

**DRAMA IN EDUCATION ADMINISTRATION:
A FARCE OR A MORALITY PLAY?**

**Charles Achilles
Eastern Michigan University
Seton Hall University**

An advantage of growing old in one field of endeavor is that the view for a critique of that field is consistently through the same filters. Sameness injects its own potential for bias: Ergo, caveat emptor. These observations derive from 48 years of work in education, including about 46 in formal education. Since 1967 I have taught Education Administration (Ed Ad). Like Robert Frost, I've had a continuing "lover's quarrel" with the field. This discussion extends that quarrel.

Part 1 presents critical historical features that have shaped the preparation arm for Ed Ad for good or for ill, and some interpretation of how this has played out. *Part 1* summarizes criticisms of Ed Ad and Ed Ad preparation programs, *empirical evidence* of issues, and critiques by commissions such as the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (NCEEAA), or the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA). *Part 2* presents current features/events shaping the survival (or demise) of Ed Ad and normative or "should" statements that include suggestions or examples for getting started. *Part 2* is brief. Recommendations require the best thinking and serious work of the field itself. The ideas are a framework to get started. Data-based support and interpretations are interspersed. Little here is new. I have liberally expressed these concerns since about 1985.

At the 2003 National Council of Professors of Educational Administration (NCPEA) Conference, Creighton (2003; 2004) urged that "It's Time to Take Back Our Profession." For sure! But, is there anything to take back? Some claim that education is a profession, but by 2005 do education and Ed Ad meet minimum criteria for "Profession?" A profession has certain minimum required elements (see Table 1; Achilles, 1999a, p. 133). Perhaps the most important criterion is that a field needs a dynamic, structured knowledge base (KB). Alas, by 2005 this is still a key issue.

The Basic Position

The morass that entraps Ed Ad and Ed Ad preparation in 2005 began with the development of and adherence to a Social Science Movement perhaps driven by (a) uncertainty about and organization of the field's KB, (b) weak research, (c) poor application of the best research available, and (d) other reasons. By following the Social Science path, professors fragmented Ed Ad into disciplines, bolstered by what they perceived as *research* in Ed Ad leading

directly to problems such as these listed below (the list is not exhaustive):

The Ed Ad Preparation Problems (Denial is a Disease)

- The list of criticisms is extensive. I start with Culbertson et al., (1969) and touch upon Levine (2005). All sources make essentially the same points—the perpetual inaction is damaging to Ed Ad credibility.

The Knowledge Base Issue (Defining a Problem)

- Ed Ad has no knowledge base of its own (an obvious problem for professing)
- A lack of knowledge about and attention to education (Ed) as a field (profession) deprives Ed Ad Professors of a research focus.

Ed Ad Research Deficits (The Necessity of Critique)

- Weak, unfocused research characterizes Ed Ad (Topics, Designs, Methods).
- Much Ed Ad research has been driven primarily by an urge for status in Academe rather than by education (Ed Ad problems and ideas).

A Profession is not Disparate Disciplines

- Fragmentation of education into pseudo-disciplines leads Ed Ad professors to try to emulate discipline-oriented research, not professional research.
- Fragmentation has led to diverse “alphabet soup” organizations attempting to represent Ed Ad (NCPEA, UCEA, AASA, NASSP, NAESP, AERA’s Division A Who speaks for Ed Ad and children?

Ed Ad Preparation Problems (A Continuing Drama Starts Here!)

Haller, Brent, and McNamara (1997) argued that advanced graduate preparation in Ed Ad has little evidence of improving America’s schools, at least on the “effective schools” correlates. Schooling *should* influence student achievement and development, and Ed Ad should influence schooling outcomes. *Unfortunately, research to date has failed to make this connection* (Boyan, 1981; Bridges, 1982; Erickson, 1979; Glasman & Glasman, 1997; Haller, 1979; Haller & Knapp, 1985; Hallinger & Heck, 1996; Witziers et al., 2003). Weak research, text inadequacy, and unfocused Ed Ad preparation, as shown by knowledge base debates and the tire-spinning search for standards, support Haller et al. (1997).

Where do new and practicing Ed Ad persons learn (a) the research-driven steps of *what to do* to improve student outcomes and (b) the leadership elements of *how* to judge and use these research results? If such information and skills are not part of the KB taught to practitioners, is it surprising that practitioners decry university-based preparation (e.g., Brown, Marcus, & Lucas,

1988; Levine, 2005; Pitner, 1988) and that Ed Ad isn't influential in school improvement?

Table 1. *Characteristics that define "profession" and serve as a base for decisions about competence in the practice of the profession.* (Achilles, 1999a, p. 133; 2004a, p. 22).

At A Minimum A Profession Has Certain Required Elements:

- A body of knowledge (Knowledge Base or KB) that the professional uses to address client (people) problems. This KB constitutes a field's Basic Skills and information.
- A method of inquiry or way to advance, assess, and access the KB and its applications. (Use of the KB is not predictable or immutable).
- Standards of conduct and application (Code of Ethics), e.g., Oath of Hippocrates. "Primum Non Nocere" (At least, do no harm).
- Entry requirements (i.e. preparation program) for licensure and certification, with internship or some guided practice before full licensure.
- Intellectual decision making based on "Informed Professional Judgment" (IPJ Factor).
- Some provision for "certification" for advancement or specialization.
- Self regulation
- Common language
- Others (?)

Evidence of a Diaphanous KB

The Knowledge Base (KB) issue has been endlessly debated. NCPEA and UCEA had KB committees. Many have written on the topic, including Achilles (1985-2004), folks I may have led astray (e.g., Achilles & DuVall; Price & Achilles, 2000) and others who should know (Culbertson 1990; Hoyle, 1991). Ed Ad conferences include ample evidence that Ed Ad is still searching for its KB, and how to organize and deliver it. A playful puppy chasing its own tail in ever-hilarious circles describes the KB issue for me.

Sources of a professional KB include research, theory, and consensually validated exemplary professional practice (a type of practitioner peer review), or informed professional judgment (IPJ). Local knowledge, legal knowledge, and experience are parts of IPJ. Without a solid, field-specific KB, there is no professional expertise. So can any person who knows about finance and fund management (TQM, Seven Habits, learning organizations, public relations, etc.), run a school?

As recently as 1987 when he was president of Harvard, Bok (1987) questioned that education even had a KB. He presaged today's condition as

educators jump from one fad to another, and acquiesce to “mandates” to reform education in ways shown by substantial education research, theory, and IPJ *not* to work (e.g., retention in grade). Educators move slowly, if at all to advance education by using relevant theory, best practices, or Scientific Based Research (SBR) supported improvement efforts, such as class or school size.

Because they have neither a strong profession or *distinctive body of knowledge* to impart, education faculties have *no firm anchor* for their programs or curricula. Instead, external forces *push them first in one direction, and then another*. (Bok, 1989, p. 46. emphasis added)

Culbertson (1988, 1990) pointed to the squishy Ed Ad KB as set forth in texts that professors teach from. He argued that much of what was supposed to be research-based wasn't. This condition might be less serious *if* educators did research to develop an education KB (more on this later), rather than repeat non-research as fact. If some claim appears often enough in print, it somehow becomes fact.

First, borrowed concepts tend to enter textbooks before they are adequately tested in school systems. The result is that such concepts may be used *indefinitely* in training programs even though their actual relations to school management and leadership practices remain unknown. (pp. 102-103, emphasis added)

English (2002) deconstructed Covey's *Seven Habits* and Peters, of Peters and Waterman (1982) admitted that: *In Search of Excellence* was data free (“Author: Data on successful firms ‘faked’ but still valid”. *U.S. Today*, 11/19/01).

Faked data are valid? How many Ed Ad professors rely on texts [e.g., Peters & Waterman (1982)] or others that contain points of questionable validity, non-research-based opinion, and downright errors? The lack of precision, clarity, and canons of practice is a major barrier to successful preparation if professors rely mostly on texts, and hinders successful practice if practitioners believe the texts and the professors. An empirical test of Culbertson's assertion about texts showed that the concepts reported in 10 frequently used school-community texts were nearly opposite ($p < .01$) what research and analyses of best practices actually showed. (Achilles, Lintz, & Wayson, 1989).

Examples of Some Problem Described Here

Besides the text issue, sources EdAd professors and practitioners include numerous inaccuracies, errors, and non-valid materials. Because of familiarity with the class-size research, examples are from it, but the *general* concepts pertain to education and Ed Ad. The STAR (Student Teacher Achievement Ratio) experiment provides a clear “case study” of the KB, research, research use, text

errors, and fragmentation issues. Class size should be of great importance to Ed Ad if a purpose of Ed Ad is to administer and organize schools to maximize student outcomes and teacher performance at reasonable cost.

The long-standing (1900-present) research outcomes on class size and their uniform conclusion have never been thoroughly discussed by Ed Ad groups or well implemented in regular schooling settings with few notable exceptions. *Unfortunately, people think that small classes simply mean hiring more teachers and doing business as usual. This misguided notion would not be prevalent of professors and practitioners had studied and understood the research.*

STAR and STAR-related studies (1984-2005) have been thoroughly reviewed (e.g. Mosteller, 1995; Mosteller, et al., 1996; Krueger (several places). STAR was cited in Educational Leadership (2003, February) as one of only 11 studies in the past 50 years “That Changed Education” (pp 18-21). After a year-long independent review of STAR, Professor Mosteller (retired) of Harvard University gave STAR good marks (1995).

This article briefly summarizes the Tennessee class-size project, a controlled experiment which is one of the most important educational investigations ever carried out and illustrates the kind and magnitude of research needed in the field of education to strengthen schools. (p. 113)

Concerning potential uses of this study, Professor Mosteller said:

Because a controlled education experiment (as distinct from a sample survey) of this quality, magnitude and duration is a rarity, it is important that both educators and policy makers have access to its statistical information and understand its implications. (p. 126)

The title of the Mosteller et al., article (1996) explains the longitudinal nature of class-size work (“Sustained Inquiry in Education: Lessons from Skill Grouping and Class Size”). The authors concluded (p. 797):

The authors suggest in conclusion that *education would benefit from a commitment to sustained inquiry through well-designed, randomized controlled field trials of education innovations. Such sustained inquiry could provide a source of solid evidence on which educators could base their decisions about how to organize and support learning in classes and schools.* (Emphasis added)

Given the merits of the class-sized research, why (after so many years) isn't this research widely used? *Indeed, where is it in Ed Ad texts?* The example here cuts across the KB, research, research use, and preparation program issues raised in

this chapter. Although I could list numerous examples, I've selected only one in each category. Other examples are amply available (Achilles, 2005). A crux of the issue is that without a strong, consensual KB, Ed Ad people cannot rally around strong practice or propose quality policies (see Burkhardt & Schoenfeld, 2003). Consider how the class-size issues here transfer to other arenas (say, in professional development, retention in grades, etc.) that EdAd practitioners decide about.

Published Comments and Other Errors Hindering Class Size Use

1. Professional Journals, Texts, and Media Confusion

An *article* in *Educational Leadership* (2002, February) with the title "The Downside of Small Class Policies" relied totally on PTR information, using numbers from Table 65 of the *Digest of Education Statistics* (1999) that is clearly labeled Pupil-Teacher Ratio or PTR. Table 69 had average class sizes by states. Differences in US elementary schools between class size and PTR are about $n=10$. Average is not actual class size. Tables 65 and 69 from the *Digest* (1999, emphasis added) are titled:

Table 65 - Public and public elementary and secondary teachers and pupil/teacher ratios. By level: Fall 1955 to 1998 (p. 75).

Table 69 - Highest degree earned, number of years teaching experience and average *class size* for teachers in public elementary and secondary schools: 1993-94 (p. 79).

In an ERIC-CEM *monograph*, and after warning readers that PTR and class size *were not the same*, the author used PTR data to project costs for small classes. [See Chapter 4 in Picus (2001).] Based on PTR data, the projected costs for small classes were far higher than have been reported where small classes are implemented following the class-size research.

A Federal Education Laboratory *research review* included "Making Policy Choices: Is Class-size Reduction the Best Alternative?" (Harris & Plank, 2000) that had *no class-size data*, only PTR data (Table 65 of *The Digest*). With so much confusion in *education* outlets, it is easy to understand popular media confusion. Reporters develop stories from sources that they have no reason to question. Do legislators and Ed Ad practitioners follow the same pattern?

2. Research Journals and Professional Pronouncements (Ex Cathedra)

A reviewer for an article submitted to a research journal in the Ed Ad field commented on the manuscript. (Emphasis added).

The author should provide a more thorough study of literature on class size. The author lists very few *and does not include negative studies or those that show that class size reduction without also improving the teaching quality usually means no gains for student achievement.*

The “more thorough study of the literature” is easily accommodated. But, what negative studies? STAR included a detailed qualitative and quantitative study of teaching in small and regular classes. A sub-set of teachers and teacher aides received intense “staff development”. Student gains of the “trained” teachers were not different (actually or statistically) from the other teachers’ students’ gains. (Word et al., pp. 116-148. Esp. p. 126).

A concerned (and apparently well-informed) educator described a meeting that included a discussion of STAR. A *State education official* said that “There could be no possible way that having a small class size would help students’ performance years later.” (e-mail, 3/15/05).

A graduate student reported that a full professor of education (2004) told the class “There is not one scintilla of evidence that small classes make any difference in teaching or in student outcomes”. Besides researchers, parents, teachers, and kids know better. What about a Professor?

3. Validity Concerns and Definitions: A Potential Solution

In *Educational Policy Systems*, Iannaccone (1975) emphasized that “descriptive reference is the first and most essential sense in which a concept has meaning” (p. 13). He explained that: “*One source of error in the scientific venture is lack of precision in the referent of the concepts. Lack of precision leads to lack of reliability in the concepts.*” (pp. 13-14, Emphasis added).

An economist who critiques small classes using PTR arguments make the same point as did Iannaccone. Hanushek (1998) noted that (1) “*pupil-teacher ratios are not the same as class sizes,*” and (2) “*The only data that are available over time reflect the pupil-teacher ratios*” (p. 12, emphasis Added.) Hanushek then *substitutes PTR* (Table 65 of *The Digest*) *for class size* in his work and to criticize class size. (Emphasis added).

Some Definitions to Anchor this Discussion. (Key terms are different).

Average Class Size is the sum of all students regularly in each teacher’s class divided by the actual number of regular teachers in those specific classes. If four 2nd grade rooms have 14, 16, 18, 18 (n=65) students, the average, (but not actual) grade-2 class size is 16.25 (or 16) students.

Class Size(s)- “The number of students for whom a teacher is primarily responsible during a school year” (Lewit & Baker, 1997, p. 113). This is an addition problem. Class size is an organization for instruction important to

teacher, parents, students.

Class-Size Reduction (CSR) includes the processes to achieve class sizes smaller than the ones presently in place, such as changing the class size from 25 to 16 or so. One needs accurate pre and post data to support the change process.

Pupil-Teacher Ratio (PTR) – “The number of students in a school or district compared to the number of teaching professionals” (McRobbie et al., 1998, p. 4). In some venues all educators are part of the computation, including counselors, administrators, etc. In this division problem, the divisor is very important. PTR is a way to assure equitable distribution of funds and is important to administrators, policy persons, etc. The difference between PTR and class size in USA elementary schools is about $n=10$ (Achilles & Sharp, 1998). PTR is a formula and administrative process for allocation of resources; class size is an organization for providing instructional and education services to clients.

Data available in large databases are PTR data. Valid and reliable ways to get class-size data are (1) to count students in a class and/or (2) establish class sizes and monitor them. Surveys generate PTRs or average class sizes (not actual class sizes).

In a discussion of “class size” Hanushek (2002, p. 39) offers Table 2-1 titled “Pupil-teacher ratio and real spending, 1960-1995”. Compare the data (correctly labeled “Pupil-teacher ratio” for the years shown) with data from the *Digest of Education Statistics* (1999) Tables 65 (p. 75) and 69 (p. 79). Class size and PTR are separate databases. Do Ed Ad people know this? Is it part of the KB?

Terminology	1960	1970	1980	1990	1995	Source
Pupil teacher ratio	25.8	22.3	18.7	17.2	17.3	(Hanushek, 2002)
Pupil teacher ratio	25.8	22.3	18.7	17.2	17.3	(Digest, 1999, p. 75)

The tabled data are followed by “Perhaps the most astounding part of the current debates on class size reduction is the almost complete disregard for the history of such policies. Pupil-teacher ratios fell dramatically throughout the 20th Century (Hanushek, 2002, p. 39. Emphasis added). Compare this with Hanushek’s (1998) correct statement that PTR’s are not class sizes! Published sources need careful critique.

The cases reported here show that much confusion arises from lack of clarity, precision, and definition that are at the heart of validity and research. Does Ed Ad preparation cover these issues thoroughly?

Evidence of Ed Ad’s Research Deficits: Focus Research on Administration

The Ed Ad emphasis on the Social Sciences focused the modest Ed Ad research not on Education and the administration, organization, and operation of schools, but upon perceptions and attitudes, on administrators rather than on

administration, and upon social-science topics such as roles. In 1976 Iannaccone stated:

The research between 1925 and 1950 is trivial in the main. The bulk of the research was done by part-time graduate students in a thesis...their first and often last piece of research. Almost all of it is atheoretical.(pp. 18-19)

Review present day dissertations and articles in Ed Ad journals for validation of Iannaccone's 1996 points. Dissertations are still the major source of Ed Ad research, even 50 years after Iannoccone's pronouncement. Levine (2005, p. 85) noted that in "2002-2003 twenty-three hundred doctorates in educational administration were awarded". Where does one find research on administration for outcomes of professional practice that should be the KB?

When they considered research in Ed Ad, Haller and Knapp (1985) suggested that the "field of educational administration was rejected because 'education' is a notoriously elusive concept" (p. 160). They settled instead on "school," essentially following Schwab (as cited in Westbury & Wilkof, 1978) who described schools as consisting of four "commonplaces": subject matter, learners, teachers, and milieus. The arrangement for carrying out the societally important task of education is usually a formal organization, so it is logical to add a fifth "commonplace," administrators who are "obliged to ensure the achievement of the organization's responsibility" (p. 160) for carrying out the schooling process. "Thus, the practice of school administration is viewed here as fundamentally concerned with establishing, maintaining, and changing patterned relationships among all five of the commonplaces within a formal organization" (p. 160).

Haller and Knapp noted that each of Schwab's four commonplaces is "characterized by a relatively few central questions which preoccupy its researchers." They rejected that the study of educational administration includes the study of administrators and so do I. Their argument focuses the discussion of school administration on relationships among the commonplaces, and not on administrators (e.g., their attitudes, perceptions, roles, etc.). Their example of a physicist who uses a questionnaire to determine how her colleagues perceive that federal funding opportunities have influenced research in physics is compelling. The physicist does a survey, tabulates results, and has the article published. "No one would confuse such an investigation with research in physics (p. 161, Emphasis added).

Dissemination Masquerading as Research

Achilles and Achilles (1998) argued that much of what passes for research in Ed Ad using the criterion of "being published" is dissemination rather than research. Dissemination is a legitimate role in a professional field but

dissemination is not “research.” A change here is reasonable given professors’ self-reported low emphasis on doing or reading research (e.g. McCarthy, 1998; McCarthy and Kuh, 1997; McCarthy, Kuh, Newell, & Iacona, 1998). If Ed Ad professors neither do, nor read education research, are they content, as Ogawa (1994) indicated, in being disseminators who enter the improvement arena late—if at all—and write to legitimate the work of others (e.g., TQM, SBM, Standards, PET, MBO, etc.)? Let’s call dissemination what it is.

The Social Science Fragmentation Bomb vs. Professional Focus

As the places that prepare education practitioners evolved from normal schools, to state teacher colleges to state colleges/universities, and with the growth of sub-specialties like guidance, counseling, special education, Ed Ad (etc.), professors in these institutions sought the status that the liberal arts and sciences enjoyed, due in part to their focus on new knowledge and the “Scholarship of Discovery” (Boyer, 1990). Status was generally driven by the reward structure. For Ed Ad professors, the two roads seemed to be to emulate (a) arts and sciences or (b) professional schools (e.g., medicine, law). Ed Ad chose the liberal arts path that was divided into social science disciplines.

Some Ed Ad professors have argued that knowledge derived from disciplines is useful in education and should be taught by educators in schools of education because professors in Arts and Sciences or in Colleges of Business are not “practical.” They do not show exactly how to apply the discipline to education/schooling. This sounds familiar, much like Ed Ad practitioners commenting on what Ed Ad professors profess (e.g., Pitner, 1988, Levine, 2005). The situation here fits well into Boyer’s (1990) discussion of the “Scholarship of Integration”, (perhaps activated as interpretation/dissemination), and the “Scholarship of Application,” two realms of scholarship for a profession. Ed Ad professors attempted to emulate professors in disciplines, and turned their research, theory, and practice away from schooling (the five commonplaces) and toward the disciplines—but still without the application-to-practice thread that practitioners needed. The Ed Ad professors became second-rate “disciplinarians” and second-rate Ed Ad researchers relative to schooling.

The social-science, liberal-arts-dominated “movement” in Ed Ad hindered Ed Ad! A better path, and one that Ed Ad needs to take quickly, is to consider Education as a profession, to study and improve the practice of the profession; that is, to improve conditions (the administration and organization of schools) so students can learn, and teachers can teach well.

Administration and Preparation of Administrators in Ed Ad Need Help:
This Help Must Start with Professors: PDQ or RIP?

Introduction and Some Background

In 1987 Education Administration (Ed Ad) formed the National

Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (NCEEA) to analyze the condition of Ed Ad and recommend improvements in the wake of dissatisfaction with education in general engendered by the release of “A Nation at Risk,” a data-free document determined to be more political than substantive. The NCEEA completed its work published its recommendations, (Griffiths, Stout & Forsyth, 1998), and eventually spun off the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA).

The NPBEA was composed of professional associations connected to education and to Ed Ad: AASA, ASCD, CCSO, NAESP, NASSP, NCPEA, NSBA, UCEA, and cooperated with AACTE, NCATE, etc. Some Washington alphabet-soup groups suggested that Ed Ad preparation was not meeting the needs of education, and that groups other than Ed Ad Professors might assume the preparation-program role (Schneider, 1998). The move from university-based preparation was triggered by the NPBEA adoption in 1997 (on a split vote) of The Interstate School Leadership Licensing Consortium (ISLLC) as promulgated by the CCSO (Murphy & Van Meter, 1997). ISLLC is an Ed Ad contribution to the “standards” movement, a recent education fad. Until 2005, (Murphy) there was no attempt to disclose if there was a research base for ISLLC!

Elements in this section are normative in nature. They represent some things that Ed Ad should do. The order is negotiable. The KB, research, text and clarify, and preparation issues are paramount: “It’s Time to Take Back our Profession” (Creighton, 2003); “PDQ or RIP” (Griffiths, 1988); “Take Command of Ed Ad Preparation” Achilles, 2004, pp. 14-15); all say the same thing.

The Ed Ad Challenge: Establish Mission, Goal, and KB Focus

Education excellence is more than test scores or Academics; there are important outcomes like student Behavior and discipline, with a goal of self discipline; Citizenship and participation in school and in society; and Development into productive, civil people through the mature integration of mind, body, and spirit. A long-term goal is Economic Sufficiency. This Abecedarian Compact imperative is to connect Ed Ad preparation to improvements in the A, B, C, D, E’s (see Appendix A). Poor showing of the school effects research, studies, and reports (e.g., Haller et al., 1997; Griffiths et al., 1988; Levine, 2005, Witziers et al., 2003) suggest a need for preparation-program changes. Several basic steps to a foundation for improving preparation include a clear goal or mission, consensus, clear and precise definition, resolution of KB and research issues, and plans to clean up the acts in the drama.

Assumptions as a First Step

1. Outcomes of schooling should be greater than only test scores: The Abecedarian Compact is a minimum standard.
2. There is considerable research-driven KB about what will improve student outcomes. (e.g., see Hoyle, 1991; Achilles, 1994, 2003;

VanMeter & Murphy, 1997).

3. Not knowing and not applying that KB impedes school improvement.

4. An Ed Ad person must know WHAT to do, HOW to do it, and

WHY it should (or shouldn't) be done to improve schools.

Brief Examples of the Problem

Glickman (1991) concluded that educators pretended not to know what they know. Achilles and Nye (1998) asserted that “much education is impostorship; at work, it is malpractice” (p. 1). “Over the past quarter of a century pre-service preparation programs for educational administration have proliferated, but their quality has deteriorated, . . . and course content is often irrelevant, outdated and unchallenging” (NPBEA, 1989, pp. 9, 11). Consider The What and How as “Conceptually Independent” for Analysis, but “Phenomenally Interactive” for Practice.

Education excellence won't happen until Ed Ad people know and use the KB related to school outcomes. This is the “WHAT” dimension. Examples of educators not knowing or using data are readily available: grade retention, homework, small classes, grouping, etc. A critical observer asks, “Where do Ed Ad people learn WHAT to do to improve schools?” As long ago as 1980, Rossell identified the disconnect discussed here.

Indeed, the thousands of educational administrators who have testified in school desegregation cases in the last two decades probably fall into one of two categories: those who are not even aware of the experimental research and those who are aware of it, but either do not know how to translate it into policy or do not care. (p. 257)

Knowing the WHAT portion of the KB is not enough. Ed Ad people must engage policy persons, faculty, parents, and community representatives to follow data-based decision models that allow educators to employ “professional practice”, a leadership element of the “HOW” dimension. The WHY dimension is, essentially, ethics, statutes, policies, morality, etc. Where do Ed Ad people learn these things? When? How? (see Waters et al., 2003 in process).

The Core Issues

The Haller et al. (1997) findings simply add to many criticisms that drove the formation of the NCEEA and NPBEA. The Levine Report (2005) is the latest in a boringly repetitive line of criticisms. The title of Griffiths' (1988) paper said it well: “Educational Administration: Reform PDQ or RIP.” Pitner, (1988), Brown, Markus and Lucas, (1988). Levine (2005) and others explained how little Ed Ad preparation programs addressed the needs of practitioners.

Other professionals (e.g., doctors, engineers) also report that conferences, and on-the-job training (OJT) are far more valuable in their work than was their formal higher-education preparation (e.g., Pitner, 1988; Levine, 2005). Ed Ad professors might shrug off criticisms, but many are from leaders in the field. Griffiths' RIP seems to win given decades of lethargy and lack of action on the problems. "Most programs for training school administrators range in quality from embarrassing to disastrous" (Griffiths, 1998, p. 6, citing Hawley). How much lack of education progress stems from Ed Ad persons lack of knowledge about, or from use of ideas without critique of or from a lack of substantive research and literature review that credits the past, conserves the good and guides changes for the future? Ed Ad research is typically conducted using questionnaires (Haller, 1979) and on the perceptions of some group (Haller & Knapp, 1985), and not on administering schools or how Ed Ad might influence schooling outcomes. Iannaccone (1976) claimed that Ed Ad research prior to 1950 or so was "trivial".

What about rigor in Ed Ad research, either by professors or graduate students? Hawley (1988) noted the "Few persons teaching in doctoral programs are now or ever have been involved in research and are not qualified to supervise research. Thus, very little good research is being conducted by faculty and students" (p. 85). If Ed Ad professors do little research, at least in Education, is it surprising that their works and those of their students add little to relevant theory and the Ed Ad KB? Research should advance Ed Ad's purposes and knowledge base.

A Profession HAS Purpose, Goals, and Inquiry Methods

An obvious question is "Does Ed Ad have an agreed-upon definition (goal or mission)? Where is it clearly stated? As a starting point for discussion, I offer the goal or purpose that I use. See Appendix A. Given an agreed-upon purpose or goal, then a theoretic framework for guiding research in a field seems important. I find the Haller and Knapp (1985) framework (commonplaces) and definitions useful here.

The "commonplaces" and the focus of research are pivotal in Ed Ad's growth for several reasons. Attention to theory, theoretic frameworks to guide Ed Ad's inquiry and agreement on the focus, design, and method for Ed Ad research are important elements for improvement. Professor and graduate student attention to inconsequential topics, to peripheral issues, and to educational administrators rather than to research on school administration (e.g., the outcomes of relationships between/among the five commonplaces) deter advances in Ed Ad and its KB.

The idea that school outcomes should relate to Ed Ad work is not new. Hallinger and Heck (1996) extend Boyan's (1981) commentary and Bridges' (1982) review of research on the "principal's role in school effectiveness." All concluded that Ed Ad didn't much influence student outcomes: ". . . findings of

these studies reveal either no effects or, at best, weak effects” (p. 20). Hallinger and Heck cited Ogawa and Hart’s (1985) finding that the “principal variable accounted for between 2 and 8 percent of the variance in test scores” (p. 39, Emphasis added). Witziers et al., (2003) are still puzzled by “The Elusive Search for an Association” between “Education Leadership and Student Achievement,” to say nothing of Glasman & Glasman (1997) desiring to connect “the preparation of school leaders to the practice of school leadership” (ad nauseam).

A non-scientific questionnaire—alas, see Haller (1979)—to more than 2800 Ed Ad persons throughout the United States (1980-2005) provided responses to illuminate issues expressed here (e.g., Achilles, 1999 Appendix B). The question (Paraphrased) has been: “What research-based information that improves student outcomes have you been taught in you formal Ed Ad preparation program?” Responses from subsamples of students (n=88) in Ed.D. programs (as recently as 4/05) illustrate the point. Over half said “none.” Others listed 10 different correct responses such as effective schools, parent involvement, cooperative learning, time on task, and small elementary classes. Respondents had an average of almost 9 years Ed Ad experience.

Group	Response None			Response Correct (6/person possible)			Ave. Yrs Ed Ad Experience
	N	n	%	n	of	%	
I	27	13	48	27	162	17	9.5
II	32	27	84	9	192	5	9.5
III	29	19	66	18	174	10	7.3
TOT	88	59	67	54	528	10	8.8

That practitioners were not taught in their Ed Ad classes what improves schools reflects upon the Ed Ad professoriate. Consider supporting points. Research in Ed Ad is weak (e.g., Haller, 1979; Erickson, 1979; Boyan, 1981; Haller & Knapp, 1985; Achilles, 1990, 1991); few Ed Ad professors do research or list it as a major strength (e.g., McCarthy et al., 1988; McCarthy, 1998). The Ed Ad KB is suspect. Its research thrust, use of research and even understanding of conducting good research are in question. (e.g., See Hawley, 1988 cited earlier).

Clear Goal or Mission for EdAd and EdAd Preparation

See the suggested Abecedarian Compact (Appendix A) and “Criteria for Policy and Ed Ad Preparation (Appendix B) as examples of this element. If Ed Ad includes leading, the leaders need to know where the organization should be going and have some explicit criteria for guiding decisions for change and expenditures. Because Ed Ad mostly occurs in schools and Ed Ad preparation doesn’t, rather than teaching Ed Ad, most professors teach about it. Teaching

about Ed Ad must include at least three elements: (1) *What* research shows will improve student outcomes, (b) *How* practitioners can get those things into education practice, and *Why*. If true, then three domains offer a structure for developing and organizing the KB.

Clear, Consensually Agreed Upon Definitions of Key Terms

Terms important for research, dissemination, and knowledge use must be defined precisely and clearly. Professions have an agreed-upon language that conveys important points in the field. For the types of confusion that can arise from lack of clarity and precision, see Part 1 and the discussion of class size and pupil-teacher ratio. Three common terms in Ed Ad that seem important, but are often used interchangeably, provide an example, of lack of precision in research. How are these alike? Different? Are the differences important? (You bet).

Administration; Leadership; Management.

Define the Current Ed Ad KB

This KB debate has been going on long enough with minimal agreement. Culbertson’s (1988) article “A century’s quest for a knowledge base” says much about the field’s lethargy here. Achilles (1994) argued that this “epic struggle continues”. Many others have written about the KB issue, but little consensus has emerged. A professional KB is not fragmented disciplines.

Organize the KB and Establish Processes to Validate, Assess, Access, and Change the KB

Meta-analysis work at McREL (e.g., Waters, Marzano & McNulty, 2003) offers one possibility for progress. The authors emphasize four major questions (p. 13) that they call “Experimental Knowledge” (Why); “Declarative knowledge” or What to do; “Procedural Knowledge” or How to do the What; and Contextual knowledge” or such things as When. [Note that Achilles (many places) would divide the KB into WHAT, HOW (including When, Where) and Why. Let’s find and agree on some approach!] If the process proposed here were used, an organizing framework might look like the following. Responses could be rated based on research, theory, and IPJ as 1-5, with 1= very sure and 5=little or no SBR, theory (etc.) support yet.

WHAT?	HOW? (WHEN, WHERE?)	WHY? (OR WHY NOT?)
The KB of making	Typical “Leadership” topics (General)schools “Better”	Ethics, Statute, Policy.Goal achievement.
(THE BASICS) as measured and judged	Education-Specific (School-community relations). Organization for Learning (Size of classes, schools)	Student outcomes (ABCDE) Evaluation Research

Redefine “Scholarship” and its Recognitions and Rewards to Focus Professor Energies

See Boyer (1990) for conceptualizations and definitions of types of scholarship: Discovery, Integration, Application, and Teaching. Frame recognitions and rewards in the Ed Ad profession to include all four types of scholarship.

Get Ed Ad Research “On Track” in Several Ways

Employ sound designs and methods for conducting Ed Ad research (e.g., Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004; Achilles, 1994b). Compare Ed Ad studies to SBR criteria (e.g., Feuer, et al., 2002; Burkhardt & Schoenfield, 2003) to help assess the value and validity of the studies. Focus Ed Ad research on administration and organization and perhaps policy. Leave the study of administrators (attitudes, perceptions, opinion) to psychologists and pollsters (Haller & Knapp, 1985).

By far, the greatest amount of Ed Ad research is done by graduate students. Thus, attention is due both to the professors who direct the dissertations (see Achilles, 1991) and to careful reporting of the SBR-type dissertations. Ed Ad professors should require that students frame dissertation abstracts in a standard form, such as proposed by Mosteller et al. (2004) to make reviews, critique of research, and professional articles user-friendly.

Clear research and literature reviews help advance a field. Unless a study is a replication of prior work, the prior work should be carefully reviewed, improved upon, and the newer study should advance the KB. Repeating prior work because of incomplete research reviews is time and effort wasted. Similarities abound between the Levine (2005) report “findings” and long-standing work in Ed Ad, from Culbertson et al., (1969) through Hallinger and Heck (1996) and later.

Roles for Ed Ad Research

- Let the 5 “commonplaces” and their relationships guide research as a conceptual framework.
- Respect “evaluation” research that features outcomes of professional practice, as well as evaluation of Ed Ad preparation.
- Focus Ed Ad research around the Ed Ad-specific leadership skills and processes to explore how to get the basic KB (the WHAT) into effective and efficient use in educating people.
- Emphasize Ed Ad-specific issues surrounding personnel, policy, and special needs in education, applications of discipline-based research and theory in education, etc.
- Separate “Research” and dissemination (“Service”), but recognize both as scholarship, if done well (Boyer, 1990). Adjust reward and

recognition models along the lines suggested by Boyer and even Levine (2005, pp. 63-64).

- Establish “filters” or processes similar to those used by the Food and Drug Administration or FDA, but avoid the problems recently exposed in the “X” drugs such as Vioxx, Celebrex, Bextra, Naproxin. Review all “downsides” and potential researcher biases. Validate research to improve practice, such as the former National Diffusion Network idea of validation, through the Joint Dissemination Review Panel (JDRP).
- Focus on schools and students. “Center” on Education as Murphy (1999) and others have suggested. Agree upon the KB needed to improve schools as a start and establish a workable process to keep the KB dynamic.
- Develop a workable “Education Model” against which to test theories.
- Organize “The Field” simply (as a guide to action): Follow the “KISS” (Keep it Simple, Stupid!) Principle to get started. For example, establish a cross-discipline model based upon a few guiding questions, such as WHAT, HOW (include when and where, WHY?), “characterized by a relatively few central questions that preoccupy its researchers.”

One Role For Theory

This discussion has only briefly mentioned theory, one of the three “legs” of a professional KB (Research, Theory, Exemplary Practice). Theory offers a two-way bridge between Research (or Discipline) and Practice, or the application of research and theory to the solving of human problem. Theory building and developing sound conceptual frameworks offer ways to move Ed Ad from the “social science” legacy into the education profession.

Ed Ad professors are not theoreticians in the sense that they generate new knowledge in the disciplines. Neither are they practitioners in the sense that they administer P. S. 1984. As scholar-practitioners, professors study, interpret, and bridge the fatuous theory-practice chasm. Professors in a profession translate problems of practice for theoreticians to study and results of research for practitioners to employ. Crucial here is Ed Ad professor recognition of the tenuous and evolving nature of the KB, but the professors should profess the best available at the time, and be reasonably humble (truthful) about the weak KB. Even in a field that some believe has a secure KB, there is evidence of the humility lacking in Ed Ad. The New York Times Magazine (3/16/03) carried a detailed series on medical education. An established MD reported that when she was a new MD student the Dean of her prestigious medical school greeted the students with “[H]alf of what we teach you here is wrong—unfortunately, we don’t know which half” (Sanders, 2003, p. 29). The message, I believe, is clear for Ed Ad, too!

Preparation as Scholar-Practitioner or Practitioner-Scholar

A professional in Ed Ad is a combination of scholar and professional practitioner. That individual's preparation must attend to at least three questions that define professional: WHY? WHAT? and HOW? These three elements constitute what many recognize as a sound basis for professional preparation programs (NCEEA, 1988): the learning of general and specific knowledge bases, the development of skills derived from the knowledge bases, and focused and guided practice to sharpen the knowledge and skills.

Preparation program accreditation should include criteria for assessing the what and how areas at the very least. The What portion of the KB, can be assessed by a simple paper-and-pencil test! But evaluation is what Ed Ad professors tell practitioners to do but don't do themselves.

Evaluate Ed Ad Preparation

The Ed Ad KB as taught lacks a body of Scientific Based Research (SBR) and of evaluation research on Ed Ad preparation. Several sound models to guide evaluations of Ed Ad preparation programs exist, and have existed for some time. The Education Professions Development Act (EDPA) in 1968 required extensive evaluation for Ed Ad programs funded under Part B. Where did the impetus go? Other models for Ed Ad evaluation might be used at least until better models are refined. (e.g., Achilles, Brubaker & Snyder, 1992; Achilles & Ramey, 1990; Coleman & Achilles, 1987). Evaluation in Ed Ad should be directed at three broad levels: (1) pre-program, including needs recruitment, selecting; (2) program, including purpose, content, structure, delivery, outcomes; and (3) post-program including follow-up, induction, assessment of job performance, and steps for program modifications. Appendix C provides one model to guide Ed Ad preparation/evaluation.

Professional practice requires careful thought for the skillful translation of the theory and research from foundational disciplines into the armamentarium of the practitioner. The shared goals and purposes of the profession are unifying elements that focus the work in supporting fields to advance the profession. Important organizations (such as AASA, NCPEA, UCEA, NASSP, NAEP, ASCD, NSBA) coordinate the work and interests of their constituents and speak with a forceful voice for the profession. Action and conversations along the lines described here, derived from Ed Ad criticisms from at last 1969 to 2005 are long overdue (PDQ or RIP). Let's Start. NOW.

References

- Achilles, C. M. (2005, April). *Why hasn't class-size research been used appropriately (or even used)?* Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association (AREA) Annual Convention. Montreal. Special Interest Group on Research Use (SIGRU).

- Achilles, C. M. (2004a). Change the damn box. In D.C. Carr & C. Fulmer (Eds). *Educational Leadership: Knowing the Way, Showing the Way, Going the Way*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press 4-27.
- Achilles, C. M. (2004b, October). *Testimony and evidence to support small classes, K-3. Mimeo*. A paper prepared to support oral testimony in various class-size hearings (updated regularly). (Summary and Abstract, also).
- Achilles, C. M. (1999a). *Let's Put Kids First, Finally: Getting Class Size Right*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Achilles, C. M. (1999b, February). *Are training programs in education administration efficient and effective?* Paper at the National Conference of the American Association of School Administrators. New Orleans, LA. 2/19/99.
- Achilles, C. M. (1998, Summer). How long? *AASA Professor* 21 (1), 9-11.
- Achilles, C. M. (1994a, February). Searching for the golden fleece: The Epic struggle continues. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 30(1), 6-26.
- Achilles, C. M. (1994b). The knowledge base for education administration is for more than content. In J. Burdin & J. Hoyle (eds), *Leadership and Diversity in Education. The second yearbook of NCPEA*. Lancaster, P.A., Technomic. 164-173.
- Achilles, C. M. (1991, Spring). Reforming educational administration: An agenda for the 1990s. *Planning and Changing*, 22(1), 23-33.
- Achilles, C. M. (1990, Summer). Research in education administration: One position. *The AASA Professor*, 13(1), 1-3.
- Achilles, C. M. (1988a). *Are we scholar practitioners, theoreticians, or practitioners?* Paper at NCPEA, Western Michigan University. Kalamazoo, MI. 8/19/88.
- Achilles, C. M. (1988b). Unlocking some mysteries of administration and administrator preparation: A reflective prospect. In D. Griffiths, R. Stout, & P. Forsyth (Eds.), *Leaders for America's schools: Final report and papers of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration* (pp. 41-67). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Achilles, C. M. (1985). *Building Principal Preparation Programs on Theory, Practice, and Research*. Paper at the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration (NCPEA). Starkville, MS. ED 308592.
- Achilles, C. M., Brubaker, D. & Snyder, H. (1992). Organizing and leading for learning: The interplay of school reform and restructuring with preparation program reform and restructuring. In F. C. Wendel (ed). *Reforming and Restructuring Education*. UCEA (Then at Penn State University). UCEA Monograph Series. 21-39.

- Achilles, C. M., & DuVall, L. A. (1991, Fall/Winter). The knowledge base in education administration: Did NCATE open a Pandora's Box? *The Record in Educational Administration and Supervision*, 12 (1), 15-20.
- Achilles, C. M., & Finn, J. D. (2005-2006). Class size and pupil-teacher ratio (PTR) confusion. A classic example of mixing "apples and oranges". *National Forum of Applied Educational Research Journal*. 18(2), 5-25.
- Achilles, C. M., Lintz, M. N. & Wayson, W. W. (1989, Fall). Observations on building public confidence in education. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*. 11(3), 275-284.
- Achilles, C. M., & Nye, B.A. (1997, November). *Education's equivalent of medicine's malpractice*. Paper at Mid-South Educational Research Association, Memphis, TN.
- Achilles, C. M. & Ramey, M. (1990). Evaluating preparation programs for school administrators. In M. Berney & J. Ayers (eds.). *Evaluating Preparation Programs for School Leaders and Teachers in Specialty Areas*. Boston: Klauer Academic Publishers. 13-32.
- Achilles, C. M., Reynolds, J. S. & Achilles, S. H. (1997). *Problem Analysis: Responding to School Complexity*. Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.
- Biddle, B. J. & Berliner, D. C. (2002, February). Small class size and its effects. *Educational Leadership*, 59 (5), 12-23.
- Bok, D. (1987, May-June). The challenge to schools of education. *Harvard Magazine*, 89(5), 47-57, 79-80.
- Boyan, N. J. (1981). Follow the leader: Commentary on research in educational administration. *Educational Researcher*, 10(2) 6-13, 21.
- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bridges, E. M. (1982). Research on the school administrator: The state-of-the-art, 1967-1980. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 18(3), 12-33.
- Brown, G., Markus, F., & Lucas, S. (1988). Acquired administrative competence: A survey of national distinguished principals. *National Forum of Educational Administration and Supervision Journal (NFEAS)*, 5(1), 58-66.
- Burkardt, H. & Schoenfeld, A. H. (2003, Dec.) Improving educational research: Toward a more useful, more influential, and better-funded enterprise. *Educational Researcher*, 32(9), 3-14.
- Carnoy, M., Jacobsen, R., Mishel, L., & Rothstein, R. (2005). *The Charter School Dust-Up*. Washington, DC: The Economic Policy Institute (EPI). Teachers College Press.
- Cawelti, G. (2003, February). Lessons from research that changed education. *Educational Leadership*, 60(5), 18-21.

- Coleman, D. G. & Achilles, C. M. (1987, Summer). An agenda for program improvement in education administration preparation. *Planning and Changing*, 18(2), 120-127.
- Creighton, T. (2003, August). *It's Time to Take Back our Profession*. Paper presented at the NCPEA Annual Conference. Sedona, AZ. (Subsequently published in AASA Professor and Education Leadership Review).
- Culbertson, J. A. (1990, Fall/Winter). Tomorrow's challenges to today's professors of educational administration. *The Record in Education Administration and Supervision*, 11(1), 100-107. Also the 1988 W. D. Cocking lecture.
- Culbertson, J. A., Farquhar, R., Gaynor, A., & Shibles, M. (1969). *Preparing educational leaders for the seventies*. Final Report, Project 8-0230, Grant OEG 0-8-080230-2695 (010). U. S. HEW.
- English, F. W. (2002, January). The penetration of educational leadership texts by revelation and prophecy: The case of Stephen R. Covey. *Journal of School Leadership*, 12, 4-22.
- Erickson, D. A. (1979). Research on educational administration: The state-of-the-art. *Educational Researcher*, 8(3), 9-14.
- Feuer, M. J., Towne, L. & Shavelson, R. S. (2002, November). Scientific culture and educational research. *Educational Researcher*, 31(8), 4-14.
- Glasman, N., & Glasman, L. (1997). Connecting the preparation of school leaders to the practice of school leadership. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 72(2), 3-20.
- Glickman, C. (1991, May). Pretending not to know what we know. *Educational Leadership*, 48(8) 4-10.
- Griffiths, D. E. (1988). *Educational Administration: Reform PDQ or RIP*. UCEA Occasional Paper 88312. Arizona State University. Tempe, AZ: UCEA. (UCEA is at the University of Missouri, 2005). ED 303858.
- Griffiths, D. E., Stout, R., & Forsyth, P. (eds). (1988) *Leaders for America's Schools*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Haller, E. J. (1979). Questionnaires and the dissertation in educational administration. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 21(3), 157-168.
- Haller, E. J., Brent, B. O., & McNamara, J. H. (1997, November). Does graduate training in educational administration improve America's schools? *Phi Delta Kappa*, 79(3), 222-227.
- Haller, E. J. & Knapp, T. R. (1985, Summer). Problems and methodology in educational administration. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 21(3), 157-168.
- Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (1996, February). Reassessing the principal's role in school effectiveness: A review of empirical research, 1980-1995. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 32(1), 5-44.

- Hanushek, E. A. (1998, February) The Evidence on Class Size. Rochester, NY: The University of Rochester. W. Allen Wallis Institute. (Occasional Paper No. 98-1).
- Harris, D. & Plank, D. N. (2000). Making policy choices: Is class size reduction (sic) the best alternative? In S. W. M. Laine & J. G. Ward. (Eds). *Using What We Know: A Review of the Research on Implementing Class-Size Reduction Initiative for State and Local Policy Makers*. Oak Brook, IL: North Central Regional Educational Laboratory (NCREL).
- Hawley, W. D. (1988). Universities and the improvement of school management: Roles for the states. In D. Griffiths, R. Stout & P. Forsyth (Eds). *Leaders for America's Schools*. Berkely, CA: McCutchan.
- Hoyle, J. R. (1991, Fall/Winter). Educational administration has a knowledge base. *The Record in Educational Administration and Supervision*, 12(1), 21-28.
- Ianacoone, L. (1976, May). *50 Years of Deed, Program, and Research in Educational Administration*. Tel Aviv: University of Tel Aviv. Conference paper.
- Iannaccone, L. (1975). *Education Policy Systems: A Study Guide for Educational Administrators*. Ft. Lauderdale, FL. Nova Southeastern University. Esp 11-19.
- Johnson, K. (2002, February). The downside to small class policies. *Educational Leadership*, 59(5), 27-29.
- Johnson, R. B. & Onwuegbuzie, A. (2004, October). Mixed methods research: A research paradigm whose time has come. *Educational Researcher*, 33(7), 14-26.
- Knapp, T. R. (1983, Spring). Underdesign and overanalysis. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 19(2), 108-113.
- Krueger, A. B. (2002). Understanding the magnitude and effect of class size on student achievement. In L. Mishel & R. Rothstein (eds). *The Class Size Debate*. Washington, DC: The Economic Policy Institute. 7-36.
- Krueger, A. B. (2000). An economist's view of class size research. In Wang, M. C. & Finn, J. D. (Eds.) *How Small Classes Help Teachers Do Their Best*. Philadelphia: Temple University Center for Research in Human Development. 99-130.
- Levine, A. (2005, March). *Educating School Leaders*. New York City: Columbia University.
- Lewit, E. & Baker, L. S. (1997, Winter). Class size. *The Future of Children*, 7(3), 112-121.
- McCarthy, M. M. (1998). The "new" educational leadership professor. In R. Muth & M. Martin (Eds). *Toward the Year 2000: Leadership for Quality Schools. 6th Yearbook of NCPEA*. Lancaster, PA: Technical. 3-15.

- McCarthy, M. M. & Kuh, G. D. (1997). *Continuity and Change: The Educational Leadership Professoriate*. Columbia, MO: UCEA.
- McCarthy, M.M., Kuh, G. D., Newell, L.J., & Iacona, C. M. (1988). *Under Scrutiny: The Educational Administration Professoriate*. Tempe, AZ: UCEA.
- McLaughlin, D., Drori, G., & Ross, M. (2000, May). *School-level Correlates of Academic Achievement: Student Assessment Scores in SASS Public Schools*. Washington, DC: U.S. Dept. of Education, NCES, 2000-303.
- McRobbie, J., Finn, J. D., & Harman, P. (1998, August). *Class size reduction: Lessons learned from experience*. Policy Brief 23. San Francisco, CA. West Ed.
- Mosteller, F. (1995, Summer/Fall). The Tennessee study of class size in the early school grades. *The Future of Children: Critical Issues for Children and Youths*, 5(7), 113-127.
- Mosteller, F., Light, R. J., & Sachs, J. A. (1996, Winter). Sustained inquiry in education: Lessons from skill grouping and class size. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66(4), 797-828.
- Mosteller, F., Nave, B., & Miech, E.J. (2004, Jan/Feb). Why we need a structured abstract in educational research. *Educational Researcher*, 33(1), 29-34. (Also Miech, et al., Kappan, January, 2005).
- Murphy, J. (1999, April). *The quest for a center: Notes on the state of the profession of educational leadership*. Invited Address, Division A, American Educational Research Association (AERA), Montreal, Quebec, Canada.
- Murphy, J. (2005, February). Unpacking the foundation of ISLLC “Standards” and addressing concerns in the academic community. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 41(1), 154-191.
- National Policy Board for Educational Administration (1989). *Improving the preparation of school administrators: An agenda for reform*. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia. Author.
- Ogawa, R. (1994, Fall). The institutional sources of educational reform: The case of school-based management. *American Educational Research Journal*, 31(3), 519-548.
- Payne, K. J. & Biddle, B. J. (1999, August-September). Poor school funding, child poverty, and mathematics achievement. *Educational Researcher*, 28(6), 4-13.
- Peters, T. J. & Waterman, R. H. (1982). *In Search of Excellence*. NY: Harper & Row.
- Picus, L.O. (2001). *In Search of More Productive Schools: A Guide to Resource Allocation in Education*. Eugene, OR: ERIC-CEM.
- Price, W. & Achilles, C. M. (2000, Winter). Doctor, lawyer, military chief: Superintendents for the Millennium. *AASA Professor*, 23(2), 28-34.

- Pitner, N. (1988). School administrator preparation. *The state of the art. Leaders for America's schools*, D. Griffiths, R. Stout and P. Forsyth, (Eds.) Berkeley, CA: McCutchan, 367-402.
- Rossell, C. H. (1980). Social science research in educational equity cases: A critical review. In D. C. Berliner (ed)., *Review of Research in Education*. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association. Chapter 5, pp. 237-295.
- Ray, J. & Mishel, L. (2005) *Advantage None. Re-examining Hoxby's Findings of Charter School Benefits*. Washington, DC: The Economic Policy Institute. (EPE).
- Sanders, L. (2003, March 16). *Medicine's progress, one setback at a time*. New York Times Magazine. 29-31.
- Schneider, J. (1998, Summer). University training of school leaders isn't the only option. *The AASA Professor*, 22(1), 7-8.
- U. S. Department of Education (1999). *The Digest of Education Statistics 1999*. Washington, DC: OERI/NCES, Author.
- USA Today. 11/19/01. Author. *Data on successful firms "faked" but still valid*. D. Lieberman.
- Van Meter, E. & Murphy, J. (1997, July). *Using ISLLC standards to strengthen preparation programs in school administration*. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.
- Waters, T., Marzano, R. J., & McNulty, B. (2003). *Balanced Leadership: What 30 years of research tells us about the effect of leadership on student achievement*. (A working paper). Aurora, CO: MCREL Education Laboratory.
- Witziers, B., Bosker, R. J. & Kruger, M. L. (2003, August). Educational leadership and student achievement: The elusive search for an association. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39(3), 398-?????
- Word, E., Johnston, J., Bain, H., Fulton, D. B., Boyd-Zaharias, J., Achilles, C. M., Lintz, M. N., Folger, J & Breda, C. (1990). *Student Teacher Achievement Ratio (STAR). Tennessee's K-3 Class Size Study*. Report. Nashville, TN: Tennessee State Department of Education.

Appendix A: Goal for Ed Ad Performance and School Outcomes

Goal: Purposes for Ed Ad performance in school improvement are more than test scores. They include making schools student friendly and helping students achieve and improve in the ABCDE's, or ABECEDARIAN Compact. Outcomes should be measured (quantity) and judged for (quality) in reportable forms.

Focus (The ABCDE's)	Examples of Indicators
Academics, such as shown By test scores	Breadth and depth of knowledge; More subjects, higher scores.
Behavior and Discipline. ("Department"). In and Outside of school.	Records of attendance, tardies, truancy, discipline referral records. (Quantity and severity offenses.)
Citizenship and participation. (Engagement). PSOC.*	School activities, clubs, sports; community work, church, clubs.
Development: Self concept, Normal growth.	Portfolios, informed professional Judgments (IPJ). Inventories.
Economic sufficiency, Earning potential.	Work experience, Co-op programs; Advanced schooling, jobs, Full employment

*Psychological Sense of Community.

Appendix B

MINIMUM CRITERIA FOR POLICY, RESEARCH, PREPARATION PROGRAMS, ETC.

SHOULD EDUCATION POLICY (Etc.) BE BUILT ON LESS THAN THIS?

CAN YOU PROVIDE TWO (or more) GOOD QUALITY, REPLICABLE, INDEPENDENT, EMPIRICAL, RIGOROUS, OBJECTIVE, SYSTEMATIC STUDIES ON THE POSITIVE EFFECTS OF:

Fill in the blank: _____

ON SHORT-TERM AND ESPECIALLY ON LONG-TERM STUDENT OUTCOMES AS USUALLY MEASURED? (AND FOR Ed Ad PREPARATION: ON THE IMPROVEMENT OF PRACTITIONER PRACTICE)?