

**Reconfiguring Master's and Administrative Certification
by Combining Theoretical, Craft, and Personal Knowledge**

Paper Symposium on:
Bridging Theory and Praxis through Professional Development for School Administrators:
A University and School District Collaboration

2005 Annual Meeting of the
American Educational Research Association

Montreal, Canada
April 11, 2005

Dr. Anne-Marie Read
annemarie.read@asu.edu

Dr. Arnold Danzig
arnold.danzig@asu.edu

Dr. James Jurs
james.jurs@asu.edu

Educational Leadership and Policy Studies
College of Education
Arizona State University
Tempe, AZ

Dr. James Rice
jrice@alhambra.k12.az.us

Alhambra Elementary School District
Phoenix, AZ

Dr. Charlotte Boyle
Charlotte_boyle@creighton.k12.az.us

Dr. Lynne Spiller
lynne_spiller@creighton.k12.az.us
Creighton Elementary School District
Phoenix, AZ

Reconfiguring Master's and Administrative Certification by Combining Theoretical, Craft, and Personal Knowledge

Introduction

Problem

There is a growing effort to involve the researched in the process of inquiry through such approaches as action research, participatory action research, and action science (Argyris & Schön, 1991). A recurring theme of debate within these models of inquiry is the dilemma of ensuring rigor without sacrificing relevance (Elden & Levin, 1991). The challenge is even greater in praxis-oriented research (Lather, 1986), where the goal of the research is to move beyond description and explanation to that of transforming conditions of practice. Such is the case in leadership preparation programs, where reflection, action research, and self-study are utilized to foster the development and evaluation of critically reflective leaders (Bell, 1996; Shapiro, 1994; Zigler, 1994). Though the rigor of self-study research may be enhanced by the obligation to monitor one's own performance (Munby, 1995), the establishment of trustworthiness is also predicated on a readiness to make aspects of the study problematic and subject to the scrutiny of others (Northfield, 1996; Polkinghorne, 1983). This requires a willingness on the part of leaders (and teachers of leaders) "to make themselves vulnerable and to put their own reasoning and actions on the line, subjecting them to the same scrutiny to which they subject the reasoning and actions" of others (Argyris, Putnam, & Smith, 1985, p. 269).

Purpose

The purpose of this paper is to do just that. Specifically, we will describe, interpret, and evaluate multiple ways in which university faculty and school district administrators collaborated in the development and delivery of courses in a master's certification program in educational administration. The impetus for the collaboration was the Learner Centered

Leadership Grant. Preliminary conversations between faculty and administrators led to a revised set of course titles to be delivered in the program and resulted in the co-development and co-teaching of courses among university professors and school district administrators including three superintendents and a director of research from participating school districts. This paper describes and analyses some of the content revisions that were made, some of the experiences of practitioners in co-teaching courses, and some implications for future course development bridging research, theory, and practice.

This paper also describes, and analyzes the processes and outcomes of action-oriented and self-reflective capstone seminar. Serving as a culminating experience in the reconfigured Masters program, the capstone course involved graduate students in an action-oriented and critically self-reflective investigation of their leadership development while enrolled in this program. Within the context of the capstone experience, students analyzed artifacts and documents from previous courses to demonstrate how they had grown and developed as leaders. They conducted an action research project within the context of their year-long internship to ascertain how others perceived their development as leaders, comparing their findings to internal and external expectations of effective leaders (e.g., professional standards). The results of each student's investigation formed the basis of a comprehensive final narrative that: 1) described his or her developmental journey as a leader; 2) assessed the status of that development; and 3) outlined plans for future growth and development. A major goal of the capstone experience was to facilitate for these aspiring leaders the internalization of strategies for life-long learning and development as well as the capacity to monitor and evaluate the efficacy of that development.

Procedures

Drawing upon Eisner's (2002) model of educational criticism, this paper describes, interprets, and evaluates the development and implementation of a Master's and certification

program, which was reconfigured around the integration of theoretical, craft, and personal knowledge. Supporting data have been collected and analyzed using both qualitative and quantitative methodologies, including: pre- and post internship survey data as well as student and collaborating instructors' critical reflections. In order to distinguish the planned curriculum from the one that was enacted, course materials (e.g., syllabus, handouts, session agendas) were used to document the planned curriculum; while course products—such as, course evaluations and student products—served, in part, as data sources for the enacted curriculum. In addition, course co-instructors wrote up critical reflections documenting thoughts, feelings, questions, concerns, and emerging insights. These data form the basis for the *descriptive analyses* portion of this educational criticism (Eisner, 2002).

By juxtaposing data from the planned curriculum (what was intended), the enacted curriculum (how that was experienced), and participants' critical reflections (pivotal sense-making moments), a number of important patterns and themes were identified through the inductive process of constant comparative analysis (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). The resulting categories were then subjected to deductive analyses using a set of *interpretive frameworks* derived from the literature (Patton, 1990). The resulting insights formed the basis for a set of *evaluative conclusions*, which articulate a number of implications and recommendations for collaboratively developed and co-taught Masters and administrative certification programs.

Descriptive Analyses

The following descriptive analyses involves a discussion of the *programmatic context* of the reconfigured Masters program followed by a descriptive overview of the content and instructional strategies used in four of the program's collaboratively developed and *co-taught courses*.

Programmatic Context

The Learner Centered Leadership (LCL) Masters program in educational administration at Arizona State University (ASU) was first offered as part of a collaborative, professional development partnership with four large urban school districts that focused on learner-centered leadership. Prospective students were nominated and/or recruited from the participating districts as part of a larger mentoring project in educational administration. In addition to a year long internship, these students took the following courses together as a cohort: Concepts of Learner-Centered Leadership: How People Learn; Instructional Supervision; School Law: National, State, and Local Policy Shaping Urban Education and Learning; Introduction to Research and Evaluation; Competency Performance: Assessment and the Demand for Accountability; State and Local Finance and Budgeting; and The Principalship: Research on Leadership and Decision Making.

In lieu of the comprehensive exam, LCL Master's students were enrolled in a Capstone Seminar that "applied the conceptual work learned in classes to the practical experiences to which they were exposed in the internships." Of the original 34 students, 27 (19 females and 8 males) enrolled in the Capstone Seminar after completing a year and half of coursework. Of that number, five were African American, 10 were Hispanic, and 12 were Caucasian. According to LCL program materials:

prospective administrators are being exposed to concepts related to the three pillars of leadership addressed in this grant (learning, community, and systems thinking). Along with this, students are receiving instruction on notions of learner-centered leadership in urban, diverse school settings.

Drawing upon a framework established by the National Research Council in *How People Learn* (2000), LCL coursework embraces four principles of professional development for adults.

First, professional development should build on pre-existing knowledge. Second, people have pre-conceptions and misconceptions that need to be recognized and when necessary corrected. Third, scaffolding that provides support and nurturing should be used with adults so that they can grow and learn. Finally, real world applications should be used so that new knowledge is more readily transferred to the existing settings and context.

In an effort to provide real world scenarios through the coursework, LCL courses have been offered using multiple mediums including web courses, labs, and case studies. Four of these courses have been co-taught by an ASU faculty member and an LCL administrative mentor from one of the participating urban school districts. These four courses are: COE 501—*Introduction to Research and Evaluation in Education: Student Testing and the Evaluation of Learning*; EDA 591—*Concepts of Learner-Centered Educational Leadership: Learning, Community, and Systems Thinking*; EDA 548—*Family, School, and Community Connections: Community as a Context for Leadership and Learning*; and EDA 691—*Capstone Seminar on Evaluation and Assessment of School Change*.

Co-taught LCL Courses in Brief

The following discussion provides an overview of the four courses that were collaboratively developed and/or revised and then co-taught as part of the LCL Masters program by district administrators and university faculty members. This discussion, however, will focus exclusively on describing course content and instructional approaches. Reflections on the collaborative process of co-teaching will occur later in this paper.

Research and Evaluation in Education. Dr. Gene Glass and Dr. Lynne Spiller co-taught COE 501: Introduction to Research and Evaluation in Education, a course that was designed to provide an overview of educational inquiry from controlled, quantitative methodologies to naturalistic, qualitative methodologies. Dr. Glass, a professor at Arizona State University, has taught this course—which is

required in all College of Education (COE) graduate programs—each year for the past fifteen years. Dr. Spiller has been the Director of Research and Evaluation at the Creighton School District for the past five years. Dr. Glass and Dr. Spiller had a previous relationship before co teaching as Dr. Glass was the chair of her dissertation committee. Because of this earlier mentor/mentee relationship, co-planning was easily managed through established communications routines. Communication was primarily through email and shared electronic documents with a few face-to-face meetings.

Their pre-planning activities centered on developing new learning goals and objectives blending the theoretical and the practical into the course. The new learning goals and objectives built into the learning experiences were designed around incorporating the skills of evaluating research articles and studies and using the information in the era of high accountability caused by No Child Left Behind (NCLB). Drs. Spiller and Glass agreed to add additional learning opportunities and skills with Microsoft EXCEL software data analysis tools, which would allow these prospective new administrators the tools necessary to more efficiently and economically comply with the requirements of prediction, verification and validation of student and site achievement. The NCLB law requires school sites to demonstrate program effectiveness at a very technical level, a level of statistical knowledge and technical expertise not usually attained by school administrators from traditional course work.

Concepts of Learner-Centered Leadership. This course focused on the principles, theories, attributes, and skills related to leadership development, with a particular emphasis on concepts aligned with notions of learner-centered leadership. Delivered primarily on-line as a series of modules in conjunction with several face-to-face class meetings, the course was co-taught by Dr. Charlotte Boyle, Superintendent of Creighton Elementary School District and Dr. Arnold Danzig, Associate Professor of Educational Administration and Director of the Learner-Centered Leadership (LCL) project.

The series of modules that formed the basis of this course focused on different aspects and functions of leadership. For instance, one of the modules involved creating and implementing a skill development plan. In the case of the following example, the graduate student had submitted his or her efforts at developing this plan. Dr. Danzig responded by validating the student's self-assessment of on-the-job performances and then explaining:

The goal of this exercise is to see a relationship among managing day-to-day events, self-assessing your strengths and weaknesses in selected skills and behaviors, and meeting professional standards in educational administration.

Like the research and evaluation course, which immersed students in real world challenges such as those posed by the NCLB Act, this course acquainted students with state certification standards. As illustrated in the following feedback on this student's skill development plan, Dr. Danzig wrote: "Monitoring your actions and performance is required as part of the Arizona Administrative Professional Standard One" which stipulates assessing the extent to which documentation of one's performance is used "to design and continually adapt a professional development plan" (R7-2-603 Professional Administrative Standards).

Family, School, and Community Connections. Dr. James Rice, Superintendent of the Alhambra Elementary School District and Dr. Arnold Danzig, co-taught a course on *Family, School, and Community Connections*, which focused on "administrative factors of primary importance in developing community involvement in public schools with an emphasis on theory and skill of school system and individual communication" (ASU Graduate Catalogue, 2004). Because the ASU faculty had recently changed the name of this course to respect deeper understandings of community, its focus was enlarged to include "individualism and commitment in American life," as well as "crossing boundaries between schools and culturally diverse families and communities" (EDA 548

Syllabus).

Like the other courses, this one was designed to address a number of standards and performance indicators for state-approved professional administrative certification. In order to meet these standards, Drs. Rice and Danzig selected three texts: one focused on practical issues--Carroll's (2000) *EdMarketing: How Smart Schools Get and Keep Community Support*; another that explored the challenges and opportunities of involving minority families—Delgado Gaitan's (2004) *Involving Latino Families in Schools: Raising Student Achievement Through*; and a third and broader perspective in Putnam's (2000) *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. Assigned readings from these and other texts were coupled with a range of activities—both in and outside of class—such as book reviews, case and video analysis, and position papers. For example, in one assignment students were required to:

Go to www.bowlingalone.com, for description of Bowling Alone. Then head to National Public Radio website at: <http://search.npr.org/cf/cmn/cmnps05fm.cfm?SegID=74874> and listen to interview with author Robert Putnam (7 minute segment audio segment with Putnam). (EDA 584 Course Syllabus)

The basic structure of class time was a mixture of lecture and discussion of important themes raised by the readings and experiences of class members. Strong opinions were encouraged, although tolerance for the perspectives of others was necessary for sharing of ideas and perspectives. As a graduate level class, there were no multiple-choice examinations. Instead, there was a focus on insights, reflections and applications of the reading and class discussion to students' own experiences in school, at home and at work.

Capstone Seminar. As the last course in the LCL program sequence, the Capstone Seminar served a dual purpose in that it (1) functioned as culminating course experience that facilitated the integration of knowledge across courses and the application of knowledge to real

problems of practice and (2) resulted in the development of a written product, which substituted for a comprehensive exam that was required of all graduate students. This overview of the Capstone Seminar, therefore, involves a more extensive description of course content and instructional strategies than that of the other three co-taught courses.

The capstone seminar was collaboratively developed and co-taught by Dr. James Jurs, a former district superintendent and Clinical Associate Professor and Dr. Anne-Marie Read, Assistant Professor at Arizona State University. The goal of the Capstone Seminar was to have class members "investigate" their own learning and then make public their findings. This entailed having students determine where they were in their development as leaders and how they arrived at that point. In doing so, students were asked to reflect on what that meant with respect to the role expectations of others and their own aspirations as school leaders. In order to meet this goal, students were required to (1) draw upon the record of their learnings from previous coursework in the program to establish a meaningful backdrop against which their growth and development could be measured and understood; and (2) seek out information from a variety of sources—including colleagues, supervisors, faculty, professional associations, and research—to describe, interpret, and assess their development as leaders. The products emerging from this inquiry were intended to allow students maximum opportunity to demonstrate evolving and integrated knowledge of teaching, learning, and leading as well as insight into how they approach the process of their own leadership development.

In cooperation with other ASU faculty, Drs. Jurs and Read developed and incorporated a series of integrated learning activities into the Capstone Seminar to facilitate the accomplishment of these objectives and outcomes. These learning activities were clustered into three interactive phases: data collection and analysis, synthesis of findings, and development of course products. Although these three phases were fairly discreet and distinct from one another, students were

involved in most of these phases simultaneously. During phase one (i.e., data collection and analysis), students were to read and review selected readings drawn from the literature (e.g., articles on evaluating and assessing change, performance standards from professional associations). At the same time, they also collected and analyzed a sample of documents drawn from earlier coursework in the program (e.g., reflective writing, educational philosophy statements, research papers). This work then set the stage for collecting and analyzing data on the status of their own leadership development from peers, colleagues, supervisors, subordinates, and university faculty (e.g., via observations, interviews, surveys).

As part of the second phase (i.e., synthesis of findings) students were asked to: meet with fellow classmates to provide updates on their investigations and to develop integrative insights into their learnings and to maintain a "Learning Portfolio" housing the record of their investigation (e.g., data, notes from readings, instrumentation, critical event write-ups). During this phase, students also wrote three interim summaries analyzing and synthesizing the findings of investigation into their development as leaders. In the final phase (i.e., product development), students were required to write a comprehensive final narrative, describing the nature of their journey (i.e., What happened?); interpreting or providing insight into what that meant to them (i.e., So what?); and evaluating or reflecting on the implications for their future development (i.e., Now what?). During the last class session, students were also asked to present a synopsis of their findings, an assessment of themselves as leaders, and a plan for furthering their development and aspirations as a leader.

To accomplish these tasks, students worked closely in three different groups: a critical friends team, where interpersonal and intrapersonal insights were explored; a learning circle, which focused primarily on cognitive and technical information from the readings; and a school group that worked to integrate all three of these dimensions. Although students did much of this

work outside of class (e.g., reading and data collection), time was set aside during each class session to provide: (1) clear instruction on each phase of the investigation; (2) practice with data collection and analysis; and (3) meaning making on the readings and during interim and summative writing tasks. During much of this group work, Dr. Jurs and Dr. Read served primarily as facilitators: circulating around, observing team interactions, offering clarification and/or elaboration of instructions, answering questions, providing validation and/or introducing provocative questions or perspectives. The purpose of these learning experiences and accompanying faculty roles was to:

challenge and support participants in the acquisition of new knowledge, perspectives, and skills; the questioning of taken-for-granted beliefs and assumptions; and the integration of theory with practice. These learning experiences were predicated on the belief that every person is both a teacher and a learner, an expert and a novice, a leader and a follower. (EDA 691 Syllabus)

Consequently, Dr. Jurs and Dr. Read's roles in the course varied depending on the needs of the participants, the particulars of the learning activity, and the stage of development as a group. For the most part, these roles were facilitative and focused upon the collaborative aspects of the course experience. One role that tended to be constant, irrespective of other factors was that of providing feedback to each student, particularly on their interim summaries. Typically, this feedback was aimed at enlarging the student's capacity to think critically. As a result, Drs. Jurs' and Read's comments tended to ask for: more detail (e.g., What exactly did you do/say/think/feel?); clarification (e.g., Could you be more specific?); elaboration (e.g., How so? In what ways?); and/or additional analysis (e.g., What assumptions might be operating here?). When and where appropriate, feedback was also given regarding syntactic (e.g., sentence structure) and semantic (e.g., interpretation) issues. Whatever the type of feedback, it was

intended to support and guide. Students were encouraged to ask for further clarification or elaboration whenever that feedback was construed as being unhelpful or insufficient.

Using a faculty-developed evaluation rubric (see figure 1), feedback was provided for each of three interim summaries, which students wrote after completing a series of data collection and analysis activities. The first interim summary focused on where students had been in their journey through the program. To complete this portion, students performed document and artifact analyses of work they had generated while in the program (e.g., course papers, research reports, reflective writing). The second interim summary was aimed at answering the question of where they were in the current development as a leader. Data sources for this part included document and artifact analysis of materials generated during their internship, interviews with and surveys of people who had observed their leadership activities. The final interim summary examined any gaps, strengths, and/or weaknesses that may have emerged when comparing their current development as a leader with what was expected relative to state and national standards. During this final piece, students developed an action plan to guide their continuing and on-going development as school leaders. After receiving feedback on all three interim summaries, students began the process of integrating the interim summaries into a final three-part narrative, which answered the questions: Where have I been on this journey? Where am I now in my development as a school leader? And where do I go from here?

Because this comprehensive final narrative was submitted as evidence of completing the course and in lieu of a comprehensive final exam, the rubric in Figure 1 was provided to students at the beginning of the course, referenced throughout the semester, and then used by Drs. Jurs and Read to provide feedback on students' three interim summaries as well as to evaluate their comprehensive final narratives.

Figure 1: Feedback and Evaluation Rubric

STANDARD		Exemplary	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory
Criteria for Evaluation and Performance Indicators	Descriptive Analysis	Supports analysis with thick description of development <u>and</u> extensive references from course and program readings.	Supports analysis with modest description of development <u>and</u> adequate references to course and program readings.	Analysis is primarily subjective with little description of development <u>and/or</u> too few references to course and program readings.
	Interpretive Framework	Clearly specifies what was selected to interpret <u>and</u> thoroughly explains why it was selected. Uses comprehensive set of relevant perspectives to interpret growth and development.	Specifies what was selected to interpret <u>and</u> explains why it was selected. Uses adequate number of relevant perspectives to interpret growth and development.	Unclear what was selected for interpretation <u>or</u> why it was selected. Interpretation is primarily subjective with few relevant perspectives cited.
	Evaluative Conclusions	Discussion of implications and recommendations is comprehensive. Conclusions are well supported and documented.	Discussion of implications and recommendations is modest but adequate. Conclusions are supported and documented.	Discussion of implications and recommendations is either meager or absent. Draws conclusions without supporting data.
	Overall Presentation	Arguments are cogent and compellingly drawn. Writing is very articulate and well-organized	Arguments are persuasive and to the point. Writing is clear and organized.	Arguments are weak and/or unconvincing. Writing is unclear and/or difficult to follow.

This rubric was based in part on Eisner’s (2002) model of an educational criticism, which is characterized by three important attributes; it is descriptive (i.e., the “what”), interpretive (i.e., the “so what”), and evaluative (i.e., the “now what”). Students received guidance in applying this model through in-class instruction, interim summary feedback, and course handouts such as the following.

Applied to your Comprehensive Final Narrative, you will need to make sure that it provides a descriptive analysis of your development as a school leader. What does your development look like? Help us to “see” how it has changed over time. You will also need to help us understand what your growth and development means by referencing interpretive perspectives drawn from your readings and course work in [this] program. Finally your Comprehensive Final Narrative will need to include an evaluative set of

conclusions in which you discuss and reflect upon the implications of your findings and propose recommendations for your continuing development as a school leader. (EDA 691 Course Handout)

One of the most important expectations of the Capstone Seminar was that students would assume a self-directed (as opposed to other-directed) role in their learning. In addition to generating some resistance on the part of a small minority of students, this expectation had implications for how evaluation and assessment occurred and the roles of Drs. Jurs and Read—not only in grading the final comprehensive narrative, but also in determining a final grade for the course. Drawing upon Getzels and Guba’s (1967) model of a school as a social system, the final grades for the Capstone Seminar encompassed two perspectives: an *idiographic* perspective (e.g., How much have I grown as an individual?) and a *normative* perspective (e.g., What does that growth look like relative to the growth of others?). The student was expected to provide the idiographic perspective by engaging in the process of self-evaluation and recommending a grade based on that evaluation. As part of the process of self-evaluation, each student was asked to develop *criteria for evaluation* that were: relevant to each individual's learning experiences; reflective of student expectations and course objectives; and supportable through documentation in their final comprehensive narrative. These criteria for evaluation were to be operationalized with *performance indicators* and a *standard of measure*. An example of one student’s self-evaluation can be seen in Figure 2.

Figure 2: Sample of Student-developed Self-evaluation Instrument (Idiographic Perspective)

SELF-EVALUATION PROTOCOL Scale: 1—Always; 2—Usually; 3—Periodically; 4—Seldom; 5--Never					
TEAMWORK					
Modeled and encouraged the group to move to task completion.	1	②	3	4	5
Encouraged involvement of members working in groups.	①	2	3	4	5
Provided specific feedback to others based on observation and data.	①	2	3	4	5
Engaged other group members in shared and focused discussion.	1	②	3	4	5
Accepted responsibility for delegated sections of assignments.	①	2	3	4	5
Offered group members materials and resources to move toward goal.	①	2	3	4	5

Figure 2 (Continued)

SENSITIVITY	
Dealt tactfully with others during stressful moments.	1 ② 3 4 5
Demonstrated professional courtesy to students from different districts, positions, or departments.	① 2 3 4 5
Refrained from criticizing the beliefs and assumptions of others.	1 ② 3 4 5
Behaved in a way that created bond of trust.	① 2 3 4 5
Abstained from judging others with different opinions about important points in assigned readings.	① 2 3 4 5
Asked clarifying questions to clarify the perspective of others.	① 2 3 4 5
Answered questions or gave others honest input.	① 2 3 4 5
RESULTS ORIENTATION	
Assumed responsibility for my own learning by asking clarifying questions.	① 2 3 4 5
Was an active participant in groups or class.	① 2 3 4 5
Supported actions taken or assigned to group or class.	① 2 3 4 5
Completed a 3 part narrative about journey as a leader.	① 2 3 4 5
Met assignment requirements deadlines.	1 ② 3 4 5
Used time and task management to support group rotations.	1 ② 3 4 5
Used strategies or protocols presented in class to incorporate new ways of collecting data.	① 2 3 4 5
UNDERSTANDING OWN STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES	
Gathered data from others and it's implication for personal change.	① 2 3 4 5
Used critical events as a way of assessing strengths and/or weaknesses.	① 2 3 4 5
Accepted input/suggestions from critical friends in areas needing change.	① 2 3 4 5
Worked collaboratively to support school group.	① 2 3 4 5
COMMUNICATION	
Utilized effective strategies for ensuring comments where understood.	1 ② 3 4 5
Listened carefully and shared relevant information.	1 ② 3 4 5
Took responsibility for resolving personal confusion related to class expectations.	① 2 3 4 5
Took responsibility to clarify directions for assignments with teacher.	① 2 3 4 5
Presented and defended point of view in group discussions.	① 2 3 4 5
INTERPERSONAL REFLECTIONS	
Low tolerance for ambiguity	① 2 3 4 5
Feel prepared to step into leadership today	1 ② 3 4 5
Valid information about my hidden side	① 2 3 4 5
View of leadership changed drastically	① 2 3 4 5
The process increased my knowledge to organize data in a meaningful way	① 2 3 4 5
Pacing of cohort needs to be extended to 2 ½ -3 yrs to increase application of knowledge to real life	① 2 3 4 5
Feels prepared to lead as an instructional leader	1 ② 3 4 5
Willingness to be a risk taker	① 2 3 4 5
A leader in my own learning and that of others	① 2 3 4 5
Engaged fully and authentically in the Capstone Project	① 2 3 4 5
My colleagues felt my behavior and interactions demonstrated that I will do well in a leadership role	① 2 3 4 5
Comments reflected by district colleagues reflected that my values and beliefs were also evident in my day to day work	① 2 3 4 5

The normative perspective for the final grade was provided by Drs. Jurs and Read and was based upon the criteria for evaluation, performance indicators, and standard of measure that had been consensually developed with input from the students. This evaluation and feedback instrument (see figure 3) also facilitated calculation of the final grade by averaging together the student's recommended grade and the instructors' recommended grade.

Figure 3: Collaboratively Developed Evaluation Instrument (Normative Perspective)

<u>LEARNING COMMITMENT</u>					
<u>Degree of Responsibility as evidenced by:</u>	←Mostly---Sometimes---Rarely→				
1. Coming prepared to learn <u>and</u> contribute to the learning of others	5	4	3	2	1
2. Following through on responsibilities, tasks and commitments	5	4	3	2	1
3. Being willing to take risks as a learner <u>and</u> to stretch as a leader	5	4	3	2	1
<u>Level of Engagement as evidenced by:</u>					
4. Contributing to the development of a learning community	5	4	3	2	1
5. Taking initiative during class discussions and learning activities	5	4	3	2	1
6. Being willing to ask questions,	5	4	3	2	1
<u>Quality of Participation as evidenced by:</u>					
7. Demonstrating effective communication problem solving skills	5	4	3	2	1
8. Engaging in effective decision making and conflict resolution	5	4	3	2	1
9. Being willing to collaborate with others meaning construction	5	4	3	2	1
<u>Learning Commitment Subtotals:</u>					

<u>LEARNING PROCESSES</u>					
<u>Utilization of Data Sources as evidenced by:</u>	←Extensive---Modest---None→				
Supporting documentation in Part I (Where have I been?) from:					
10. Notes on and/or quotes from LCL course readings		5	4	3	2
1					
11. Student generated papers, reports, reflective writing	5	4	3	2	1
12. Ethnography, autobiography, philosophy, etc.	5	4	3	2	1
Supporting documentation in Part II (Where am I now?) from:					
13. Capstone documents and artifacts (e.g., concept map, collage)	5	4	3	2	1
14. Interview transcript(s)	5	4	3	2	1
15. Survey/questionnaire results	5	4	3	2	1
16. Internship documents and artifacts	5	4	3	2	1
Supporting documentation in Part III (Where do I go from here?) from :					
17. State certification and/or ISLLC standards	5	4	3	2	1
18. Critical events content analyses	5	4	3	2	1
19. Leadership Development Plan objectives and action steps	5	4	3	2	1
<u>Interim Summary Development as evidenced by the timely:</u>					
←Always---Frequently---Rarely→					
20. Submission of <i>three interim summaries</i> as drafts for Parts I-III	5	4	3	2	1
21. Incorporation of recommendations in <i>draft of final narrative</i>	5	4	3	2	1
22. Transformation of draft into <i>comprehensive final narrative</i>	5	4	3	2	1
<u>Learning Processes Subtotals:</u>					

Figure 3 (Continued)

<u>LEARNING OUTCOMES</u>						
<u>Quality of Comprehensive Final Narrative as evidenced by:</u>	←Exemplary--Satisfactory--Unsatisfactory→					
<i>Descriptive analysis</i> through the:						
23. Provision of thick description		5	4	3	2	1
24. Inclusion of supporting documentation	5	4	3	2	1	
<i>Interpretive framework</i> through the:						
25. Provision of relevant perspective		5	4	3	2	1
26. Inclusion of supporting references		5	4	3	2	1
<i>Evaluative conclusions</i> through the:						
27. Discussion of implications and recommendations		5	4	3	2	1
28. Provision of supported and documented conclusions		5	4	3	2	1
<i>Overall presentation</i> in which:						
29. Arguments are logical and persuasive		5	4	3	2	1
30. Writing is clear and organized		5	4	3	2	1
<u>Quality of Self-evaluation as evidenced by the:</u>						
←Exceptional---Adequate---Inadequate→						
31. Development of appropriate <i>criteria for evaluation</i>		5	4	3	2	1
32. Generation of observable <i>performance indicators</i>		5	4	3	2	1
33. Identification of a <i>standard of measure</i>		5	4	3	2	1
34. Calculation of a grade representative of learning		5	4	3	2	1
<u>Learning Outcomes Subtotals:</u>						
		_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
<u>Overall Sum:</u>		_____ = _____ + _____ + _____ + _____ + _____				
<u>Instructors' Grade</u> (calculated using this formula):		$\frac{\text{Overall Sum}}{34} = \text{Mean Score}$				
		(Overall Sum) (# of Items) (Mean Score)				
<u>Student's Grade</u> (calculated using attached self-evaluation instrument):		_____				
<u>Final Course Grade</u> (calculated by averaging instructors' and student's grade):		_____				

Interpretive Frameworks

Collaborative planning and co-teaching were the primary processes through which reconfiguration of the LCL Masters program occurred and theoretical, craft, and personal knowledge were combined. Therefore, the focus of this section is on making sense of the variety of ways in which we experienced these collaborative processes during program planning and development and course co-teaching.

Collaborative Program Planning and Development

Due to his experience as a district superintendent, Dr. Jurs joined the ASU faculty in a clinical capacity and became the coordinator of ASU's Educational Administration Master's program. As a consequence, he was immediately expected to collaborate both with the Ed. Adm. faculty and school

district administrators in the establishment of university-school partnerships for the purposes of training aspiring school administrators. His background and experiences as district administrator were helpful in gaining the active support of district leadership so essential for effective school-university collaborations and partnerships (Bruce, 1993). At the same time, he had the added challenge of learning and negotiating aspects of the university culture and political structure that were significantly different from those he had experienced in K-12 schooling. His reflections on this experience highlight a number of important issues in developing and sustaining such partnerships. Acknowledging the assumption that “everyone is a reflection of his or her accumulated experiences,” Dr. Jurs shared the following:

My professional experience consisted of more than thirty years in public schools and encompassed positions as a junior high school classroom teacher, high school assistant principal and principal, assistant superintendent in the area of human resources and superintendent of a large (35,000 student) pre-K through 12 public school district. These exposures shaped my thinking about the challenge of preparing administrators. More recently at the university as a clinical associate professor, I have been exposed to a different set of organizational norms, mores and role expectations. This has allowed me to see administrator preparation from a different point of view. The dichotomy of these two experiences has provided a unique perspective from which to offer the following observations.

Continuing, he recalled how school administrators were prepared during the time he served as a superintendent:

Our district offered an internal administrative training program that focused on selected classroom teachers who demonstrated an interest in becoming a principal. A requirement for admission to this program was possession of an administrative certificate or concurrent enrollment in a university program leading to certification. A common

concern voiced by students in this program on many occasions over more than a decade was that the course work taken at the university was distanced from, if not unrelated to, what the student experienced on a daily basis in the school building. An additional concern was that all course work was completed with university professors whose practical experience was dated if not nonexistent.

As a result, the district designed a local “in-house” curriculum that emphasized a product-driven curriculum, in contrast to what seemed to be a process-driven program at the university. It was only later that Dr. Jurs came to understand that this “dichotomy was consistent with the disparate cultures of the two institutions.” As he put it,

Within the district, we were task-oriented and focused on the completion of a project.

The university was fashioned to be more thoughtful and to debate alternatives, sometimes it seemed, to the point of gridlock. Within the district program, we created an opportunity for the students to apply what was learned at the university. We structured the experiences offered in the program to highlight the skill sets required for successful administration, as practiced in our district. We attempted to establish a linkage between this local program and the university. Our goal was to incorporate the program’s emphasis on practical experience into the university’s practicum or internship programs.

While they were unsuccessful in accomplishing this goal, Dr. Jurs and his district collaborators “remained convinced that a collaborative effort would provide a great benefit to the students who were exposed to two separate styles of preparation.”

So it was a pleasant surprise when he learned, upon assuming his clinical position with the university, about LCL and the collaborative partnership that had been established between ASU and four urban districts.

Here was an innovative program that appeared to provide a bridge over the gap that had been observed from the field. This program incorporated the experience of practitioners. Currently practicing administrators were instrumental in selecting the class members, served as mentors and internship sponsors, even taught or co-taught several of the courses. Periodic and topical seminars were held in the districts, using the expertise of district staff. Applying concepts learned in class was not only encouraged, it was an integral part of the established program of study. Course titles and content were arranged to reflect current issues facing administrators. Courses were offered at a central location convenient to all students. A two-semester internship was incorporated to provide a full school year experience for the students. The program of study was firmly established at the beginning of the two-year cycle. In short, the program was user friendly and designed with a balanced blend of theory and practice.

In his work as program coordinator, Dr. Jurs concluded that it was important that students in ASU's Masters program be "at the center of decisions" during the reconfiguration of the program into one aimed at combining theoretical, craft, and personal knowledge. He noted that the reality embodied in the LCL Masters program "provided the encouragement needed to formalize a new delivery system for the administrator preparation program" at ASU. Although "cohort strategies had previously been employed, it was accomplished on a sporadic basis." Yet, with his leadership, programs of study have since been developed with the assistance of school districts in two geographic regions of the Phoenix metropolitan area. The goal has been to develop highly qualified administrators in a timely fashion to meet the needs of rapidly growing population centers. Consequently, and like the LCL Masters program,

each ASU program is organized on a cohort basis and offered at convenient locations within the school districts. Instructors reflect a balance of university staff and district

administrative staff. Courses are offered on a schedule that reflect student and district needs. Courses included in the program of study are determined in collaboration with the school districts served by each cohort.

Since these cohorts have not yet completed the program of study, it is too early to draw formal conclusions. However, early comments suggest that the university's responsiveness to the needs of students and districts has been viewed as a positive step. Informal discussions with senior level district administrators show that concerns about relevancy and currency have been alleviated. Students are being exposed to the best of current practice and the best research-based theory. This combination is being viewed as a strong response to district concerns regarding the university's ability/willingness to collaborate on the important issue of leadership development.

The successes implied in these observations have also shown up in research on other school-university collaborations and partnerships. For example, Richardson, Flanigan, Vaughn, McKenzie, and Lane (1992) identified a number of benefits in these types of partnerships, including "being able to identify potential administrators early and mentor them thereby enlarging the pool of potential administrators beyond those who self-select to become an administrator" (p. 14). In addition, they found that collaborative groups, which shared authority were able to build mutual trust, take greater risks, become innovators and ultimately be more effective school leaders. The authors concluded, "Thanks to the collaboration effort, and high commitment levels of the team members, the program was successful in preparing future leaders for a career in administration and ultimately toward the improvement of education" (p. 15).

As a member of the LCL Project Team, which is made up of administrators—who serve as "liaisons" from each of the four urban school districts—and ASU faculty, Dr. Read shared some observations regarding the role of collaboration in LCL team planning.

I joined the project team at the beginning of its second year of operation. Although I had not experienced the team building activities, which had occurred during the previous year, I immediately noticed how the team's dynamics differed significantly from those of other groups with whom I've worked (e.g., eight years on a board of education, five years on a school improvement team).

As a collaborative task group, the LCL Project Team has been responsible for planning all of the professional development activities and events for participating district mentors and mentees (e.g., workshops on participant identified needs such as mediating change and fostering community partnerships). Alluding to one of these planning sessions, Dr. Read offered the following recollection as an illustration:

We had just reviewed the four clusters or strands of information that the mentees had shown an interest in learning more about. In contrast to the workshops in the fall, which had been prepared and presented by each of the four participating school districts, many of those present seemed to assume that these next workshops would be prepared and presented by university faculty. Although it wasn't manifesting itself literally as a division of labor—where the practitioners would deal with the practical side and the academicians would deal with the theoretical side—there was more tension in the air than I had seen at other meetings. Eventually, one of the administrators present had the courage to admit that there were concerns about the workshops being focused too much on theory and not enough on practice. Inwardly I smiled because I was aware of concerns on the part of some university faculty that the workshops had been too focused on the practical. However, once the issue was placed on the table, everyone present—district liaisons and university faculty alike—actively explored and critiqued a wide variety of approaches to help ensure more balance between theory and practice.

Without knowing they were doing it, the team ended up exploring five different models of co-teaching: (1) “one teaching/one assisting” where one person takes the lead while the other moves around the room observing students; (2) “station teaching” where responsibility for planning is shared but instruction occurs in separate locations within the classroom; (3) “parallel teaching” where teachers plan instruction jointly but each presents the material to a subset of the group allowing for a smaller teacher-student ratio; (4) “alternative teaching” where one teacher works with a small group and the other instructs a large group; and (5) “team teaching” where each person takes turns, perhaps with one leading the discussion while the other demonstrates a concept (Comton, Stratton, Maier, Meyers, Scott, & Tomlinson, 1998, p. 205). Given the critically reflective and thoroughly collaborative decision making processes of the LCL Project Team, it isn’t at all surprising that the group finally settled on a “team teaching” approach (where one member of each teaching team would be an administrator and the other would be a university faculty member) for the next series of professional development workshops. This consensually developed decision has since received repeated validation in the evaluation forms that were completed at the conclusion of each workshop.

Collaborative Course Development and Co-Teaching

In addition to program planning and development, collaboration and co-teaching also occurred in four of LCL Master’s Program courses. Co-teaching, which can be “one of the most powerful manifestations of professional collaboration” (Pugach & Johnson, 1995, p. 193), occurs when “two or more professionals jointly deliver substantive instruction to a diverse, or blended, group of students in a single space” (Cook & Friend, 1995, p. 1). Increasingly popular at the post-secondary level (Davis-Wiley & Cozart, 1998), co-teaching provides opportunities to implement innovative instructional strategies “utilizing another set of hands and eyes, as well as, lowering the teacher-student ratio (Comton, et al., 1998, p. 205). LCL students in the Capstone

Seminar received just such a benefit because Dr. Jurs and Dr. Read were able to spend more time and give more in-depth feedback by each working with one half of the class. As Dr. Jurs noted:

Each of the three parts to the final paper was submitted to one of the course instructors separately. Each part was reviewed and feedback was provided. This meant that from the twenty-seven students, eighty-one drafts needed to be reviewed and areas for improvement noted. At the close of the semester, the finished paper was again read in its final and complete version. A rubric with four standards was used for the final review. There were three levels of competence for each standard. This process, although time-consuming, provided an on-going dialogue between the student and the instructor that allowed for the development of the reflective habit deemed as critical to the entire capstone process.

Another benefit to co-teaching is that it “increases instructional options for all students by means of bringing the strengths of two teachers with different expertise together” (Comton, et al., 1998, p. 205). By studying with instructors from “very different backgrounds and perspectives” (Davis-Wiley & Cozart, 1998, p. 7), students are able to “better see relationships between theory and practice” (Lenn & Hatch, 1992, p. 10). For Drs. Rice and Danzig, in the course on School, Family, and Community Relationships, interconnections between the world of theory and practice were fostered on a variety of fronts. For example, many of the readings were processed along side of presentations by and panel discussions with professionals from the field (e.g., the Executive Director of the AZ Center for Law and the Public Interest; Coordinator of Public Relations, Alhambra School District). The inclusion of videos, which brought alive the issues as they play out in situations of real practice were also important in the establishment of theory-practice linkages. For instance, “Yellow tale blues” explored the experience of Asians in America with reference to images and stereotypes in popular culture and film. Likewise, the

video recording “The Children’s storefront” described goals and struggles of an independent school in East Harlem. Perhaps the most significant factor in bridging the theory-practice gap, however, was that Drs. Rice and Danzig’s course was delivered by two instructors—a professor from the university and a practicing superintendent from a large urban school district in the area, who brought different perspectives to this rich variety of learning activities.

In addition to students acquiring differing perspectives and content knowledge when a course is co-taught (Davis-Wiley & Cozart, 1998), co-teachers are able to “enhance their teaching ability, receive intellectual stimulation, and enjoy a closeness of connections (Reinhiller, 1996). For example, during the co-teaching experiences in the course on Research and Evaluation in Education, Dr. Spiller described Dr. Glass as “a repository of historical and future trends in education research.” In fact, both Dr. Spiller and Dr. Glass felt that collaborating on redesigning and co-teaching the course had great positive dividends for all involved. For example:

Dr. Spiller enjoyed reviewing and refreshing past learning in research and evaluation. . .

In-class discussions had immediate bearing on district policy and procedures being developed with the implementation of the new law. Dr. Glass [who] received new insight on the effect of NCLB on school administrators [in turn] encouraged the development of skills and knowledge of the technical tools needed to produce program evaluations and data analysis.

In the course on Concepts of Learner-Centered Leadership, collaborative planning and co-teaching on the part of Drs. Boyle and Danzig afforded students the benefit not only of diverse perspectives drawn from the field of practice and the world of theory, but also individualized feedback on student reflective writing. For example, some of the modules Drs. Boyle and Danzig developed directed the students to critically reflect on

course readings (e.g., Michael Fullen, Howard Gardner), important theorists (e.g., Karl Weick, Noam Chomsky), and a variety of leadership functions (e.g., mission and vision setting, developing common purposes, goals, and objectives). The one-on-one opportunity for individualized feedback that these modules provided significantly enhanced the depth and complexity of student learning—particularly since that feedback came from two different perspectives—that of the practitioner and that of the academician. Here are two illustrative examples of this feedback:

I think it is important to distinguish between gaining followers by virtue of an important message and gaining followers by coercion or manipulation. It is clearly easier to gain followers by communicating stories to which others can relate. However, to be *a leader*, one must communicate a story that appeals to the adult in us, a story that moves us beyond our own greed, self-importance, narrow-mindedness, jealousy, selfishness, and manipulative five year-old in us. To lead is to adopt a set of moral principles and practices to which others can understand and voluntarily choose to subscribe. You may gain followers by terrorizing, bribing, or appealing to self-interests. However, Gardner would not call this leadership.

One of the major issues related to the purpose and direction of individuals and groups has to do with the formal and informal organization. Whereas the formal organization is bureaucratic, as represented in the first flowchart you posted in the discussion board, formal relationships and authority don't necessarily explain how mandates or requests from the top of the hierarchy are translated into actual practice. So, to understand how people participate in an organization, one must look at both the formal authority relationships and the informal (and more human) relationships.

Likewise, Drs. Jurs and Read, in the Capstone Seminar, were able to offer students the benefit of their different career paths in the types of examples each used to demonstrate concepts and in level of detail accrued from their different work experiences. In the case of a student whose interim summaries were overly abstract, Dr. Read offered the following diagnosis on Parts I and II:

In both parts, you use considerable space to discuss things at a philosophical and theoretical level (as one would in a “think” piece) and it’s all very interesting. However you include far too little empirical data from the many data collection and analysis tasks we asked you to do. . . . Consequently, parts II and III are not very convincing or compelling, despite the elegance of your writing. Your use of passive and impersonal sentence construction further obscures who you are as the person who: (1) has experienced this journey in leadership development and (2) is authoring what is supposed to be a descriptive analysis of that journey, based on actual data.

In a pre-arranged phone call and several follow-up e-mails, Dr. Read and this student worked to address these concerns. Individualized attention such as this resulted in comprehensive final narratives, which taken as a whole, were of superior quality. Drawing upon a sample of final narratives, which he read and responded to, Dr. Jurs shared the following student reflection:

Trust me; it’s finally coming together for me. Both of you are doing a great job to teach us reflective practice, about action research, transformational leadership, etc. When I started this program, I didn’t even know such concepts existed. What an excellent program of study.

In another section of the same final narrative, the following comment demonstrates this student’s ability to give meaning to a theory discussed in class and the practical application she observed in the field.

Spiritual leadership intrigues me and has become a part of my development as a leader because I am personally aware of what a narcissistic leader can do to followers and the school system. Although I admire the leader for other qualities, I definitely have learned what I don't want to emulate as a leader.

As a result of reflective analyses such as these, Dr. Jurs was able to write the following response:

Your paper is a prime example of what this assignment was designed to accomplish.

You have used multiple text citations. You have used course learnings. You have used interview, survey and questionnaire information. You have referenced the administrative standards and internship experiences. You have incorporated all of this into an excellent paper. Overall, your paper falls into the "Exemplary" category.

The Problems and Possibilities of Co-teaching in Collaborative School-University Partnerships:

Evaluative Conclusions and Recommendations

There are many requirements for and potential obstacles to the development of collaborative partnerships and effective co-teaching experiences, including: establishing relationships, expertise of members, collegiality, and time. Collectively and for the most part, our efforts to integrate theoretical, craft, and personal knowledge in this reconfigured Masters program have been characterized by the establishment of respectful, collegial relationships that draw upon the expertise of each member. For example, Dr. Spiller reported that the course on Research and Evaluation in Education was efficiently and effectively redesigned with a minimum of time because a relationship was already established between the co-instructors. Each member valued each other for their expertise. An established method of communication was already in place. A high level of collegiality was already established.

The one requirement, which has repeatedly proved to be a challenge, is time—in terms of its importance to the process and with respect to its scarcity. For instance, despite appreciating the “opportunity to affect the training of new administrators,” Dr. Spiller admitted it had “entailed a significant commitment of personal time.” As a result, she cautioned:

Time is a component that will have a high impact on reproducibility. University professors have time built into their schedules to plan and teach courses. School district employees must devote time outside of their normal business day to developing course materials, meeting with the co-instructor, and teaching the course. This level of time commitment may eventually cause a great idea to be abandoned.

Time also turned out to be a significant issue for Drs. Jurs and Read in the Capstone Seminar. Much of this was due to the depth of responsibility for reviewing multiple drafts of interim summaries and communicating with and monitoring the progress of each student, which then posed serious challenges to their ability to collaborate on the delivery of important course content regarding the change process. Although the goal of collaboration was met in the area of assessing student papers, it was not successfully met in the delivery of course content. Consequently, Dr. Read—the tenure-track professor—who had previously taught a similar course, took on the responsibility of lesson planning for all class sessions. Furthermore, because the Capstone Seminar was offered as part of an already existing course, it was necessary to blend the reflective practice piece into the existing course elements dealing with evaluating and assessing school change. Consequently, this course naturally contained a significant amount of complex subject material. Because of the aforementioned time constraints and the priority of focusing on moving students forward on the development of their evidence-based comprehensive final narrative, the planned practical elements of the course syllabus were not delivered.

The realization that there would not be enough class time to include case studies of school change created a significantly different role for Dr. Jurs—the clinical professor. When paired with the realization that neither instructor could find the time for a formalized approach to co-planning the weekly lessons, the result was a diminished in-class profile for the clinician and a much lower priority for the discussion of practical applicability of topics covered. Drawing upon the work of Friend, Reising, and Cook (1993), Davis-Wiley and Cozart (1998) confirmed the negative effects of Dr. Jurs' and Dr. Read's experience:

In order for co-teaching to be efficacious, not only must the teachers involved be confident, but they must resolve beforehand to be equals in the classroom; if this does not occur, one of the teachers may take on the role of a paraprofessional, providing for an obvious loss of expertise and knowledge (p. 8).

Student evaluations completed at the end of the course noted the lack of involvement on a weekly basis by the clinical professor and suggested a lost opportunity to gain a practical perspective:

As much experience that Dr. Jurs has, I would like to see him have more of an active role. Readings are good but I feel that as future leaders, we need to hear about more real experiences and how to handle them. For instance, what is the protocol for dealing with a teacher who does not follow policy? What do you do with a teacher who has had good evaluations—a new principal is hired and she does not agree with the past evaluations.

These are issues that we need to know how to solve.

Drs. Jurs and Read evaluated the course as well and agreed that there had been an imbalance that needed to be addressed in subsequent course offerings.

They concluded that, in order to assure the depth of reflection needed to make the capstone experience rigorous and meaningful, it would be necessary to separate it from another

course and offer it as a stand alone offering. Both agreed that change and how it is effectively brought about—the focus of the course in which the first capstone experience was offered—is an appropriate topic for inclusion in such a stand-alone course. Change provides a natural linkage to the goal of developing a habit of critical self-analysis for students of administration, especially those students who are about to complete their graduate program of study.

Drs. Jurs and Read also agreed that the extensive review and feedback requirements of the capstone experience require the continued assignment of two instructors to the course. The final paper is not only a requirement of the capstone experience, it is also the culminating evaluation required for graduation. As such, the paper must be read for its comprehensiveness and depth of understanding, not just as related to the topics of change and personal/professional development, but also for the student's ability to apply the knowledge gained throughout the entire program of study.

The issue of time also surfaced in relationship to the role of formal clinical faculty in facilitating school-university partnerships and the bridging of theory and practice. Reflecting back on his own journey to becoming a clinical faculty member, Dr. Jurs noted that relevancy and currency are concepts that revolve around time:

Among practitioners, experiences gained can quite quickly be viewed as dated. While a scholar can stay current with recent research, trends and innovations, practitioners lose the edge provided by exposure to the daily challenges faced by current administrators. This reality implies a “life expectancy” for practitioners who become university clinicians. The duration of the effective lifespan is difficult to determine and consists of multiple variables such as length of experience, the extent to which attempts are made to remain current with developments, turn-over in administrative positions within area

districts, and the amount of district fieldwork accomplished during the university experience.

Dr. Jurs surmised that the span is no greater than five to ten years after the completion of active service as a school administrator. Beyond this timeframe, the once relevant administrator starts to become irrelevant and dated. He offered, as an example of the rapidity with which datedness can occur is seen, the No Child Left Behind federal legislation.

It is a primary concern of today's school administrators, yet it had barely been signed into law when I left the superintendency in the summer of 2001. While I can keep current with developments associated with NCLB, I cannot speak from experience of the challenges, solutions or problems created by the legislation. If this is true after less than four years, what can be expected after ten years?

This suggests that universities would be well advised to consider these relevancy issues as clinical positions are considered. The presence of clinicians is an important aspect of any meaningful administrator preparation program; however an outdated clinician loses the advantage of currency and could be worse than no clinician at all.

Despite the challenges each of us has individually and collectively faced in our efforts to work collaboratively in the integration of theoretical, practical, and personal knowledge within this reconfigured preparation program, we remain committed to the process. Witnessing the impressive growth of students as they move through their collaboratively developed and co-taught coursework convinces us that we must find ways to sustain our partnering efforts. These observations have been validated in workshop participant feedback questionnaires, through role-alike focus group interviews with district liaisons and with university project team members as well as in survey data collected from students enrolled in the reconfigured Master's program.

For instance, in an LCL survey that was administered to the first LCL cohort, fully 91% of those

who responded either strongly agreed or agreed that the coursework prepared them for their internship experience. Similarly, over 95 % of the respondents strongly agreed or agreed that they were satisfied with the courses that they took as part of the LCL Masters/Certification program. Looking at the other side of the equation, somewhat fewer of the respondents either strongly agreed (50.0%) or agreed (36.4%) that their work in the LCL program was supported in their district. (Power, 2004)

Part of the reason for the slightly lower approval rating regarding the third survey question can be attributed to those students who were primarily classroom teachers and, therefore, unable to do administrative internships, which involved leaving their classrooms for extended periods of time. Not surprisingly—as noted in these comments from a Capstone Seminar Mid-semester Questionnaire, their concern revolves around the issue of time:

As a classroom teacher, I find it difficult to find the time to practice my internship during the regular school day.

What can be very counterproductive is that classroom teachers are not provided enough opportunities to take on leadership responsibilities over the course of the school day.

Most internship hours were spent effecting leadership roles before [and] after [the school day] or during the intercession of the school.

Because the LCL program has experienced the active support of district leadership, which is so essential for collaborative school-university leadership programs (Bruce, 1993), we anticipate efforts to address this issue and the other challenges that have surfaced in this program. Our confidence is derived from the research that has been conducted on effective collaborations “among school district administrators, college professors, practitioners in the field, and potential school administrators” in which team members share a common vision focused on providing “guided theoretical and clinical-based experience in school

administration—all aimed toward improving the quality of education” (Richardson, et al., 1992, p. 3). Unequivocally, this has been the case in this collaborative leadership development program.

Collaborative school-university partnerships, such as the one described in this paper, not only address the pre-service and professional development needs of school districts, they also avail to university faculty members the opportunity to reconnect to the real world of practice and abandon their perceived status as “ivory-tower loner[s]” (Richardson, et al., p. 14). Likewise, co-teaching—a collaborative partnership that occurs at the micro level—affords benefits to students as well.

Many college students attend classes and do not necessarily see the connection between any of their courses. They construct knowledge that is fragmented and atomized. Since their professors may not necessarily make curricular connections for them, they have to make them themselves, and unfortunately, some never do. They continue to attend classes, never seeing the association between the facts and concepts being presented in one class with the knowledge gained from another, seemingly unrelated class (McDaniel & Colarulli, 1997). Co-teaching, especially with collaborating team members from disparate disciplines, can help students bridge this step. (Davis-Wiley & Cozart, 1998, p. 5).

Likewise, co-teaching provides students with more content knowledge as well as an opportunity to observe teachers with different or opposing views and professionals with diverse perspectives (Collins, Hemmeter, Schuster, & Stevens 1996; Presskill, 1995; Reinhiller, 1996; Wheeler & Mallory, 1996). Another benefit accrues when co-teachers meet after each class to discuss, contemplate, and critique their teaching, which can lead to greater reflection on the part of the co-teachers and result in the examination of their assumptions about theory and practice

(Bowles, 1994; Lenn & Hatch, 1992; Morganti & Buckalew, 1991; Winn & Messenheimer-Young, 1995).

As we noted earlier, in order for co-teaching to be a successful, it is important that both teachers make decisions together and share the workload and the responsibility for what happens in the classroom (Adams & Cessna, 1993). Because co-teaching increases the amount of time needed to plan and prepare course experiences (Hatcher, Hinton, & Swartz, 1995), we recommend (1) that school districts find ways of securing release time for participating administrators (e.g., allowing administrative interns to job share) and (2) that universities work to eliminate disincentives for participating faculty members (e.g., increasing the weight of teaching in performance assessments and for merit rewards).

As for ourselves, we'll be working with one another to sustain the momentum that began with our involvement in the Learner-Centered Leadership Grant. Based on much of the information reported in this paper, faculty members in the Educational Administration and Supervision program have received, reviewed and approved a recommendation to make the Capstone Seminar a formal requirement for graduation from the Masters in Educational Administration and Supervision program. It will serve as the replacement for the previously used comprehensive objective examination. Three masters cohort groups, which are currently underway, will be evaluated using the Capstone Seminar as they complete their programs of study over the next fifteen months. From there on out, all future Masters in Educational Administration and Supervision candidates will complete their program of study with the Capstone Seminar serving as their last course.

Faculty members in the Educational Administration program will continue to work collaboratively to further develop the administrative steps needed to implement these recommendations including timeframe issues, revisions to the Graduate Catalog, revisions to the

Department's website, student counseling and the issue surrounding the assignment of two instructors to the course.

We cannot emphasize enough the role the Learner Centered Leadership program played in providing a receptive location in which to pursue new approaches to administrator preparation. The ability to deliver a Capstone Seminar as the last course in the twelve-course program of study served as motivation to experiment with an updated form of student evaluation. This approach emphasized reflection and self-analysis along with the ability to link the theoretical and practical applications of the student's program of study. An updated form of comprehensive evaluation was utilized, one that provides meaningful data about the effectiveness of leadership development as practiced within ASU's Educational Administration and Supervision Program. Importantly, an opportunity for practitioner/academician collaboration was provided throughout the program. Students benefited from this cooperative approach as did the instructors. Field-based instructors were able to access the process used to prepare new administrators. University-based instructors were able to access the second tier consumer of the preparation program, those practicing administrators who ultimately hire the program's graduates. By doing so, they were able to verify that the course content being delivered was appropriate, current and consistent with successful practice.

References

- Adams, L. & Cessna, K. (1993). Metaphors of the co-taught classroom. Preventing School Failure,37(4), 28-31.
- Argyris, C., Putnam, R. & Smith, D. M. (1985). Action science: Concepts, methods, and skills for research and intervention. San Francisco, CA: W. H. Freeman.
- Argyris, C. & Schön, D. A. (1991). Participatory action research and action science compared. (pp. 85-96). In W. F. Whyte (Ed.) Participatory action research. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Bell, E. D. (1996). To create self-renewing schools. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Japan-U.S. Teacher Education Consortium (JUSTEC) (Naruto City, Shikoku, Japan, July 15-18, 1996). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 399 657).
- Bowles, P. D. (1994). The collaboration of two professors from two disparate disciplines: What it has taught us. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Reading Conference (44th), San Diego, CA (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 386 744).
- Bruce, R. E. (1993). Leadership enhancement and development (LEAD): A flourishing product of school and university collaboration. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association in Atlanta, GA, April 12-16, 1993 (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED361883).
- Collins, B. C., Hemmeter, M. L., Schuster, J. W., & Stevens, K. B. (1996). Using team teaching to deliver coursework via distance learning technology. Teacher Education and Special Education,19(1), 49-58.
- Comton, M. V., Stratton, A., Maier, A., Meyers, C., Scott, H., & Tomlinson, T. (1998). It takes two: Co-teaching for deaf and hard of hearing students in rural schools. In Coming

- together: Conference proceedings of the American Council on Rural Special Education, Charleston, SC, March 25-28, 1998 (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 417901).
- Cook, L. & Friend, M. (1996). Co-teaching: Guidelines for creating effective practices. In E. L. Meyen, G. A. Vergason, & R. J. Whelan (Eds.), Strategies for teaching exceptional children in inclusive settings. (pp. 155-182). Denver, CO: Love Publishing Co.
- Davis-Wiley, P. & Cozart, A. C. (1998). Are two instructors better than one? Planning, teaching and evaluating à deux. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association in New Orleans, LA, November 3-6, 1998. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 428038).
- Elden, M. & Levin, M. (1991). Cogenerative learning: Bringing participation into action research. (pp. 127-142). In W. F. Whyte (Ed.) Participatory action research. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Friend, M., Reising, M., & Cook, L. (1993). Co-teaching: An overview of the past, a glimpse at the present, and considerations for the future. Preventing School Failure, 37(4), 6-10.
- Hatcher, T., Hinton, B., & Swartz, J. (1995). Team-teaching in graduate level HRD: Participants' attitudes and perceptions. Academy of Human Resource Development Conference Proceedings. (March, 1995). St. Louis, MO. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 398 357).
- Lather, P. (August, 1986). Research as praxis. Harvard Educational Review, 56(3), 257-274.
- Lenn, E. E., & Hatch, J. A. (1992) Making a kindergarten methods course make more sense: A teacher and professor team up. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Association for the Education of Young Children, New Orleans, LA (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 352 189)

- McDaniel, E. A., & Colarulli, G. C. (1997). Collaborative teaching in the face of productivity concerns: The dispersed team model. Innovative Higher Education,22(1), 19-36.
- Morganti, D. J., & Buckalew, F. C. (1991). BI Vignettes: The benefits of team teaching. Research Strategies,9, 195-197.
- Munby, H. (1995). Gazing in the mirror: Asking questions about validity in self-study research. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA. April 18-22, 1995). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 389 726).
- Noffke, S. E. (1995). Action research and democratic schooling: Problematics and potentials. In S. E. Noffke & R. B. Steven (Eds.) Educational action research: becoming practically critical (pp. 1-12). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Northfield, J. (1996). Quality and the self-study perspective on research. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. (New York, NY. April 8-12, 1996). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 397 034).
- Polkinghorne, D. (1983). Methodology for the human sciences: Systems of inquiry. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Powers, S. (2004). Learner-centered leadership survey. Report produced by Creative Research Associates, Inc.
- Preskill, H. (1995). Using critical incidents in teaching HRD: A method for fostering critical reflection and dialogue. Academy of human resource development. Conference proceedings (March, 1995), St. Louis, MO. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 398 357).
- Pugach, M. & Johnson, L. (1995). Collaborative practitioners, collaborative schools. Denver, CO: Love Publishing Co.

- Reinhiller, N. (1996). Coteaching: New variations on a not-so-new practice. Teacher Education and Special Education,19(1), 34-48.
- Richardson, M. D., Flanigan, J. L., Vaughn, R., McKenzie, M., & Lane, K. E. (1992). ADAM: A collaborative effort to prepare future administrators. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Regional Council on Educational Administration in Atlanta, GA, Nov. 8-10, 1992. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED352711).
- Shapiro, J. P. (1994). Towards the preparation of ethical educational administrators for diverse communities: Exploring "Self," Content and Pedagogy. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration (Philadelphia, PA. October 28-30, 1994) (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 381 876).
- Smyth, J. (1992). Teachers' Work and the Politics of Reflection. American Educational Research Journal,29 (2) 267-300.
- Vaughn, S., Schumm, J. S., & Arguelles, M. E. (1997). The ABCDEs of co-teaching [on-line]. Available: http://www.ldonline.org/ld_indepth/teaching_techniques/tec_coteaching.html.
- Wheeler, E. J., & Mallory, W. D. (April 1996). Team teaching in educational research: One solution to the problem of teaching qualitative research. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, NY.
- Winn, J. A., & Messenheimer-Young, T. (1995). Team teaching at the university level: What we have learned. Teacher Education and Special Education,18, 223-229.
- Zigler, T. A. (1994). A case study evaluation of the reflective process in a preparation program for educational administrators. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-western Educational Research Association. (Chicago, IL. Oct. 12-15, 1994). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 385 005).