2010

IT'S NOT THE BICYCLE, IT'S THE RIDE: EIGHT NCPEA LIVING LEGENDS RESPOND

Theodore Creighton
Virginia Tech University

Marilyn Grady
University of Nebraska–Lincoln, mgrady1@unl.edu

Louis Wildman
California State University, Bakersfield, lwildman@csub.edu

Robert Beach
Alabama State University

Rosemary Papa
Northern Arizona University, rosemary.papa@nau.edu

See next page for additional authors

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cehsedadfacpub

Part of the Educational Administration and Supervision Commons

Creighton, Theodore; Grady, Marilyn; Wildman, Louis; Beach, Robert; Papa, Rosemary; McCarthy, Martha; Achilles, Charles; and Texas A&M University, 'IT'S NOT THE BICYCLE, IT'S THE RIDE: EIGHT NCPEA LIVING LEGENDS RESPOND' (2010). Faculty Publications in Educational Administration, 51.
http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cehsedadfacpub/51

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Educational Administration, Department of at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications in Educational Administration by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.
Authors
Theodore Creighton, Marilyn Grady, Louis Wildman, Robert Beach, Rosemary Papa, Martha McCarthy, Charles Achilles, and Texas A&M University

This article is available at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln: http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cehsadfacpub/51
IT'S NOT THE BICYCLE, IT'S THE RIDE: EIGHT NCPEA LIVING LEGENDS RESPOND

Theodore Creighton, 2009
Marilyn Grady, 2008
Louis Wildman, 2006
Robert Beach, 2004
Rosemary Papa, 2003
Martha McCarthy, 2002
Charles Achilles, 2001
John Hoyle, 1999

INTRODUCTION

My 2009 Living Legend presentation highlighted the fact that the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration (NCPEA) is currently experiencing “lightening speed” issues that need to be addressed sooner rather than later in the scheme of things. Using the metaphor in the title, I suggested that we really can’t wait until the “bicycle is finished,” but we need to get on and “build the bicycle as we go.” Further, I borrowed a phrase from Roger Martin (2007) who in discussing the innovative Amtrak Acela Railcar stated, “The salient issue is the ride, not the railcar” (p.83).

I used another metaphor when discussing my scant qualifications for the Living Legend Award. In my research and writing, I have come to believe, “An author is essentially the PEN through which significant others write.” I further concluded, “Whatever accomplishments bring me this recognition has resulted from that which significant others have contributed.”

So, as I began to think about how to approach this invited chapter for the 2010 NCPEA Yearbook, it occurred to me that I was facing the same metaphor once again. My accomplishments have really been dependent on the accomplishments of significant others, and more specifically, the Living Legends who came before me. How could I capture the connection between my accomplishments and those before me? I concluded the only way was to invite them to coauthor the chapter with me, and we would “ride this (under construction) bicycle together.”

The task has not been an easy one. How do we blend together the thoughts and ideas of eight Living Legends who span a decade and a year? We decided to focus on three pressing issues that we feel NCPEA is currently facing—and three pressing issues needing immediate attention from both our organization and the profession of educational leadership preparation. We further decided to present one issue at a time, with all our responses together.

Issue #1 Concerns, Cautions, and/or Recommendations

NCPEA has moved from a once-a-year face-to-face organization (i.e. one conference in August) to a 24/7 operation and has developed what Executive Director Elect Jim Berry calls a Virtual Presence. Monthly NCPEA Board meetings are now held online, and we are

Note: Michael Martin (2007) and Clarence Fitch (2005) were not able to join us for this chapter. We lost our colleague and 2000 Living Legend Jack Culbertson, who passed away two years ago.
initiating monthly Webinars for members across the country. Even our Connexions Project, though a dynamic assembly of a knowledge base, is really only part of a larger whole. What might this larger whole look like in a decade? More importantly, what might be some of the Living Legends' concerns, cautions, and/or recommendations for the organization as we face a whole new frontier?

Robert Beach, Alabama State University

Without doubt, NCPEA has made real progress in creating member benefits by adapting programs to developing technology. Many opportunities have opened for member publishing. This has resulted from the efforts of several members—Outstanding! With concerns of saturating our presence and losing affective interaction aside, this virtual expansion looks like a powerful trend. NCPEA could become a virtual organization, all efforts electronic and all meetings by interactive TV. However, should we reflect also on what we value and might have valued that could slip away, each of us could provide a list of candidates. Mine looks like this: a few hours yearly with friends; talking with, maybe even helping, young professors—and getting help; friendly, warm, yet professional meetings; and providing experiences for students in a non-hostile environment. As a curmudgeon, my reflections include remembrances of two annual meetings, now down to one. Perhaps, the affective side should not be forgotten.

Charles Achilles, Seton Hall University

NCPEA has not only moved ahead with technology and printing, but in costs. It may become too costly for young faculty and families to attend either regularly (best option), or irregularly (when NCPEA is in a convenient location). Convenience could conflict with the goals of diversity, youth, and growth, factors that costs influence substantially. Recommendations seem to be: still focus on youth (new members), diversity, and think more seriously about location. We need to consider new sources of income to keep pace with inflation, or better yet, to beat inflation a bit.

Rosemary Papa, Northern Arizona University

In years past, individuals could earn degrees and/or credentials of sorts by taking a series of courses at home and sending in completed skill sheets. Those correspondence courses offered specific skills and/or information based courses/programs to those who could not attend on-site classes or preferred learning at home. As universities and community colleges grew and became more affordable, correspondence courses became scarce.

Over the more recent years in teaching, the cries of content in lieu of experiences and the notion that repeatable skills could be listed, observed and counted has led to a resurgence of the correspondence course format. However, at this time, it is being cloaked in the package of anywhere, anytime digital learning, and referred to as on-line education with possible professor access 24/7. Instead of a certificate of completion, the individual is given a university degree!

NCPEA as the premier professional organization for professors of education administration/leadership must focus its efforts on using the information deluge through social
networking venues while helping faculty understand their changing role in both synchronous and asynchronous universities.

Louis Wildman, California State University, Bakersfield

My 2006 Living Legend Lecture (available at http://www.csub.edu/~lwildman) criticized an over-emphasis on scripted, direct instruction of pre-determined standards. I recommended a balance with creativity-developing investigatory, project-based instruction. Fortunately, more educators now agree.

Yong Zhao has just written American Education in the Age of Globalization (ASCD, 2009) which describes how China is moving away from standardized, high-stakes testing toward more investigatory education. Similarly, Linda Darling-Hammond (2010), from her study of instructional practices in better schools, recommends guided inquiry—the coaching of independent research, projects and experiments.

NCPEA’s Connexions project should provide free access to web-based pre-programmed on-line instruction pertinent to the teaching of pre-determined standards. However, without a balanced curriculum, the availability of such instructional technology will tempt students to turn education into a race to graduation.

Martha McCarthy, Indiana University

With the rapid pace of technological advances, we can only speculate as to what will characterize the “new frontier” that NCPEA soon will face. Possibly, universities may not be key players in the preparation of school leaders within a few years, and universities already are not the only players. It would be counterproductive for NCPEA members to close ranks and act like competition from private providers and school districts growing their own administrators will simply go away. It will not. NCPEA needs to influence the criteria used to evaluate these alternative providers as well as our university programs to ensure a pipeline of excellent school leaders.

A related development is that on-line courses and video conferencing are quickly becoming the preferred way to provide leadership preparation as well as many components of K-12 education. Not only do technological advances allow diverse parts of the world to be connected instantly, but also technology is changing the concept of “school” from bricks and mortar to wireless connections. The jury is still out regarding whether the long-term impact of some of these developments will be positive or negative. Thus, NCPEA has an important role to play in influencing standards for distributed education; designing strategies to assess the quality of materials on the Web; exploring implications of the Internet-generation’s socialization through MySpace, blogs, Twitter, etc., instead of face-to-face communication; and numerous other technology-related issues. The only thing we know with certainty is that rapid change will be the norm. NCPEA needs to be at the forefront in helping school leaders and those preparing them to thrive in continually changing circumstances.

Marilyn Grady, University of Nebraska Lincoln

Professors of educational administration often come from roles as principals and superintendents. As principals and superintendents, they report the best part of their work is the relationships they form with the different people they encounter. The person-to-person, human dimensions are the keys to their satisfaction.
The work of professors as writers will be challenged by the demise of publication houses. As fewer books and journals are printed, what impact will this have on the lifespan of scholarly works?

The decline in memberships in professional organizations continues to be a challenge. NCPEA serves a membership that spans many generations. We must:

- Keep in touch with all the generations.
- Identify the problems that exist with NCPEA that need to be addressed.
- Identify the goals that the organization seeks to achieve on behalf of the membership during the next decade.
- Use these goals to guide future innovations.
- Examine the demographics of the membership.
- Examine the demographics in relation to membership trends during the past 20 years.
- Examine the geographic location of members.
- Survey members concerning their use and facility with a variety of technology tools.
- Survey members concerning their personal behaviors during Webinars.
- Balance the virtual with the personal aspects of the organization.
- Identify how many members are participants in the virtual aspects of NCPEA.
- Be attentive to the membership numbers of NCPEA.
- Examine the membership of other professional associations that attract professors of educational administration as members.

*John Hoyle, Texas A & M University*

NCPEA members have always reached out to each other, but now with a well designed “Virtual Presence,” we “reach out and touch each other” any time or any place. Veteran professors struggle to adapt their teaching and research to on-line technologies and find it difficult to work in more than one medium at a time. Baby Boomer professors tend to seek isolation to conduct research while our younger Millennial professors born since 1982 thrive on multi on-line information systems, and they are highly collaborative networkers internally wired to the world. Millennials linked to MySpace etc., and Blackberrys view the once-a-year NCPEA conference merely contiguous to their wired world. Thus, while traditionalist professors of educational administration are more comfortable sharing papers and ideas in face-to-face presentations, the Millennials share ideas with the virtual world. I am concerned about the yet to be determined standards and measures of academic authenticity in an “open world warehouse” of research/inquiry. Regardless of the problem of authenticity in a “Virtual Presence,” it is “the now,” and NCPEA has talented colleagues ready to connect our community of scholars 24/7 that will provide instant data to enhance our research and share the best ideas to prepare exemplary school leaders.
SUMMARY OF ISSUE #1

Theodore Creighton, Virginia Tech University

There seems to be wide agreement among the eight Living Legends that NCPEA has already entered a “New Frontier” (Grady & McCarthy). We have very quickly moved from a 1 to 2 conferences per year organization to one whose “virtual presence” is in operation 24/7/360. Some suggest we monitor closely and not lose our equally important focus on maintaining the “affective interaction” among members (Beach & Achilles).

The Living Legends feel strongly that NCPEA needs to “influence the criteria used to evaluate these alternative providers as well as our university programs to ensure a pipeline of excellent school leaders” (McCarthy), and “focus its efforts on using the information deluge through social networking venues while helping faculty understand their changing role in both synchronous and asynchronous universities” (Papa).

In addition, attention is drawn to the need to “balance” web-based, pre-programmed instruction with the need to offer “investigatory, project-based instruction” in the preparation of future administrators (Wildman), and attention is drawn to the recognition that NCPEA has talented colleagues ready to connect our community of scholars 24/7 in order to provide instant data to enhance our research and share the best ideas to prepare exemplary school leaders (Hoyle).

As this chapter is written, NCPEA member Bonnie Beyer and her committee have finalized their Guidelines for the Submission of Instructional Modules—truly one of our next explorations of the “new frontier.” In addition, the NCPEA Education Leadership Review (ELR) will be housed on its own website offering both printed and online options for members and subscribers.

Issue #2 Recommendations for Guidance to Developing Programs

What guidance, if any, should/could NCPEA provide to developing programs—especially virtual ones? This will sound like a standard’s question, but it is an important issue if NCPEA is to have any input into the development of the profession. What should we say to those who are developing programs about basic expectations for reasonable levels of resource support? Can just anyone offer programs? Can one get by without presenting the qualifications of faculty? What do we, as an organization, recommend?

Achilles, Seton Hall University

Clearly, theoretical perspectives should continue to inform the field of Education Administration (not just leadership, but management as well). Thus, NCPEA professors need to work not only on theories that may inform the field of Education Administration, but also on developing a process that the professors can put in place to allow (help) NCPEA professors to make changes in the field: this process would provide changes in the Knowledge Dynamic (KD) that would accommodate the teaching and learning changes that are becoming the new KD. Instead of a Knowledge Base (KB), the field is progressing to a Knowledge Dynamism (KD) that has a way to replenish the KD to get rid of the stagnant content and build on the dynamism of an alive field. The “Good NCPEA Professors and Programs” will do and use dynamic research and results.
Unfortunately, although I have taught some courses using SKYPE and participated in NCPEA Board Meetings using SKYPE-like Eluminate (which is not dynamic yet), the work was not refereed and is not part of the Knowledge Dynamic (KD). Only my vision of quality teaching and learning was presented. Thus NCPEA professors need not to “politick”, but strengthen the traditional teaching/learning role in traditional education administration programs.

If Connexions is to count as a research/theory outlet, how is Connexions to be refereed? Achilles has written much on “The Human Side” of Education Administration—management as well as leadership, (but to little avail) including the following:

- Humanities and Values Interest Group of NCPEA
- Helped Ron Lindahl in "Dispositions" in the Cocking Lecture (notice ISSLC dropped Dispositions in its framework)
- The Humanities in Education Preparation (Monograph)
- The Humanities Seminar with Dr. Charles Keller (from Columbia and Williams College) 4 years as part of a large grant from USDOE to prepare principals and central office staff for students in Appalachian Schools
- The Administrator as "Man" (Pre Title IX), a monograph for R. Blackmon, (NCPEA).

McCarthy, Indiana University

NCPEA can provide guidance in the development of leadership preparation programs on a number of levels, and I’ll limit my comments here to program assessment practices. As noted in my response to the first issue, NCPEA should play a leadership role in identifying criteria to assess the merits of leadership preparation programs, including traditional and virtual university-based, for-profit, and school district programs to prepare school leaders. All of these programs should be judged on the basis of the success of their graduates as effective school leaders. NCPEA can assist in broadening and refining the assessment strategies used to make such determinations. Currently, high stakes testing is the dominant strategy to assess whether school leaders have mastered standards, usually ISLLC or state-created standards. A number of states are using the Education Testing Service (ETS) School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA) to determine if the standards are satisfied (Murphy, 2007), and SLLA has been faulted for not sufficiently addressing leadership characteristics such as creativity and imagination, ethical behavior, and commitment to social justice (English, 2008).

NCPEA should work with other professional associations to expand program assessment strategies and ensure that they consider factors linked to success as school leaders. It has been difficult, but not impossible, to identify the school leader’s impact on student outcomes (see Leithwood, Louis, Anderson, & Wahlstrom, 2004), and even more challenging to link successful school leaders to specific components of their preparation (see Pounder, Orr, & Black, 2006). But, simply because the task is difficult does not mean it should be avoided. We must address the outcomes of leadership preparation, because without evidence regarding which types of preparation produce the most effective leaders in terms of graduates’ impact on student learning and social development, inferior leadership preparation alternatives that are less costly may become the norm. NCPEA, in cooperation with other professional organizations, can raise the bar in establishing standards that ALL leadership
preparation programs must meet, which should result in the much-needed elimination of some current programs.

Beach, Alabama State University

Should NCPEA consider providing guidance on best practice? Is there a role for an organization such as NCPEA relative to assisting in the improvement of our profession? By profession is meant our preparation programs and, specifically, the support required to see these programs flourish. If such a role exists, would we accept that we have a responsibility in this area? Probably, most of our members would agree with the proposition that a professional organization should be concerned with providing at least minimal guidance to the profession, i.e. an obligation toward professional improvement. It can immediately be pointed out that NCPEA has accepted such a role and made real efforts toward improving the preparation of educational leaders. Our members have served and are serving on the National Policy Board (NPBEA) in the development of the ISLLC and Educational Leadership Constituent Council standards.

Organizations external to ours provide such guidance. The majority of our colleges fall under the auspices of the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), and our members assist in the facilitation of NCATE and regional accreditation agency standards, such as, those promulgated by the Southern Accreditation of Colleges and Schools (SACS). This seems appropriate as it should be. However, on reflection, the existing standards begin with stems such as: An education leader, Candidates, The institution ensures-publishes-has, etc. These are typically exhortations focused on what, in general terms, the overall institution must provide or do and, in the case of preparation programs, statements relative to what competencies their graduates should evidence. These standards capture, in general terms, how the institution should operate or, at the programmatic level, they are statements of output. We are informed that we must have an appropriate curriculum and that graduates will be capable of performing in relation to that curriculum. This also is as it should be. However, guidance as to how that curriculum is to be developed and how it is to be delivered is notably lacking. Consider, what is an appropriate range for student faculty ratios, or what is a reasonable workload, and how many faculty members should minimally be in place for small programs? Our standards are in fact largely well meaning but insubstantial pontifications, creatures that serve, are largely created by, and managed by agencies external to NCPEA—our professional group!

The growth and evolution of preparation programs at the masters, specialist, or doctoral levels, whether site-based, virtual, or hybrid, and existing at a time of reduced institutional resources, has created some justification for exploring:

- How and should NCPEA make available guidance on best practice for concerns such as what is an appropriate program resource base—inputs and operations?
- How would such an internally created role be defined and promulgated?
- How would we develop an understanding or consensus that captures what we believe to be best practice for the development and operations of our programs?
This is not a call for a standards' movement. It is not thought of as something compulsory. It is not a call for placing strait jackets around flexibility, and one of our strengths is program diversity. Few members would accept these constraints or more standards. We would not and could not police such things. Rather, this is just a series of questions that we may wish to examine. These are questions about the role of a professional organization and its willingness to offer guidance to interested members on what best professional practice in program support and operation is considered to be.

Grady, University of Nebraska Lincoln

If you could step into a time machine and travel back fifty years to the time of your parents or grandparents, you would find the world much changed. There would be no computers and television would be quite new. The cities would appear small and provincial, with only the occasional car and a few big retail chain outlets. Travel back another fifty years and cars disappear from the streets, as do telephones, washing machines and vacuum cleaners from our houses and airplanes from the air. (Hofstede & Hofstede, 2005, p.11)

When I consider one aspect of the issue presented for comment, I wonder if the proliferation of graduate programs in educational administration makes many of the traditional graduate programs part of Hofstede and Hofstede's time machine analogy. The undergraduate campuses that have embraced the allure of graduate programs are everywhere. Even in the heartland of the United States, the number of colleges that have become universities, seemingly overnight, is astounding.

The attraction for higher education institutions is obvious—revenue, credit hour production, an available market niche, the apparent ease of distance delivery of courses, an online environment that can accommodate large enrollments, inexpensive staffing of courses through use of adjuncts who can be paid minimal stipends, no costly investment in tenure-line faculty, and no need to maintain office space for adjuncts.

The allure for students may include—ease of admission (entrance requirements may not include standardized test scores or demanding grade point averages), accessibility (programs offered online, flexible or minimal class meetings, emphasis on field-based experiences), and accelerated timeline for program completion.

When the institution “owns” the course, syllabus, and class activities, then the course can be taught by “anyone” once the initial development has been completed. If the course is delivered as a very structured experience with limited student—faculty interaction, without development of a community of learners, and without significant research and writing opportunities, course delivery is a management issue not a teaching issue.

Educational administration professors who once said they would have no involvement in online learning have been surprised when they discovered their institutions were proceeding to develop online programs. In these instances, the professors have not been leaders in the change but, often, unwilling participants in making the programs work.

The professoriate is forced to change in response to the proliferation of these programs. Pursuit of student enrollment and meeting student demands for flexibility and accessibility, while maintaining high standards for faculty and program excellence, are clear contemporary challenges. Professors of educational administration must define their work and their programs in powerful ways to compete in the contemporary graduate education marketplace.
Papa, Northern Arizona University

What is a ‘virtual program?’ Is it simply electronic submission of information? Is it complying with a check list of skills via self-verification? The mission, and goals and objectives of such programs need to be clear and valid. That is, does the program enhance the teaching and learning and research processes?

NCPEA must continually help members explore, the new world. Traditional university preparation, for now, comprises the majority of membership though, perhaps, not so over the next ten years. For the traditional university, the core question might be, “Can only university research produce and expand on theoretical perspectives that continue to inform the field?” The full time faculty that meet (synchronous and asynchronous) and research together shape the experiences that drive the practices that develop the new theories.

Today, we are under siege as traditional, scholarly faculty by the professional organizations (NCATE, Secretary of Education, etc.) in support of a broader field that includes for-profit programs. I prefer to not have NCPEA take professional positions as other national organizations are doing to have a voice in Washington politics (NASSP, NAESP, AASA, etc.) as that will further politicize the field. NCPEA, which represents the individual faculty member, must lead in asking all faculty to continue to provide on-going research that informs school practices. The online, pre-shaped one-size curriculum that meets the NCATE standards solely is not acceptable as the final preparation program for school leaders. Today, we know that 20% of all Ph.D.’s defended in 2006-2008 were from for-profit online universities (English & Papa, 2009). Educational leadership faculty must address the question of online for-profit programs or go the way of the dinosaurs.

Wildman, California State University, Bakersfield

Harvard Business Professor Clayton Christensen and colleagues (2008) predict that six years from now computer assisted instruction will be providing individually appropriate instruction for half the K-12 students. Probably, virtual educational administration programs will provide half of the education administration instruction, too. Christensen stated that online education is in the early stage of the history of similar “disruptions,” such as, when Apple disrupted Digital Equipment Corporation, Toyota disrupted General Motors, Sony disrupted RCA, Canon disrupted Xerox, and Sony disrupted Kodak.

In education, Christensen (2008) sees virtual programs first offering specialized courses (e.g. Arabic) on-line to small, rural, and urban schools, to school districts where budgets have been severely cut, as well as to home-schooled students. Initially, the disruptive pace is slow; then, it steepens dramatically.

As university budgets are cut, on-line programs are seen as a way to cut costs. While a good on-line course takes at least as much faculty time as a face-to-face course, some universities are already running very large numbers through former graduate seminars that had 12 to 15 students, creating a downward spiral in quality.

NCPEA’s Connexions project should provide examples of excellent on-line courses, but unless educators and the general public recognize the two sides to education (direct and investigatory), the pressure to replace traditional educational administration programs with on-line test preparation will overwhelm us. In California, a teacher can now read a small booklet, take a test, and get an administrative credential without taking any course work.
Hoyle, Texas A & M University

There remains a growing need to prepare greater numbers of effective school administrators, but observers are concerned about the perceived standardization of both traditional and on-line programs. This penchant for standards/objectives driven leadership education may be diminishing the quality among the 371 programs taught by over 3,000 professors. With a greater number of degree outlets, rigor and quality have become more suspect. Critics contend that the growing number of on-line administration degrees and licensure programs emphasize credit counting rather than crucial practical and theoretical knowledge and skill acquisition. While this critical picture may not be accurate, little research exists in the area of leadership education programming quality to refute such claims. The competition for student enrollments is a primary reason for the growing number of online degree and alternative certification programs. This rapid, uncontrolled growth in cyber leadership preparation has prompted program planners to question the quality and integrity of online degree and licensure programs. Graduates of online programs may be successful in passing the ISLLC licensure examination, but some question if they will be prepared to work in a team setting and grasp the dynamics of school politics and organizations. The unanswered question is, “Can we adequately prepare school leaders by wire?”

In an effort to answer this question, this writer recently served as consultant to a mid-western university’s leadership education program for principal preparation. Their enrollments in the master’s degree program for principals had slowly dropped, primarily due to other regional universities offering the degree and licensure completely online. Thus, in response to this cyber competition, the following new program is underway. It is a balance of face-to-face on campus and hybrid classes (i.e., one-half online, the other half on campus) and a few select classes are offered only online. The new program is grounded in the standards-based curriculum and research methods, and foundations and supported by an influential advisory team consisting of area school leaders (i.e., superintendents and principals). These area administrators are invited to campus for meetings, dinners with faculty and students, to teach classes, to serve as mentors and to provide internship experiences during the two year program. Each new cohort of students begins in the summer with a three-day academy. The academy includes barbecues, seminars taught by professors, advisory team members and hands-on projects that emphasize building learning communities. This hybrid leadership education model is attractive to prospective students because of the personal attention and mentoring by the faculty and strong collaboration among university faculty and school administrators. These valuable contacts with area school leaders can lead to possible administrative positions upon graduation. Valuable contacts are rare in most online degree or licensure programs.

SUMMARY OF ISSUE #2

Creighton, Virginia Tech University

Achilles and Papa argue for attention to the individual faculty member in providing ongoing research that informs practice (Papa) and strengthens our traditional teaching and learning roles (Achilles). McCarthy warns that without research-based evidence on outcomes and on which types of preparation produce the most effective leaders in terms of graduates’ impact on student learning and social development, inferior leadership preparation
alternatives that are less costly may become the norm. All Living Legends repeated their call for NCPEA action:

- NCPEA, in cooperation with other professional organizations, can raise the bar in establishing standards that ALL leadership preparation programs must meet, which should result in the much-needed elimination of some current programs. NCPEA should work with other professional associations to expand program assessment strategies and ensure that they consider factors linked to success as school leaders (McCarthy).
- NCPEA professors need not to “politick,” but strengthen the traditional teaching/learning role in traditional education administration programs (Achilles).
- NCPEA, which represents the individual faculty member, must lead in asking all faculty to continue to provide on-going research that informs school practices (Papa).
- NCPEA’s Connexions project should provide examples of excellent on-line courses, but unless educators and the general public recognize the two sides to education (direct and investigatory), the pressure to replace traditional educational administration programs with on-line test preparation will overwhelm us (Wildman).
- NCPEA professors of educational administration must define their work and their programs in powerful ways to compete in the contemporary graduate education marketplace (Grady).
- NCPEA should make available guidance on best practices for concerns, such as, what is an appropriate program resource base of inputs and operations? We should develop an understanding and consensus that captures what we believe to be best practices for the development and operation of our programs (Beach).
- NCPEA needs to conduct research on the growing number of on-line administration degrees and licensure programs emphasizing credit counting rather than crucial practical and theoretical knowledge and skill acquisition (Hoyle).

**Issue #3 Educational Administration Projection Progress**

What are the essential qualities our preparation programs need to consider at the master’s level, such as the accoutrements of leadership? What roles and responsibilities should NCPEA have in addressing Levine’s (2005) criticism of a proliferation of master’s degrees in education administration? Do we believe university research can produce and expand on theoretical perspectives that continue to inform the field?

_Papa, Northern Arizona University_

I offer six necessary features of good leadership preparation that are beyond the tests and standards set by accrediting bodies or professional organizations. These should be vigorously pursued through continuing theoretical study.
1. Adult Learners
Leader preparation needs to be grounded by theory and practice.

2. Human Agency
We must ensure the future school leader has a varied repertoire. When real life situations need answers for complex issues, our theories can guide leaders into the situational, contextual world of real schooling.

3. Ignored Intended Skills
We need to mentor our students, meshing the experience of real school settings where we can learn what not to do, but may not know exactly what to do, and, have the understanding that it is ok and normal to wrestle with complex issues.

4. Intellectual Curiosity
Curiosity in learning and how it is fostered in the school environment is critical for school leaders to develop, understand and apply.

5. Futurity
Our leaders-in-preparation must be exposed to learning frames that go against the grain of current wisdom. Going against the grain may just be the best hero trait we encourage.

6. Imaginativeness
Creativity, inspiration, original, resourceful, visionary, artistry, inventive, ingenuity, clever, are the synonyms to exceptional and effective leadership that no single test can capture and make these human traits accountable in one-size-fits-all approaches.

We must be the inspiration for leaders we are preparing. It takes recognition and commitment to reframe our programs to what we know will deliver the inspiration all students should have.

Achilles, Seton Hall University

At the master's level, Levine (2005) may have, in his haste to advocate for a master's level course following a "new" idea from Great Britain omitted a citation to Paul Pouland's "The Return of the Mayflower" from Leaders for America's Schools (Griffiths, Stout, & Forsyth, 1988). So, Levine (2005) in his quest for speed of change may have sacrificed citations for ideas he used.

Wildman, California State University, Bakersfield

Consider what is happening in teacher education. Major foundations, including the Broad Foundation, the Michael and Susan Dell Foundation, The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, and the U.S. Department of Education are funding "Teach for America" type programs which include very little foundational education course work and de-professionalize teaching. The National Education Association, as well as the administrator associations should be very concerned and recognize that they need to prioritize the good of their members over their desire to increase their staff development business.

In summary, the problem is much larger than NCPEA. Higher education needs to launch a major public relations effort to inform the public about what faculty do. The public needs to recognize the importance of teaching pre-determined objectives as well as instruction that develops the talents of each student. The public needs to recognize the importance of
McCarthy, Indiana University

To produce graduates who can successfully lead schools where students are learning and developing into socially conscious and engaged citizens, leadership preparation programs need to focus on this outcome from recruitment practices through program completion. The importance of rigorous admission standards cannot be overstated. If the pipeline has outstanding and intelligent individuals who are committed to improving education and student learning, the likelihood of producing exemplary school leaders is greatly enhanced. However, far too many educational leadership graduate programs basically have open admissions for those interested in pursuing administrative licensure and/or use criteria that have very little relevance to performance as school leaders. States in conjunction with professional organizations need to support policies that call for the elimination of leadership preparation programs that do not employ selective admissions with the criteria linked to success as school leaders.

In addition to a rigorous admission’s process, leadership preparation programs should be outcomes oriented and mission-driven, and the mission should permeate all components of the program. To illustrate the disjunction that often occurs between mission statements and program elements, many preparation programs that assert a mission of promoting leadership for learning actually give little attention to how students learn or to the school leader’s role in enhancing student learning. This is disheartening, because the program mission should provide the scaffolding upon which all aspects of the program are built (Murphy, Moorman, & McCarthy, 2009).

NCPEA: In a New Voice (Hoyle & Estes, Eds, 1993) is the title of the first Yearbook of the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration and the first in our field of study. The introductory chapter set the stage for 26 others written by several “legends” in our discipline. Among these leading authors are Chuck Achilles, Louis Wildman, Jim Guthrie, Mike Martin, David Erlandson, Mike Richardson, Ken Lane, Paul Bredeson, Diane Newby, Henry Peel, Ed Chance, Marilyn Hirth, and Tom Valesky. In Chapter One, Dwaine Estes and I presented four proposals to advance our discipline and the image of educational administration. They are as follows:
1. Promote quality in administration.
2. Stress ethical behavior among NCPEA members and its clients and the students and practicing administrators they serve.
3. Promote quality use of technology.

While these four tenets are just as viable today as they were in 1993, I will focus on tenet three—"Promote quality use of technology." We wrote that school districts are spending an increasingly large amount on technology to improve student performance, but unfortunately, these dollars have not resulted in expected gains. The reasons for this dilemma in 1993 are the same in 2010—little involvement by teachers in the selection of the technology. This lack of buy-in on the part of teachers results in wasting available valuable assets. Also, training is insufficient (Hoyle & Estes, 1993). In 1993, we challenged professors to teach principals how to provide leadership to incorporate technology in their schools. Also, we urged teachers to learn the appropriate instructional goals for students to learn through the use of technology and establish benchmarks and assessment techniques to ascertain whether students are actually learning. Finally, we charged our professional colleagues in educational administration to lead their graduate students toward quality implementation of technology through modeling new virtual methods.

We closed the chapter by writing:

It is clearly a time for optimism about the discipline/professional field of educational administration and for NCPEA. More and better students are enrolling in preparation programs. Research reveals an overall positive student perception of the quality of administrator preparation, but it is imperative that NCPEA members take the lead in reforming the ways in which school administrators view themselves as change agents. (Hoyle & Estes, 1993, p. 8)

Today, professors must embrace the latest and best applications of technology to enhance online and classroom teaching and add virtual/global knowledge to enrich research agendas.

Optimism was high in 1993 to make educational administration a proud and powerful field of study. It remains high in 2010, but the overwhelming demand to manage virtual leadership preparation is perhaps the greatest challenge faced today. We must find the “golden mean” to balance our teaching strategies for future school leaders with unconditional love in a virtual world.

Beach, Alabama State University

Upon graduation, few of our master’s level students will walk directly into a true leadership position. With this in mind, and remembering that one of Rosemary Papa’s (nd) “Accoutrements of Leadership” attributes speaks to futurity and going against the grain, it may be appropriate to consider how our programs address the future. This seems to make sense for several reasons. First, the role that each student will play will be different from state to state, district to district, and from now into our graduate’s future. Also, many graduates are entrenched in the district in which they will provide leadership services and may practice for two or more years prior to obtaining any administrative appointment. It will likely take years...
before they are awarded their initial principalship or central office position. During that hiatus, most graduates who genuinely seek administrative positions are aware that they must "go along to get along," which can mean that going against the grain can be quite counterproductive. The ability to hold one's values patiently until an appropriate opportunity for their expression arises, even when being immersed in a counter culture, may be a good candidate for a preparation program goal—an accoutrement.

Second, at this point in time, education appears to be undergoing a financial retrenchment mitigated by short-term applications of deficit spending. While, as a nation, we are not about to collapse, our schools and colleges may lose a year or more in development. Many young, untenured teachers have been put at risk, with further retrenchments likely. We can expect a rise in class size and reductions in elective courses as curriculum contractions respond to fiscal concerns. Our programs may well be producing graduates for fewer positions, in somewhat diminished institutions. Would a contracting future strangle program expansion and development, limiting opportunities for university graduates, and thereby, inadvertently mitigate Levine's proliferation concerns or just speed up the race to the bottom? Are we adjusting programs and preparing leaders to handle such uncertainty or change?

At the same time, and a third issue noted above, the nature of education seems to be refocusing away from the affective dimensions of learning and toward more technologically-dependent instruction. In the 2006–2007 academic year, approximately 70% of 4 year institutions offered online degree programs and postsecondary education "offered 11,240 complete online degrees and enrolled over 12,156,000 students" (NCES, 2008, pp. 9–11). What does this data imply regarding future teacher preparation programs? If this approach to instructional delivery descends extensively into P-12 education, what will educational leadership become if half of our P-12 students are no longer physically at the school? Is an itinerant assistant principal's role coming? Will teaching become far more dependent on the teacher's role being a facilitator from afar, pointing the way to online media resources that become an Orwellian version of direct instruction? What implications does this have for supervision and evaluation of those teachers who also may not be physically present in the school during instruction? What does educational leadership become when the classroom gives way to an Internet-based information exchange? Here, I disagree with Dr. Papa. Such frames will not go against the grain of current practice; they will likely eclipse this practice. Are our candidates being made ready?

Grady, University of Nebraska Lincoln

It may be time to take a few pages from the past as guides for the preparation of educational leaders. One old, but valuable, source is the *Flexner Report*. It was prepared by Abraham Flexner (1866–1959) who spent 19 years of his career as a secondary school teacher and a principal in Louisville, Kentucky. In 1910, he completed Medical Education in the United States and Canada (known as the *Flexner Report*). The report was prepared for the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. At the time Flexner completed the report, many medical schools were "profit centers" rather than "education centers." Medical schools, at that time, did not have clear goals and standards. The publication of the *Flexner Report* is linked to the reform of medical education. Many medical schools closed their doors after the publication of the report.

The transformation that occurred following the publication of the *Flexner Report* led to the emergence of medicine as a profession. Aspects of the profession include: a profession
has an organized body of knowledge; professionals police their own membership and set their own standards; there is a means of enforcing the ‘rules’ of the profession; professionals continue to advance their knowledge of the field throughout their careers; and, professionals have autonomy (Grady, 1993). Admission to medical school became highly selective following the publication of the Flexner Report.

Perhaps, we should host a reading circle using the Flexner Report or possibly Flexner’s biography, Iconoclast: Abraham Flexner and a Life of Learning, as our guide. The contemporary proliferation of master’s programs in educational administration certainly resembles the “profit center” approach to education that plagued the medical schools before 1910.

SUMMARY OF ISSUE #3

Creighton, Virginia Tech University

The Living Legends’ responses to the sudden increase in numbers of programs (proliferation) though varied, were more similar than different. Beach went right to the data reporting the extent of such proliferation. In the 2006–2007 academic year, approximately 70% of four year institutions offered online degree programs and postsecondary education offered 11,240 complete online degrees and enrolled over 12,156,000 students. With a reference to how the medical field faced proliferation in their field, Grady posits that the contemporary proliferation of master’s programs in educational administration certainly resembles the “profit center” approach to education that plagued the medical schools before 1910. McCarthy sees as most problematic that far too many educational leadership graduate programs have open admissions for those interested in pursuing administrative licensure and/or use criteria that have very little relevance to performance as school leaders.

Though written in 1993, Hoyle and Estes could easily be referring to the current state of affairs when they stated:

It is clearly a time for optimism about the discipline/professional field of educational administration and for NCPEA. More and better students are enrolling in preparation programs. Research reveals an overall positive student perception of the quality of administrator preparation, but it is imperative that NCPEA members take the lead in reforming the ways in which school administrators view themselves as change agents. (Hoyle & Estes, 1993, p. 8)

CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

In my 2009 Living Legend address to the NCPEA membership, I made reference to Roger Martin (2007) and his theory of “integrative thinking.” Let me suggest that the eight Living Legends, who you read here, are truly integrative thinkers. By refusing to accept unpleasant trade-offs and conventional options, integrative thinkers are able to find creative solutions to seemingly intractable problems. Furthermore, these eight see the ride as the salient issue.
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