Preparing Educational Leaders for Social Justice: Reimagining One Educational Leadership Program from the Ground Up

Holly M. Manaseri
State University of New York at Cortland

Christopher B. Manaseri
State University of New York at Cortland

Preparing Educational Leaders for Social Justice: Reimagining One Educational Leadership Program from the Ground Up

Holly M. Manaseri[i]
State University of New York at Cortland

Christopher B. Manaseri
State University of New York at Cortland

Thirty years after the report that started the latest round of educational reform, A Nation at Risk (National Commission on Education Excellence, 1983), the Wallace Foundation began funding a series of studies examining the preparation of school and district leaders. Bringing together findings from four reports, one each by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), The School Superintendents Association (AASA), the American Institutes for Research (AIR), and the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA), the Wallace Foundation issued five key recommendations for university preparation of school leaders. This call to action was sounded at a time when a shortage of school leaders is both active and continuingly predicted, and in which a seemingly ever-increasing focus on accountability continues to prevail. The attention to quality of the next generation of educational leaders equipped to face challenges of leading schools for the future in the Wallace report includes a focus on a high-quality curriculum emphasizing the skills principals most need, such as the ability to be instructional leaders, and also enables candidates to practice important job skills (Wallace Foundation, 2016).

In New York State, certification requirements for Educational leaders lay out the knowledge and skills deemed essential for emerging leaders to be successful in supporting high achievement by and for all students and in alignment with the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA), which published the Professional Standards for Educational Leaders 2015. These standards were formerly known as the ISLLC standards. The Council of Chief State School Officers published the ISLLC standards for educational leaders in 1996, and revised them in 2008. However, the NPBEA sought to identify the gaps between previous standards, day to day work of educational leaders and the leadership demands of the future (NPBEA, 2015) as evidenced by an increased emphasis on student centered practices. At the time of this writing, a Wallace Foundation funded study of Principal Preparation programming in New York State is currently underway, a study informed in part by participants in and the current coordinator of the program examined herein. While the results of the Wallace Foundation study are not scheduled for presentation to the state's chief policy-making body for education, the Board of Regents, until summer 2017, it is routinely anticipated that they will highlight the need for educational leaders to be prepared to address issues of diversity, social justice and advocacy at multiple levels reflecting a student body comprised of increased racial, socio-economic, and gender as well as gender-identity, difference.

---

[i] **Holly M. Manaseri** may be contacted at *holly.manaseri@cortland.edu.*

In 2016 we began our work as new faculty in an educational leadership program that had been recently reorganized from a stand-alone two-FTE department to a program housed within the Department of Foundations and Social Advocacy, one of three departments within a School of Education at the SUNY college that produces the largest number of teacher candidates of any comprehensive college within the 64-campus SUNY system. As part of a self-study of the program upon our entry we sought to address the following research questions:

- RQ1: Does the existing curriculum (formal and informal, described and as taught) prepare future administrators for foundational advocacy and social justice work?
- RQ2: How can a social advocacy/social justice framework serve as a guide for developing a program preparing leaders to excel in administration of socially just schools?

The primary purpose of this paper is to share our efforts in educational leadership preparation change in terms of a foundations and social advocacy framework and its importance for both research and practice. In particular, we focus on the leadership preparation program of one upstate New York college that has recently reorganized from a stand-alone department into the Foundations and Social Advocacy department and work to thus reimagine the curriculum, pedagogy, and assessment practices to align with a social justice framework to ensure that graduates of the program see themselves as agents of change and disruption in the fundamental social replication structure of public schools. The lessons learned from this case study can provide insight to other educational leader preparation programs in New York, and across the nation, who seek to deeply examine their programs to ensure emphasis on the knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to prepare the next generation of leaders as advocates for all students and families.

Theoretical Framework

Why social advocacy and social justice? As part of the reorganization of the Educational Leadership program from a stand-alone department into the Foundations and Social Advocacy (FSA) department at our institution, the FSA department revisited its mission, vision, and core values statements. The stated mission is one that is deeply embedded with a charge of preparing educators, and now educational leaders, to promote a reflective, critical, interdisciplinary approach to understanding the multiple and shifting contexts and practices of education (FSA, 2017). Situating ourselves as instructors within this department, we found it appropriate and necessary to review the literature on social justice in order to actualize this stated mission. Gewirtz (1998) provides a definition of social justice centered on the ideas of disrupting and subverting arrangements that promote marginalization and exclusionary processes. Social justice supports a process built on respect, care, recognition, and empathy. Goldfarb and Grinberg (2002) define social justice "as the exercise of altering [these] institutional and organizational arrangements by actively engaging in reclaiming, appropriating, sustaining, and advancing inherent human rights of equity, equality, and fairness in social, economic, educational, and personal dimensions" (p. 162). The preparation of teachers for linguistically and culturally diverse populations has been the subject of a growing body of research and discussion over the last two decades (Brisk, 2008; Cochran-Smith, Fieman-Nemser, McIntyre, & Demers, 2008). In

addition, there is an emerging body of theoretical work in the area of social justice and educational leadership (Blackmore, 2002; Bogotch, 2002; Dantley, 2002; Furman & Gruenewald, 2004; Larson & Murtadha, 2002; MacKinnon, 2000; Marshall & Ward, 2004; Rapp, 2002; Shields, 2004). We note that some educational leadership preparation programs have evolved to better address issues of social justice (Blackmore, 2009; Jean-Marie, Normore & Brooks, 2009; McKenzie et al., 2008), but the educational leadership literature is still insufficient when it comes to providing concrete examples programs can implement into their curricula (Diem & Carpenter, 2012).

Recent literature has laid the groundwork for a theoretical change required of school leadership, yet little has so far been published that promotes common practice in this regard. (Theoharis, 2016). In 2010 Hawley and James, in their survey of 62 institutions affiliated with the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA), found that educational leadership programs frequently failed to address a number of the micro-political diversity issues school leaders face on a daily basis. Thus, the offering of a curriculum failing to address how leaders should navigate "day-to-day" issues pertaining to diversity leaves future leaders without the strategies necessary to lead within the current context of increasingly diverse schools (Hawley & James, 2010). Capper, Theoharis, and Sebastian (2006) reviewed 72 pieces of literature related to administrator preparation and social justice and proposed a framework based on their review of the literature that would place programs in categorical compliance with a foundations framework involving a nine-box chart with vertical indices for Curriculum, Pedagogy, and Assessment intersecting horizontal indices of Disposition (or as they term it Critical Consciousness), Knowledge, and Skill. We find the intersection of these indices helpful in categorizing the relative maturity and depth of our approach to considering the changes in our program completed already as well as those contemplated for the near future, and use this schema to depict which of our existing courses falls where in their design.

Our underlying question in modifying the taught curriculum to reflect the mission, vision and values of the Foundations and Social Advocacy department became how we might bring to the classroom issues of poverty, equity of access, and contemporary diversity of race, class, gender, (dis)ability, and other areas of marginality that intersect the relatively traditional "school management" model of educational leadership preparation and replication of hierarchical power structures. In order to accomplish this task, we set about a year-long effort to acquaint ourselves with the educational leadership program as it existed in print and in principle, in policy and in practice. Concurrently, we worked with other faculty in the Foundations and Social Advocacy department who were responsible for courses in Foundations of Education, Urban Education and Inclusive Education, the majority of which coursework consisted of undergraduate teacher preparation classes for dual certification in elementary and inclusive special education. With that faculty we reshaped the department's Mission, Vision and Values statements to include recognition of teacher leadership and administrative preparation, while also conducting both a self-study of the existing Educational Leadership program and a cross-campuses comparative study of similar SUNY CAS programs in Educational Leadership with whom we might compete for students. The focus of this article is on the immediate implementation of change within the existing coursework required of graduate students seeking their Certificate of Advanced Study, such that Foundational and Social Advocacy/Social Justice issues were as expeditiously added to the taught curriculum as possible, essentially changing course orientation within the boundaries

of academic freedom and text and topic choice, while leaving the fundamental elements of course title, number and outline sufficiently unchanged so as to avoid lengthy and protracted processes required for institutionalizing, formally approving, and codifying such changes. We acknowledge that we bring a particular lens to this study, situating our work within a critical theory framework. We both hold degrees in Cultural Foundations of Education and were heavily influenced in qualitative methodology in order to examine underlying power (Biklen & Bogdan, 1998). That orientation pervaded our view of educational leadership practice while we were administrators of public schools, and continues to influence our interest in social justice and advocacy work in educational systems in order to better understand the ways in which existing power relationships are maintained or disrupted, made hierarchical or more democratic, and in which leadership is exercised as power and authority, advancing agency and change.

Methods

Structured interviews were conducted with current program faculty (both of whom were slated to leave teaching in the program at the end of 2017 summer session) to generate curriculum maps across four quadrants: course topics, assessments, key readings and course objectives. Data collection, coding, and analysis took place between December 2016 - March 2017.
An analysis of course descriptions available in the university course catalogue and most recent course syllabi for each course was completed. Of the ten required courses in the school building and school district leadership program, only nine had a written course syllabi and were included in this study. Syllabi course description, objectives and essential questions, as well as course outlines that enumerated specific topics for each week, class, or unit were analyzed. In addition, a review of the key assessments outlined as part of the required assessment reports were reviewed, as well as curriculum maps that were generated during a half-day program review meeting conducted in November, 2016.

Analysis

This study is situated within critical theory (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998; Carspecken, 1996; Roman & Apple, 1990) recognizing that this work is complex, influenced by power relations, and not necessarily empirically knowable. Specifically, Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) aims to investigate critically social inequality as it is expressed, constituted, legitimized, and so on, by language use, or in discourse (Weiss & Wodak, 2003). This is most appropriate to our study in examining how discursive practices work to produce and reproduce unequal power relations. Drawing upon John Dewey's work on continuity and interaction (1938), we wanted to look deeply at the experiences provided to candidates in our educational leadership programs and how these do or do not provide opportunities for engagement in issues of social justice.

Using discourse analysis, we examined curriculum maps, course outlines, course syllabi, and key program assessments for congruence as well as evidence of social justice alignment based on the framework of Capper, Theorharis and Sebastian (2006) who advocate that to prepare leaders for social justice, educational leadership programs must attend to critical consciousness, knowledge, and practical skills focused on social justice with their students. In addition, they contend that preparation programs create the conditions for future educational leaders to take risks safely. Highly effective programs attend to these key attributes for social justice preparation throughout

their curriculum, pedagogy and assessments. Using their framework which defines horizontal dimensions that depict what school leaders must know, value and be able to enact to lead socially just schools, they identify these attributes as critical consciousness, knowledge and skills. Vertical dimensions of the framework include the key components of a preparation program necessary to "intentionally consider if students are to learn about critical consciousness, knowledge and skills" (p. 213). These components are curriculum, pedagogy and assessment. We applied this framework to our analysis of current existing course descriptions of the nine courses that qualified for the study found in the university course catalogue for the 2016-17 academic year and the actual taught course syllabi for the 2016 -2017 academic year, our first at the institution.

Coding

The various course weeks of instruction were coded according to the following key questions proposed in the Capper, Theoharis and Sebastian framework:

Level 1: Curriculum related to critical consciousness, knowledge and skills.
To what extent is the course addressing critical consciousness, knowledge about equity issues, and skill development for social justice?

Level 2: Pedagogy related to critical consciousness, knowledge and *skills for social justice.*
What methods are being used to raise consciousness, knowledge or skill development?

Level 3: Assessment. *How are we measuring the critical consciousness, knowledge and skills to show we are impacting consciousness, knowledge and skills of students toward socially just ends?*

We gauged the emphasis of each lesson and coded each into one of the areas of their social justice framework. Within each area, we then coded the various lessons based on their primary focus. This two-step approach allowed us to provide a broad take on the curricular landscape and to explore particular topics in some detail. We used the constant comparative method of data analysis (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998; Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss & Corbin, 1998) using both inductive and deductive components (Erickson, 1986; Graue & Walsh, 1998; Strauss & Corbin, 1998). The constant comparative method was utilized for this research endeavor because the design contained "multi-data sources" (Bogdan & Biklen, p. 66). This method worked well with the guiding research questions in that "key issues, recurrent events, or activities in the data that become categories of focus . . . discover[ing] basic processes and relationships" (Bogdan & Biklen, p. 67). The process of constant "doubling back to more data collection and coding" provided an essential analytical approach to understanding the data from school leaders working for social justice.

Table 1 illustrates the curriculum gap analysis where course descriptions were identified as having high, moderate or weak alignment to a social justice framework and defines the taught curriculum through changes in texts or emphasis that allowed for increased involvement of issues of social advocacy and justice.

Table 1. Curriculum Gap Analysis

Course	Course Catalogue Description/Prescribed Curriculum	Modified Curriculum/Syllabus	Degree of Social Justice/Advocacy Alignment
EDL 613 Principles of Financial Leadership	The role of financial management at the building level, the management of budgets, managing building and student accounts, working with the business office and officials, the diversity of roles and responsibilities, and the legal and ethical ramifications related to financial management at the school level.	Added emphasis on inequitable state funding for local schools/CFE-AQE lawsuit, including information on distribution of state aid to schools of residence and work for each enrollee Added readings on role of federal dollars as lever for social change (ESEA and title I, NCLB, ESSA)	Moderate
EDL 615 Educational Leadership & the Law	(B) The legal, political and ethical issues faced by the school leader and a basic understanding of parent and student rights, personnel issues, contract negotiations and management, and other legal and education regulations that affect the school leader.		Moderate
EDL 616 Principles of Curriculum Leadership	(B) An understanding of curriculum, instruction, assessment and the curriculum improvement process, addressing curriculum development and models and strategies for supervision of curriculum.	Added UDL unit and text to address access and success of all students including marginalized populations (ELL, SPED, etc.) *Program Assessment on Comprehensive Curriculum Planning	Moderate
EDL 657 Principles of Organizational Leadership	Explores the roles, responsibilities and skills of the strategic, instructional and political leader within the organization, addressing organizational development, systems thinking, complexity theory, cultural diversity and the change process.	Removed "cultural diversity" from current syllabus of course description.	Weak
EDL 683 Principles of Special Programs Leadership	(B) The principles, laws, mandates and procedures required to manage and provide leadership for special programs such as pupil personnel, special education, social services and supplementary funding programs	Added "Equity Audit" assignment analyzing data on student achievement/achievement gaps using DTSDE protocols Focus on school/district responsibilities to ensure access to high quality academic and positive school climate through Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) Focus on parent engagement	Moderate

Table 1 (Continued)

Course	Course Catalogue Description/Prescribed Curriculum	Modified Curriculum/Syllabus	Degree of Social Justice/Advocacy Alignment
EDL 678 Strategic Supervision & Leadership	(B) An in-depth understanding of supervision of instructional and non-instructional staff and student management techniques through the exploration of theories of motivation, legal ramifications and models of supervision.	Added TESA (Teacher Expectations and Student Achievement) as a means of addressing concerns for equitable response opportunity, feedback and personal regard for ALL students Added texts to promote teacher professional conversations and teacher advocacy for imbedded PD on effective practices for all students Added analysis of research article on Teacher Effectiveness from MET Project funded by Gates Foundation Added Restorative Justice and PBIS to student supervision content	Moderate
EDL 680 Principal Leadership	The role of the principal, the change process, student guidance and management, legal aspects, curriculum supervision and models of decision-making and shared leadership	Added focus on Effective Schools Elements (Lazotte) Added focus on Data-Driven Decisions impacting student subgroups on state testing Added texts related to both data driven decision-making and to Effective Schools Model	Moderate
EDL 690 Principles of School District Leadership	A focus on district leadership as it relates to organizational and team development, strategic planning, district-wide financial management, working with policy and decision-making bodies, and legal, political and ethical issues. Prerequisite: Matriculation in the program. Completion of at least nine credit hours in the program.		Weak
EDL 699 Culminating Seminar	A culminating course providing a comprehensive assessment of students' leadership and administrative understanding, skills and dispositions. It is recommended that candidates take this course while they are enrolled in the administrative internship.		Weak

Findings

Emerging themes from analysis indicate three distinct findings, as areas where the formal curriculum had either a high degree of alignment, moderate alignment or weak alignment to advancing social justice and equity. There were areas where minor changes to the course readings and syllabus were able to insert themes of social advocacy/social justice with relative ease. And finally there were areas where within the timeframe of a single academic year, we were as yet unable to make substantive changes to specific courses, or courses for which no substantive change may be appropriate or necessary.

High degree of Alignment. Course descriptions and the most recent syllabus for each course indicating a high degree of alignment to social justice and equity objectives occurred in exactly zero out of nine opportunities. There were no courses in which we were able to ascertain as yet a high degree of alignment to social justice and equity objectives, in large part because we have /not yet attempted to modify the catalogue course descriptions, despite having made meaningful changes to the classroom, textbook and assessment requirements for several of the courses in question. Our focus in the first year has been on making substantive change to classroom practice (pedagogy) and readings (curriculum), and less so on making published changes to the course descriptions. This may be seen as expeditious only, or as partially subversive and "feminist" in our approach to making change within the formal hierarchical structures of the university processes. Either way, we make these changes unapologetically for what we perceive to be the immediate benefit of our current students, many of whom will complete the program and begin practice before the time necessary to accomplish catalogue changes approved by multiple parties at increasingly hierarchical and formal levels of review.

Moderate degree of alignment. Six out of nine courses indicated moderate degrees of alignment, using most recently redesigned syllabi, five more than would have otherwise been the case in the program. Two of the course syllabi showing moderate degree of alignment had recently been modified in the fall of 2016. The first course, ED 613 Principles of School Finance, was modified from previous offerings to be taught by a full-time faculty member rather than an adjunct faculty member who had been a school business official, and shifting the emphasis of the course from an overview of typical school business management administrative functions to issues which all school and district leaders ought to be able to address or advocate for from their positions of relative power. These issues involve inequitable distribution of resources, inequitable expenditures per pupil in urban and rural versus suburban settings, recent state lawsuits over adequacy of state school funding formula, awareness of social and fiscal inequities tied to urban and rural school environments and racial segregation, costs for special education programming and "victim"-blaming, and the changing economic and political environment and its effect on public schools including shifting costs to localities and then limiting their ability to address student needs through tax caps and similar structures designed to curb overall spending at the expense of shifting student needs (high poverty, high mobility, higher incidence of ELL and special education placements). The second course, EDL 683: Special Programs Administration, likewise showed what we term a moderate degree of alignment in the most recent syllabus, but was mismatched to the course description, which had weak alignment. This shift from weak to moderate was made by including field-based activities allowing candidates to analyze policy documents in their districts and reflect on equity issues

that may be presented in these policy and procedures. Students also use data to identify achievement gaps and make recommendations to address those gaps using the New York State Diagnostic Tool for School and District Effectiveness protocol to conduct a program audit of their school based on attributes of effectiveness in order to identify robust measures for school improvement. Students also review the Blueprint for Special Education Reform and Results Driven Accountability materials and reflect on the current practices in their own district to support students with disabilities in the general education setting with access to high quality instruction.

Two additional courses, one taught in spring and the second in summer session one, will have moved from Weak to Moderate. The first course, EDL 616: Curriculum, was taught in spring 2017 by a new full-time faculty member with a background in Social Foundations of Education, and was modified to include a digital text and major unit of study related to Universal Design for Learning, a major shift to accommodate in preplanning the potential needs of all students including traditionally marginalized groups, and to require all students to consider an Equity Audit for curricular design and delivery. The second course, the EDL 680: Principal Leadership, also includes the utilization of a full-time faculty member with a background in Cultural Foundations of Education and will in its current iteration offer both Essential Elements of Effective Schools material associated with Larry Lazotte, and data-based decision making based on statewide student examination scores, both at the elementary and secondary levels. These data analyses and response strategies complement the Regents Reform Agenda, the use of specific interventions to address specific population needs, RtI and AIS planning, and the use of technology and data mining both identify and to close achievement gaps for specific populations of students. The sixth course in this category, EDL 615 School Law, did not have a redesigned syllabus but was assessed at the moderate level in our analysis as the alignment to knowledge, skills and dispositions stress the rights of students and teachers and their constitutional guarantees.

Weak degree of Alignment. A surprising finding from our research shows a mismatch between the stated course description, which would have had a moderate degree of alignment, and the most recent syllabus for one course in particular. ED 657: Organizational Change has a stated course description that indicated a high degree of alignment to intended social justice and equity, however in the most recent version of the syllabus the reference to cultural diversity was removed. The other two remaining courses had none of the indicators of the social justice framework represented in the critical consciousness, knowledge or skills or of the written curriculum, pedagogy or program assessments as they exist currently.

Discussion

Beginning with a review of the formal written curriculum in educational programs to assess the degree to which the course descriptions and syllabi align with a social advocacy/justice framework provides an opportunity for critical reflection on the values of the program. Our findings indicate what is widely noted in the literature, that educational leadership preparation often lacks attendance to social justice issues. In fact, our review indicates that if no such alignment in the course description, course objectives or key assessments exists, it is very unlikely that any attention will be paid to social justice issues in the class content and course

delivery. In the case for five of the six courses that did indicate a most recently determined moderate degree of alignment, each course had intentional reference to social justice and equity; therefore, the instructors indicate that they intentionally enacted a social justice framework through their pedagogy and course assignments such as student written reflections, added or modified textbook selections, and in individual and group projects required. However, key assessments at the program level also need to be developed as performance tasks to indicate any evidence of impact such attention to social justice may have on the candidates themselves and on the program as it continues. Our intention is to continue first to infuse a social advocacy and justice framework within the extant courses, while we simultaneously work to modify the course descriptions if not the actual course offerings themselves, toward a greater recognition of the role of the school leader as an advocate for change within the school environment as opposed to an unenlightened, or, worse yet, acknowledged, perpetuator of inequitable policies and practices. Our research also allowed us to place each of the courses within Capper et al.'s framework as noted below:

Table 2. Course alignment to Capper, et al. Social Justice framework

Domain	Critical Consciousness/ Disposition		Knowledge		Skills	
Curriculum	N= 6		N=6		N=2	
	613 (M)	657 (W)	613 (M)	657 (W)	615 (M)	
	615 (M)	678 (M)	615 (M)	678 (M)	616 (M)	
	616 (M)	683 (M)	616 (M)	683 (M)		
Pedagogy	N=5		N=6		N=7	
	613 (M)	678 (M)	613 (M)	657 (W)	613 (M)	680 (W)
	615 (M)	683 (M)	615 (M)	678 (M)	615 (M)	678 (M)
	616 (M)		616 (M)	683 (M)	616 (M)	683 (M)
						690 (W)
Assessment	N=3		N=3		N=0	
	613 (M)		613 (M)			
	615 (M)		615 (M)			
	616 (M)		616 (M)			

The data charted here indicate that there is a greater degree of alignment of pedagogical practices within each of our existing courses than there is an alignment of either published curriculum or program assessment in practice. This corroborates our stated approach to utilizing a social justice lens or framework in which to make assignments of critical readings and in which to add topics of discussion to the course syllabus without significantly altering the published course descriptions. Note the significant number of courses in each of the top two boxes in the chart, depicting degree of alignment and number of courses in alignment with curriculum and pedagogy compared to critical consciousness (Dispositional Awareness) and Knowledge. The area in which there is the greatest degree of alignment is Pedagogy, that area wherein the instructor has the greatest degree in shaping the experiences that may or may not align to advocacy and social justice framework. Specific skills and assessments of those skills trail in development at this point. Great alignment should be anticipated moving forward once we concentrate on making curriculum reviewed changes to the course descriptions. Our college uses

Curriculog, a technology tool for tracking the approval process for such changes and a calendar of approvals from program faculty and departmental curriculum committee, departmental faculty through department chair, dean, School of Education curriculum committee, then Faculty Senate and Provost.   Those formal process for change will come after informal processes are exhausted and our internal and external studies of comparable programs are complete.   The need to pursue social justice issues in the preparation of school administrators, however, cannot wait for the fine-grinding but slow turning wheel of formal academic processes. The mission is too critical, the need for advocates for change as opposed to defenders of status quo too immediate.

Our findings also point to the need for a consistent curriculum review process to be in place in educational leadership programs to ensure that stated course descriptions are in fact translated into the taught course syllabi and student learning outcomes that promote a social justice agenda. The findings from this study show misalignment in some instances between the course description and the syllabus where attention to issues such as "cultural factors" were eliminated from the taught curriculum, though remaining in the published course description in the catalogue.

In addition, this study illustrates the importance of congruence between all factors in preparation programs, such as: the placement of the program into a department whose stated mission, vision and values align to the social justice framework; the alignment, creation or modification of course syllabi; planned and practiced pedagogy and assessment to reflect those values; and the attributes, preparation, and skill set of the instructors to create the conditions to bridge theory into practice in order to attend to macro and micro social justice issues so that graduates may be best prepared to address day to day challenges they will face in the increasingly diverse and demanding milieu of the public school environment in states like California and across the United States.

Conclusion

Academic freedom is a hallmark of the American university, and respect for the ability of faculty to determine the most effective means of achieving stated student learning outcomes is fundamental to best practice in any classroom at any level. By making changes to selected texts and other classroom materials, making consistent pedagogical practices that promote students relating their lived experiences in school settings to best administrative practices in professional development, using data analysis and gap-closing, and offering opportunities for reflection on . one's own role in the replication or disruption of practices of power distribution, as well as embedding themes of social advocacy, social justice, and acknowledged privilege and inequity through existing course requirements, we believe that we have brought about a far greater degree of alignment to, and integrity within, the Educational Leadership program and the Foundations and Social Advocacy Department. We believe that Educational Leadership preparation that promotes Foundations approaches that inherently challenge such assumptions and promote the disruption of traditional repressive and antidemocratic principles is critical in the preparation of leaders to meet the needs of schools and society today.   By changing personnel and by deliberately seeking individuals to teach that bring with them backgrounds in Foundations and similarly critical approaches to the examination of professional educational practices, and by empowering those individuals with the charge to alter the design and delivery of coursework that

has been very traditional and "practical" in its approach, our Educational Leadership program has taken, we believe appropriately, the initial steps toward becoming one that is increasingly responsive to the needs of all students its administrative graduates are hired to address. This shift of mindset, of perspective, of nuanced appreciation for the complexities of the needs of children and young adults in an increasingly diverse and too-often polarized society largely served by public schools in which the students of this program, all aspiring administrators, is one that reflects the values, the vision, and the mission of the Foundations and Social Advocacy program in which it is now much more appreciatively housed.

Lingering questions to still be addressed in future study may include: In what ways might situating an educational leadership program within a Foundations and Social Advocacy department facilitate alignment between teacher preparation, teacher leader preparation, and educational leadership preparation with social justice frameworks?

Our work continues to evolve in making Education Leadership a program of study that is intentionally self-reflective and critical of the status quo of schooling in America, one that is responsive to current and emerging student and parent needs, and one that recognizes the importance of treating all members of the paid educational community as professionals with purposes larger than the three Rs. Respect for individual and cultural difference, relevance of curriculum to students' lived experience, rigor of formal academic endeavor, and relationships that require democratic distribution of both resources and power are all elements of a Foundational approach to education that can and should be fundamental to schooling in an educated society in the 21st century. That the preparation of leaders for such schools should be part and parcel of a sound Educational Leadership program should be equally based on fundamental Foundational approaches to this purpose is only natural.

References

Blackmore, J. (2002). Leadership for socially just schooling: More substance and less style in high risk, low trust times? *Journal of School Leadership, 12*, 198-222.

Bogdan, R.C. & Biklen, S. (1998), *Qualitative Research for Education: An Introduction to Theory and Methods*, Needham Heights, MA., Allyn and Bacon.

Bogotch, I. (2002). Educational leadership and social justice: Practice into theory. *Journal of School Leadership, 12*, 138-156.

Blackmore, J. (2009). Leadership for social justice: A transnational dialogue. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education, 4*(1), 1–10.

Brisk, M. E. (Ed.). (2008). *Language, culture, and community in teacher education*. New York, NY: Erlbaum.

Capper, C. , Theoharis, G., & Sebastian, J. (2006). Toward a framework for preparing leaders for social justice. *Journal of Educational Administration. Vol. 44, No. 3*, 209-224.

Carspecken, P. F. (1996). *Critical ethnography in educational research: A theoretical and practical guide*. London: Routledge.

Cochran-Smith, M., Fieman-Nemser, S., McIntyre, D. J., & Demers, K. E. (Eds.). (2008). *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring questions in changing contexts* (3rd Ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Dantley, M. (2002), Uprooting and replacing positivism, the melting pot, multiculturalism, and other impotent notions in education leadership through an African American perspective, *Education and Urban Society, Vol. 34 No. 3,* 334-52.

Diem, S., & Carpenter, B. (2012). Social Justice and Leadership Preparation: Developing a Transformative Curriculum. *Planning and Changing, Vol.43, No. ½,* 96-112.

Erickson, F. (1985). *Qualitative methods in research on teaching* (Occasional Paper No. 81). East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University, Institute for Research on Teaching.

Furman, G. C., & Gruenewald, D. A. (2004). Expanding the landscape of social justice: A critical ecological analysis. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 40,* 49-78.

Gewirtz, S. (1998). Conceptualizing social justice in education: mapping the territory, *Journal of Education Policy, 13(4),* 469-84.

Glaser, G.B. & Strauss, A.L. (1967), *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research,* Chicago, IL., Aldine Publishing.

Goldfarb, K. P., & Grinberg, J. (2002). Leadership for social justice: Authentic participation in the case of a community center in Caracas, Venezuela. *Journal of School Leadership, 12,* 157-173.

Graue, M. E., & Walsh, D. J. (1998). *Studying children in context: Theories, methods & ethics.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hawley, W., & James, R. (2010). Diversity-responsive school leadership. *UCEA Review, 52*(3), 1–5.

Hill, D. & Kumar, R. (2009). Neoliberalism and its impacts. In Hill, D. and Kumar, R. (eds), *Global neoliberalism and education and its consequences.* New York, Routledge.

Jean-Marie, G., Normore, A., & Brooks, J. S. (2009). Leadership for social justice: Preparing 21st century school leaders for a new social order. *Journal of Research on Leadership in Education, 4*(1), 1–31.

Larson, C. & Murtadha, K. (2002). "Leadership for social justice", in Murphy, J. (Ed.), *The Educational Leadership Challenge: Redefining Leadership for the 21st Century,* Chicago, IL., University of Chicago Press.

McKenzie, K., Christman, D., Hernandez, F., Fierro, E., Capper, C., Dantley, M., & Scheurich, J. (2008). Educating Leaders for social justice: A design for a comprehensive, social justice leadership preparation program. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 44*(1), 111–138.

MacKinnon, D. (2000). Equity, leadership, and schooling. *Exceptionality Education Canada, Vol. 10 Nos 1-2,* 5-21.

Marshall, C., & Ward, M. (2004). "Yes, but . . .": Education leaders discuss social justice. *Journal of School Leadership, 14,* 530-563.

Professional Standards for Educational Leaders 2015. Reston, VA, National Policy Board for Educational Administration.

Rapp, D. (2002). Social justice and the importance of rebellious imaginations. *Journal of School Leadership, Vol. 12 No. 3,* 226-45.

Roman, L., & Apple, M. (1990). Is naturalism a move away from positivism? Materialist and feminist approaches to subjectivity in ethnographic research. In E. Eisner & A. Peshkins (Eds.), *Qualitative inquiry in education: The continuing debate* (pp. 38-73). New York: Teachers College Press.

Shields, C.M., Larocque, L.J. & Oberg, S.L. (2002). A dialogue about race and ethnicity in education: struggling to understand issues in cross-cultural leadership. *Journal of School Leadership, Vol. 12 No. 2*, 116-137.

Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. M. (1998). Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and theories for developing grounded theory (2nd ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Theoharis, G. (2007). Social Justice Educational Leaders and Resistance: Toward a Theory of Social Justice Leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly, Vol. 43, No. 2*, 221-258.

Theoharis, G. (2009). The School Leaders Our Children Deserve: Seven Keys to Equity, Social Justice and School Reform, New York: Teachers College Press.

United States. National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983). *A Nation at Risk: the imperative for educational reform: a report to the Nation and the Secretary of Education*, Washington, D.C., United States Department of Education.

Wallace Foundation (2016). Improving University Principal Preparation Programs: Five Themes From the Field. Retrieved from http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/Pages/Improving-University-Principal-Preparation-Programs.aspx.