The Research

Gaps in the research within each of the domains were identified as follows.

Defining and Describing Professional Learning and Development

What is current best practice?
How does educational leadership professional learning compare with other professions?
What are the primary local, state and federal policies governing professional learning and development?
Is professional development for maintaining the status quo or transformation?
What is the role and impact of context on professional learning?
What is the relationship of the changing role of the educational leader to best practices?
What are the relationships between administrative/principal evaluation and professional learning?
How is professional learning related to ISLLC and/or state leadership standards?

Programs and Strategies

How is professional learning being implemented within organizations/
What are the factors that make it succeed and fail?
What are the norms?
What are best practices for socialization, induction, developing professional learning communities, enhancing practice, and impacting student learning?
What types of local, state, and federal policies foster best practices and professional learning?
How are problems related to funding, time and a general lack of support for fostering professional learning?

Delivery Modes

Where are the conflicts between who delivers, when, how, and why? Are some things better delivered by associations, schools, universities, states, federal government, private enterprise?
What models are there for successful collaboration in delivering professional development and learning?
What are the relationships between types of experiences, professional learning and career stages?
What are the role of professional organizations, schools, colleges, technological networks and system in fostering professional learning?
What is the relationship of professional learning to context? (rural and urban settings)

Outcome Assessment

How is quality and expertise being addressed across various delivery modes?

What is the relationship of professional learning to changing practice, and improving school culture and climate ?
What is the relationship of professional learning to improving student learning ?
What is the role of technology in the process?
How is quality best examined and how is it defined?
What are issues related to re-certification?

The Future

What will the role of technology be?
What are present and emerging innovative strategies?
What policies and governance structures will be needed?
What are the issues related to private/public dissonance in terms of delivery?
What is the future for cross-professional training?

Research Agenda

Our research agenda needs to be further defined. We have begun to identify areas to be examined and strategies to foster the research agenda. In general the research agenda will focus on the gaps in the literature. Potential strategies follow. We will also need to identify who will take the lead in completing each task.

Research and Dissemination Strategies

1. Develop a survey to gather ideas from UCEA professionals about the topic-lead
2. Develop a white paper on the topic to be distributed through UCEA.- lead Kathleen Topolka Jorissen
3. Develop an article for *UCEA Review* on the topic
4. Prepare at least two proposals for special journal issues
5. Develop a proposal for a *UCEA* symposium/presentation on the topic

Participants

There are seventeen members of the committee, representing 16 institutions. They are:

1. Michele Acker-Hocevar (Florida Atlantic University)
2. Jacqueline Kearns-Barber(The Professional Edge Network
3. Kathleen Sullivan-Brown (University of Missouri)
4. Elizabeth Burns (Auburn University)
5. Connie Fulmer (University of Colorado at Denver and Health Sciences Center)
7. Laura Hassler (Florida State University)
8. Patricia Herdich (University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee)
9. Gary Ivory (New Mexico State)
- 10 Kathleen Jorissen (Bowling Green State University)
11. Estelle Kamler,(Long Island University, C.W. Post Campus)
12. Jackie Kearns (Lehigh University, College of Education)
13. Frances Kochan (Auburn University)
14. Diane Ricciardi (Clemson University)
15. Ronald Oliver (California State University, Fullerton)
16. Pam Salzar, University of Nevada, Las Vegas
17. Ingrad Smith (Mississippi State University)
18. Debra Touchten (Stetson University)

DOMAIN 10: LEADERSHIP EDUCATION AROUND THE GLOBE
DOMAIN LEADER: MILES BRYANT, UNLV, BRYANT@UNLSERVE.UNL.EDU

This domain will examine leadership education within countries outside the US. Potential areas to explore within this domain would include: 1) leadership education within specific countries; 2) how contexts, cultures and economies have shaped leadership education, 3) how public education systems influence the need and design for leadership education, 4) how leadership education is provided, and 5) the nature of scholarship on leadership education.

Interim Report Submitted by Miles Bryant

The following areas are of concern to this domain:

Leadership Preparation: An International Perspective: Hallinger
Influence of Culture on Leadership Preparation: Lumby and Harris
Models of Leadership Preparation: Bush and Johansson
Research Methods in the Study of International Preparation: Bryant
Short Profiles of Leadership Preparation in Different Nations: To be determined

Domain Members:

Gary Crow	University of Utah	gcrow@ed.utah.edu
Fergus O'Sullivan	University of Lincoln	fosullivan@lincoln.ac.uk
David Scot	University of Lincoln	dscott@lincoln.ac.uk
Jacky Lumby	University of Lincoln	jlumby@lincoln.ac.uk
Tony Bush	University of Lincoln	tbush@lincoln.ac.uk
Clive Dimmock	University of Leicester	CD47@le.ac.uk
Geoff Southworth	UK National College for School Leadership	Geoff.southworth@ncsl.org.uk
Allan Walker	Chinese University of Hong Kong	adwalker@cuhk.edu.hk
Paul Begley	Penn State University	ptb3@psu.edu
Tim Goddard	University of Calgary	goddard@ucalgary.ca
Paul Bredeson	University of Wisconsin	BREDESON@EDUCATION.WISC.EDU
Khaula Murtada	Indiana University	kmurtadh@indiana.edu
Margaret Grogan	University of Missouri	groganm@missouri.edu
Teresa A. Wasonga	Northern Illinois University	P80TAW1@wpo.cso.niu.edu
Trudy Salisbury	Kansas State University	tas@ksu.edu
Nancy Mims	Kennesaw State University	nmims@kennesaw.edu
Ed Harris	Oklahoma State University	elh@okstate.edu
Adrienne Hyle	Oklahoma State University	Adrienne.hyle@okstate.edu
Marilyn Grady	University of Nebraska	mgrady1@unl.edu
Oren Yagil	University of Nebraska	orenyagil@yahoo.com
Mike Thurlow,	University of Kwazulu-Natal, South Africa	thurlow@iafrica.com
Qiang, Haiyan	PR of China	zhugin@public.guangzhou.gd.cn
Miles Bryant	University of Nebraska-Lincoln	mbryant1@unl.edu