

California Association of Professors of Educational Administration: Promoting Equity and Excellence in Educational Leader Preparation

Franca Dell' Olio

Loyola Marymount University

Albert Jones

California State University, Los Angeles

Susan Jindra

California State University, San Bernardino

Linda Jungwirth

Pepperdine University

Delores B. Lindsey

California State University, San Marcos

Randall B. Lindsey

California State University, Los Angeles

Philip Mirci

University of the Redlands

Linda Purrington

Pepperdine University

Thelma Moore-Steward

California State University, San Bernardino

Chris Thomas

University of San Francisco

Cheryl Ward

California State University, San Diego

Peg Winkelman

California State University, East Bay

Don Wise

California State University, Fresno

Educational Leadership and Administration: Teaching and Program Development

Volume 25, March 2014

ISSN 1532-0723 © 2014 California Association of Professors of Educational Administration

This feature article charts the efforts of the California Association of Professors of Educational Administration (CAPEA) to move from primarily a policy-driven organization that lacked a significant number of diverse members and perspectives to a values-driven organization committed to equity and cultural competency. This is a chronicle of the journey as the organization moved with a newfound direction, passion, and commitment in a quest for equity to be “the innovators of change in practice that is focused on creating social justice leaders for the future.” The article was developed during the spring and summer of 2013 by members of the Diversity, Equity, and Social Justice Committee of the California Association of Professors of Educational Administration.

The California Association of Professors of Educational Administration (CAPEA) views educational equity as a paradigm well beyond diversity and equal treatment. Equal access—even to rigorous, relevant, and culturally responsive curriculum and learning experiences—is not synonymous with equity in education. Equity in education is about equal outcomes. Equity-principled leaders ensure that all students are provided with the individual support they need to reach and exceed high levels of achievement and well-being. Equity-principled leaders assume responsibility and accountability for the success of all students in school and in preparation for their lives and futures. Equity-practicing leaders are instrumental to helping individuals and institutions make the paradigm shift from equality to equity through the promotion and support of policies and practices that are based on equity-principled beliefs, values, and assumptions.

The article begins with a brief history of CAPEA from its humble beginnings and lack of organizational focus, to various steps forwards and backwards in the direction of equity, to a newfound purpose and invigorated core. The evolution in the organization’s membership from a predominantly white male organization to a greater balance of gender and the increasing membership of professors of color helped CAPEA to begin to see itself differently and to work towards a vision of cultural competency.

Recent CAPEA conferences have been aligned with that vision. In 2011, a day-long preconference included visits to two elementary schools that were high poverty, high minority population, and high student achievement. The conference then opened with a keynote presentation by Tim Wise, nationally renowned speaker on racial and diversity issues. A panel of minority superintendents shared their views of leading culturally diverse organizations.

In Spring 2012, the CAPEA Conference theme was Leading Equity-Principled Communities of Practice with keynote speakers Etienne Wenger and Linda Lambert leading the membership to reflections on building a strong culture within the organization. In the fall of 2012, the CAPEA Conference theme was Equity and Excellence: Leading Change in Educational Policy. Dr. Ken Magdaleno was the keynoter focusing on “Developing Leadership for Equity” and provided some key principles in his powerful message.

Another recent addition to CAPEA conferences that has added an unexpected and surprising richness to our organization was the addition of doctoral poster sessions. A number of doctoral students from member institutions of CAPEA have presented their research, much of which focused on issues of diversity and equity. These young leaders have taught us lessons that we can only learn by their presence at our conferences.

We invite you to read about our journey in the following pages, learn from our successes and challenges, and share with us your own experiences and reflections. This is a journey worth taking.

CAPEA History with Diversity and Equity Issues

Our organization, the California Association of Professors of Educational Administration (CAPEA), was born in the same post-World War II environment of white male predominance as was the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration, the national organization to which CAPEA is loosely affiliated. CAPEA professors, as was true for professors across the nation, tended to be white men who had been principals and, often, superintendents from K-12 school districts. This predominance of white male school administrators continued during the 1950s and 1960s as those decades witnessed a great expansion of compulsory education throughout the U.S.

In the early years, CAPEA meetings tended to be quasi-social events, held twice yearly in Fresno, convening noon Friday and adjourning not later than noon Saturday. Participants in those early decades were two to three dozen faculty members drawn largely from California State University (CSU) campuses. Agendas focused on sharing course information and materials and, by the late 1970s, preparing for program changes required by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) (formerly the Commission on Teacher Preparation and Licensing). No elective officers served in the manner we have today. A chairman and a secretary/treasurer were genially recruited to fulfill those roles and little effort was made to have recorded minutes other than treasurer reports. Few sessions were devoted to professional development. Friday evenings for many of the men involved playing poker, eating snacks, and enjoying adult and soft drink beverages. Other professors self-organized into other group activities.

The professoriate of this early era seemed to be largely immune to the emergence of race and gender topics within the civil rights movement or from school desegregation advances that were occurring in California and across the country. But, demographic changes occurring in P-12 schools portended changes in faculty recruitment and curriculum that were on the horizon for members of the organization and those changes were not readily embraced by all members. In the mid and late 1970's programs across the state began to recruit and hire women, African American and Latino faculty members. Though the number of women and faculty of color were modest, it became apparent that change was afoot, if not fully embraced.

By the mid 1980s CAPEA's changing demography of faculty was accompanied by a broadening of membership to include parochial and private universities. At that time, private schools such as National University, LaVerne University, and Chapman University were recognized as growing entities impacting enrollments in the CSU system. The common theme being addressed by all credential providers were increased requirements by CCTC to address issues of diversity, staff development, and improved field experience opportunities for candidates. At that same time CAPEA began to formalize the organization through the election of officers, maintenance of formal meeting records, and informal lobbying with CCTC and the California legislature.

A series of watershed events occurred in the mid-1980s with the election of the first women presidents of CAPEA. First, Vera Pitts from CSU Hayward in 1984, Jodi Servatius, CSU Hayward in 1988, and then Rosemary Papalewis from CSU Fresno in 1989 and again 1990. Not only were these women eminently qualified for leadership of CAPEA, they came to symbolize the demographic changes occurring in the professoriate. A growing number of faculty members entered the education administration classrooms from the field of research and professional development rather than the offices of retired superintendents or principals.

“Diversity” became a term of roundtable discussions and topics of faculty research presentations at the two-a-year CAPEA Conferences. As urban-rural k-12 inequity issues came into sharper view through the broader research field, however, we experienced a continuous struggle in the organization by factions who wanted to discuss or who wanted to minimize diversity and equity issues at our universities and in our own organization.

In the early 1990s, the term ‘cultural proficiency’ was introduced to the organization by 1992 CAPEA President, Randall Lindsey, from California State University, Los Angeles. The conceptual framework was presented as a lens to view the work of diversity in the programs’ coursework and field experiences as well as a way for the organization to examine its policies and practices about equity and access. Following Randy’s leadership, other Presidents, Jim Parker (1993), Linda Lambert (1994), and Rita King (1995) continued to challenge the organization to move forward with diversity and equity as a focus of planning conversations, conference presentations, and journal articles. Gradually, however, the topic was moved to the margins of organization agendas for a decade or more.

As PreK-12 teachers and leaders in our programs struggled with the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) under President George W. Bush, called No Child Left Behind (2001), education administration professors faced our own struggles with how to prepare emerging leaders to meet the new Interstate School Leader Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) and California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) leadership standards. CAPEA partnered with the Association of California School Administrators (ACSA) and the California School Leadership Academy (CSLA) to work with CCTC to identify what those standards might be. CAPEA members serving on the CCTC “Design Team” worked hard to ensure that diversity, inclusion, and serving all families and communities were part of the new standards.

In 2008, under the leadership of Gary Kinsey (Cal Poly Pomona) as President, the question of elevating “diversity” to a committee level surfaced for CAPEA Executive Council. With President Kinsey’s advocacy, CAPEA/ACSA Committee member, Franca Dell’Olio, from Loyola Marymont University, wrote a Position Paper to create an Equity, Diversity, and Achievement for Social Justice Chair Position on the Executive Board of the CAPEA organization. After a couple of years of discussion and design, CAPEA President 2010, Wayne Padover from National University established the Diversity Committee and appointed Delores Lindsey as the Committee’s first Chair. President Padover set forth “action goals” from each committee and the Diversity Committee, chaired by Delores Lindsey from California State University, San Marcos, established the following goals for the first two years:

- focus on membership training, support, recruitment & retention, internal capacity building, internal leadership, data collection, and communication & relationships as they relate to equity, diversity and achievement for social justice;
- identify “diversity” categories for membership form;
- design a new membership form using identification categories;
- establish a goal for membership increase in conjunction with Membership Committee;
- make personal contact with prospective members to recruit specifically for areas of diversity reflected in the overview statement;

- work closely with the Membership Committee Chair to communicate strategies and monitor progress of membership data;
- work closely with Conference Committee Chair to ensure continued CAPEA Conference focus on diversity and social justice;
- present and/or recruit members to present Conference presentations on current research, instructional strategies, and performance assessment tools for advocating for and addressing social justice and diversity.

As a result of the efforts of the Diversity Committees (2011-present under Linda Purrington, Pepperdine University) and the leadership of Dr. Padover and the following CAPEA presidents, Don Wise (2011) from Cal State Fresno, and Chris Thomas (2012) from University of San Francisco, equity and social justice became the focus and major topics of interest at the Fall and Spring Conferences from 2009 through 2012. President Franca Dell’Olio (2013) and Diversity Chair Linda Purrington have continued with the following goals for the committee and the organization:

- focus on membership training, support, recruitment & retention, internal capacity building, internal leadership, data collection, and communication & relationships as they relate to equity, diversity and achievement for social justice;
- identify “diversity” categories for membership form;
- design a new membership form using identification categories;
- establish a goal for membership increase in conjunction with Membership Committee;
- make personal contact with prospective members to recruit specifically for areas of diversity reflected in the overview statement;
- work closely with the Membership Committee Chair to communicate strategies and monitor progress of membership data;
- work closely with Conference Committee Chair to ensure continued CAPEA Conference focus on diversity and social justice.

CAPEA Fall 2011 Conference Leading for Equity and Excellence in Leadership Preparation

One of the main goals of the CAPEA Fall 2011 conference was to highlight exemplary superintendents, principals, districts and schools leading the way in the area of social justice and equity. To this end, educational administration professors from across the state kicked off the conference by visiting two high performing, high poverty and high minority schools in San Diego Unified and later heard from a panel of superintendents leading the charge in this area.

The two schools visited were Edison Elementary and Garfield Elementary, both with 100% of their students living at or below the poverty line as defined by the National Free and Reduce Lunch Program (United States Department of Agriculture, 2011). Edison’s student population was nearly 100% Latino. Garfield had a more diverse population in which 64% of the students were Hispanic, 15% were African American and 13% were Caucasian. The site also had 14% of its students qualifying for Special Education. At both schools more than half the students were second language learners. Yet in spite of language barriers and poverty,

students at both schools were able to exceed district and state results in the areas of English language arts and mathematics as delineated in Tables 1 and 2.

Table 1
Edison Elementary School State Standards Testing Performance Data Compared to District and State Data

California Standards Tests (CST): English Language Arts and Mathematics

Percentage of students achieving at the proficient or advanced levels (meeting or exceeding state standards):

Gr	English Language Arts									Mathematics								
	School			District			State			School			District			State		
	09-10	10-11	11-12	09-10	10-11	11-12	09-10	10-11	11-12	09-10	10-11	11-12	09-10	10-11	11-12	09-10	10-11	11-12
2	70.0	68.5	64.4	57.0	58.9	59.8	53	56	58	75.0	56.2	67.3	66.1	66.3	64.8	62	66	64
3	42.7	55.1	53.4	46.8	49.4	52.5	44	46	48	85.5	74.4	80.0	67.8	69.0	72.7	65	68	69
4	67.1	78.9	78.2	67.4	68.2	68.9	63	64	67	78.9	89.9	81.8	71.0	71.6	70.5	68	71	71
5	67.1	68.6	67.1	63.2	65.8	67.0	58	59	63	81.2	76.4	87.0	62.7	65.0	65.7	60	63	65

Table 2
Garfield Elementary School State Standards Testing Performance Data Compared to District and State Data

California Standards Tests (CST): English Language Arts and Mathematics

Percentage of students achieving at the proficient or advanced levels (meeting or exceeding state standards):

Gr	English Language Arts									Mathematics								
	School			District			State			School			District			State		
	09-10	10-11	11-12	09-10	10-11	11-12	09-10	10-11	11-12	09-10	10-11	11-12	09-10	10-11	11-12	09-10	10-11	11-12
2	44.4	64.8	41.4	57.0	58.9	59.8	53	56	58	52.4	76.1	48.3	66.1	66.3	64.8	62	66	64
3	38.9	43.1	50.9	46.8	49.4	52.5	44	46	48	78.8	63.5	70.7	67.8	69.0	72.7	65	68	69
4	80.6	72.7	76.6	67.4	68.2	68.9	63	64	67	82.3	83.6	72.9	71.0	71.6	70.5	68	71	71
5	80.0	85.2	73.7	63.2	65.8	67.0	58	59	63	85.5	87.3	74.5	62.7	65.0	65.7	60	63	65

At the time of the conference, the principal at Garfield was just beginning his third year there. Garfield had entered Program Improvement (California Department of Education Accountability Performance Index, 2013). Garfield entered Program Improvement in 2003-04 and the 2008 CST data showed only 35% passing ELA and 40% passing Math indicating that the school had made little progress in five years. In spring of 2009, the statewide rank for the school was a 1 (Garfield, School Accountability Report Card, 2010).

The Garfield principal received his undergraduate degree from Wheaton College and his master's from Harvard University. He entered teaching through Teach for America [TFA] (Teach for America, 2011) and taught for four years before becoming a vice principal for six years at three different sites, working with the same principal. Garfield's principal's philosophy was that every child regardless of their background deserved quality *first* instruction, targeted intervention to fill learning gaps, and support to meet their home environment needs. He believed in rigorous *first* teaching scaffolded to provide support with learning gaps. He also believed it was his job to ensure Garfield students were matriculating

into middle schools with a track record of successfully meeting the needs of kids like his. He spent most of his time in class rooms, meeting with teachers in small groups; collaboratively developing unit plans; acquiring resources for his teachers; and finding ways for them to meet, plan and make decisions based on student data.

The Edison principal received her undergraduate degree from the University of San Diego and her masters at San Diego State University. She had been a vice principal for three years before becoming principal at Edison. She had been there for three years at the time of our visit, taking the helm in 2008. She, like the Garfield principal, was an instructional leader who placed a strong emphasis on strengthening teacher practice and maximizing student achievement. She believed her role was vital in supporting all teachers, building on their strengths and providing daily feedback as a result of instructional visits. The belief at Edison was that they are in a constant state of development and change. As was the case with the Garfield principal, she was well versed in the analysis of data and attended professional learning community and data meetings with the sole purpose of providing resources and support. She worked collaboratively with a team of teachers within professional learning communities, thereby establishing a culture of collective problem solving, shared responsibility and mutual ownership of student achievement. The Principal believed that she was responsible for ensuring that all students were meeting their goals and reaching proficiency. She was highly aware of the power of collaboration and shared decision-making and used these combined factors to make decisions on behalf of the wellbeing of the students at Edison. Finally, aligned with the findings of Ron Edmonds (1979), the Principal protected instructional minutes and eliminated all barriers that would have served as a potential challenge to teaching and learning. She understood that for children in poverty the time spent in school would have the most direct impact on their academic success.

One of the premier conference events was the Superintendents' Panel discussion in which urban district leaders, leading the way in equity and access, engaged in a set of reflective structured questions about building systems of equity and promoting social justice. The panel discussion focused on the tenacity of the district leaders and their vision and commitment to creating pathways and support systems for historically underperforming students to achieve success. In every case, the superintendents were the visionaries for their districts demanding equity, excellence, and building support from school board members through open dialogue, awareness building, and training. The superintendents were also creative about finding resources to support their programs and used student data, both hard and soft, to determine how to best build pathways. Each led their school boards to develop policies around equity and each developed partnerships with outside agencies to find ways to fund their programs. It was clear from their work that they dedicated their lives to ensuring equity and access for all students.

One such panel member was Chris Steinhauser, Superintendent of the Long Beach Unified School District. According to Chris, educating all children well is a matter of social justice. Superintendent Stienhauser adheres to Ron Edmonds (1982) renowned quote, "All children are eminently educable and that the behavior of the school is critical in determining the quality of that education." "We can whenever we choose, successfully teach all children whose schooling is of interest to us." (Edmonds, 1979, p. 20). Steinhauser who has led Long Beach Unified since 2002 leads the district by four goals, two of which are explicitly focused on the student:

- Goal 1: All students will attain proficiency in the core content areas
- Goal 2: All students will graduate from high school prepared for post-secondary and career options

Under each of these goals, are the objectives and the strategies to see each goal to realization. These were Steinhauser's goals when he attended the conference and will remain the district's goals through 2016 when the district will revisit its strategic plan (LBUSD, Strategic Plan, 2011). The goals are not just written on paper. They guide the superintendent's every decision (Steinhauser, 2011). So when Steinhauser saw that there were issues with black and brown students, specifically males, he started a Male Academy to bring black and brown kids together and develop their skills including becoming adult males. This academy started as a pilot on one high school campus and now is on every high school campus with over 700 students. Over 90% of these students go on to college. Moreover, the model has been replicated by more than a handful of districts in California. Steinhauser has developed over 40 pathways to the university through the districts' linked learning program. He has increased the number of high school graduates for his most at risk students and opened Advanced Placement classes to all who desire to take them. The Advance Placement courses, to date, have a 55% passing rate with Latino students as the largest ethnic group represented. Steinhauser and the Long Beach district have also opened every high school to every student through a school of choice option as long as there is room. He also continues to work with the Long Beach Community College so that district students can receive credit at both the college level and the district level for courses taken at City College. Steinhauser's work is strongly aligned to his belief in social justice, equity, and access for all children.

**CAPEA Fall 2011 Conference
Leading for Equity and Excellence in Leadership Preparation**

**Keynote Address
Tim Wise**

CAPEA was also pleased to welcome Tim Wise, noted anti-racist author, speaker, and educator as the keynote speaker for the 2011 CAPEA Fall 2011 Conference. Wise's works include such works as *White Like Me: Reflections on Race From a Privileged Son*, *Colorblind: The Rise of Post-Racial Politics and the Retreat from Racial Equity*, and *Dear White America: Letter to a New Minority*. In addition, Wise has provided numerous anti-racist trainings to school leaders throughout the United States around the issues of white privilege and systemic racism in America's schools. Following the conference, Wise was interviewed to give his insights into the role of CAPEA around issues of diversity and equity and what should be the next steps for CAPEA.

An Interview with Tim Wise

As an anti-racist speaker and writer, how should an organization like CAPEA (California Association of Professors of Educational Administration) which has historically seen itself as primarily as a policy advocacy group for its own membership, transition itself into an organization who sees its primary role to advance the cause of equity and social justice in California schools through the preparation of school leaders? What should be our initial actions? How can we create greater buy-in to this effort within our profession?

I think the first step is to acknowledge the centrality of equity and social justice to fulfilling even the most basic mission of the organization. Equity and social justice are key components of developing effective educational leadership in the 21st century. These are not secondary or tertiary matters, or luxuries to which an organization like CAPEA should only attend once other concerns are addressed. In a state whose students are already mostly children and young adults of color, and in which the pool of potential teachers is also mostly of color, remaining blind to the obstacles -- some formal, others informal -- that continue to produce unequal access to quality education and quality employment as educators, is a recipe for disaster. One cannot prepare effective school leaders in the 21st century -- even in Iowa or Vermont, let alone California -- without directly confronting the issues of race, class, language and culture, and the inequities that too often revolve around these identities. Students are not simply students: they are a complex mix of experiences, informed by their identities; so too with teachers and staff. Strong administrators have to not only know this, but create school environments that offer all within the school the opportunity to speak to concerns about inequity, to challenge policies, practices and procedures that maintain inequity, and to ultimately make equity and social justice central to the educational mission. I think buy-in comes by clearly and without apology making it clear to all within CAPEA that this **IS the work**. It is a matter of doing one's job better, more fully, and restoring to education that social mission that was always at its core, but updating it for a modern era in which multicultural democracy is not simply something we'd like to have, but something without which the nation can't survive.

Do you know of any examples of organizations such as CAPEA who have made this transition and what was the outcome of this transition?

It strikes me that many organizations are struggling with the same issues, some more effectively perhaps than others, but that none have fully transitioned to a full-on social justice paradigm. But this isn't cause for alarm, per se. Fact is, every institution in this society, to one degree or another, was established with inequity at its core. We have never lived up to the billing we offer ourselves, as a truly equal opportunity society. Schooling was established not to break down inequity but to serve existing power structures; so to the job market, criminal and civil justice systems, the military, you name it. So with that kind of history, it is hardly surprising that equity and social justice fail to come naturally to our institutions. They require a fundamental rethinking of our basic national narrative. As such, it takes time. But that doesn't mean that we can't make real progress in that direction, and that's what I see many folks -- including folks at CAPEA -- willing to do.

You have mentioned before in your writings and speeches that many times in anti-racism work that organizations have to be willing to allow for two competing ideas to be present to do the work fully. For example, in the preparation of school leaders we are well aware that many of the policies and practices a school leader will have to implement are socially unjust, yet failure to do so will place the school leader in jeopardy of loss of employment and/or legal action. How should we who are in the business of preparing schools leaders create learning opportunities from these sorts of conundrums? Furthermore, what knowledge and skills should we be equipping our students so they can face these conundrums?

I think we must confront the contradictions openly. The worst thing we do as a nation, sometimes, and as institutional leaders, is hide behind a veil of neutrality or innocence, and pretend that we are somehow not implicated in the injustices that take place around us. So if I don't deliberately set out to hurt you, I have no responsibility if and when you get hurt. So if the schools were created to maintain inequity and the power of those who have it, so be it, but hey that's not my fault because I didn't set them up like that...I'm just a teacher in the school, or a principal, or whatever. But that's a cop- out and everyone in the community being badly served by that school system knows it. It's like when a cop says "well, I don't racially profile. I mean, my colleagues do, but I'm one of the good ones, and I don't, so therefore I don't have to do anything to change the culture." Wrong. You do. I think you have to speak out about the contradictions, let the families you serve and the students and communities know that YOU know. That you see what they see. And that with their help and involvement, you're willing to do all that you can to change those dynamics. And yes, occasionally, you do have to be prepared to go to the mat, so to speak, for your principles. Better to do so with some support though, rather than alone. So I think of those courageous teachers in two of the Seattle high schools recently, who simply refused to administer state assessments that they felt failed to authentically assess their students. Not only should school site leaders and central office folks not have threatened their jobs, they should have applauded them for standing up for authentic education and the integrity of their students. If, ultimately, comfortable, short-term job security is more important to someone than whether or not students are treated equitably and justly, then that person should probably not be allowed within 50 yards of a school, let alone be running one.

At the conference presentation in 2011, you mentioned the work that the state of Washington has done around creating standards for school leaders around issues of social justice and anti-racism. What do you see as the successes and challenges of these efforts?

Well, on the one hand, the standards were never adopted because the legislature balked at the idea that teachers would be, in effect, screened by the criteria and assessment tool that had been developed by two of the multicultural educators' groups in the state. So, in that sense, the efforts failed.

And yet, what was still valuable about the process of developing an anti-racism, anti-bias rubric was the process of thinking through what such a thing should be assessing. How SHOULD we be evaluating teachers and administrators in the modern era? What are the skill sets we're looking for and how will we know when folks have attained them? So despite the fact that these criteria and rubrics weren't adopted, I think the folks in Washington learned a lot and have been able to teach others about how better to select with antiracism and social justice in mind, even if it's only voluntarily so, because of the squeamishness of the lawmakers.

In your writings and speeches, you mention often of the concept of Racism 2.0. Could you provide a definition of this and give examples of how this manifests itself in our schools? Furthermore, what do you see should be the strategies of school leadership programs in addressing Racism 2.0?

Racism 2.0, to me, refers to that kind of racism a person is manifesting when they will gladly allow for “exceptions to the rule” but still, by and large, believe that “the rule” (in terms of how they perceive racial, ethnic and cultural groups other than their own) still stands. In other words, the kind that allows for white folks to have “black friends,” or to love various non-white cultural traditions, but ultimately to still view most of those “others” as lesser than, as a compendium of stereotypes, as people who are different than one’s friend, or the “good ones” that we feel comfortable around. It’s what millions of white folks did when they pulled the lever for Barack Obama, in fact. Because according to surveys taken shortly before the 2008 election, a large percentage of white Democrats -- and persons who said they were going to vote for Obama -- nonetheless admitted to believing any number of anti-black stereotypes to be true. So they carved out an exception for the one person of color who made them comfortable, while still viewing the larger group in negative and decidedly more hostile terms.

In schools this plays out in the way that teachers and administrators sometimes end up playing off individuals and groups of color against one another. So, it might be by holding up one or two black or Latino kids as exemplars, while still having a pretty negative view of the larger black and brown communities from which they come. Or it might be by holding out certain other groups, like Asian Americans, as “model minorities,” in our schools, not recognizing how that process -- while seeming to be positive about a group of color, and thus not racist in the traditional, 1.0 sense -- actually is incredibly racist in the 2.0 sense. First, it serves to denigrate non-Asian minorities (and the history of “model minority” rhetoric is actually one in which this concept was created exactly for that purpose); and then secondly, it perpetuates a horribly one-dimensional understanding of Asian American folks as well, completely glossing over the racism and discrimination that Asian American and Pacific Islander kids and families experience, or their disproportionate poverty rates in places like California. So 2.0 SOUNDS less offensive to some, because it allows for some faint praise to be offered to non-white persons, but in the end, it is equally insidious or worse, and precisely because it operates behind that seemingly ecumenical cloak, and therefore is harder to pin down.

School leadership programs are encouraged and in many cases required to obtain both national and state accreditation. As a part of this process, the programs are asked to provide evidence of diversity in the makeup of the program’s faculty and student body, in the schools that we serve, and in our curriculum. What is your opinion of these efforts by accrediting agencies? How might these expectations be beneficial to the program? How might these expectations be lacking? How might a program work with the accrediting agency to move them from a diversity paradigm to an anti-racist and social justice paradigm or vice versa?

Well, I think evidence is good. It serves as a way to gauge our effectiveness, our progress and the depth of our commitments. But sadly, “evidence of diversity” often gets boiled down to a very simplistic, bean-counting exercise, devoid of depth or context. So if the numbers look fairly representative of the various communities being served by the schools, then we sometimes figure our work is done. And if the numbers don’t measure up, we think that the most important thing is the numbers. But in both cases, the bigger issue might be climate and leadership. On the one hand, even when the numbers seem indicative of real progress, that may mask a real deficiency of leadership, and a school climate in which we have diversity without equity, or even real discussions about equity and what it means, and how we maintain it. On the other hand, if we don’t have the “good numbers,” we might need to focus on climate

and leadership FIRST, precisely because problems in those two areas may be the reason for the lousy numbers. And no one is served by recruiting greater diversity only to place those folks who add to the diversity of an institution, into a setting where justice and equity are given short shrift. That's a set-up, and clearly not helpful. To move to a social justice and equity paradigm will require us to ask fundamental questions about the very purpose of education. What is the point? What is the mission? And how might that mission be different, depending on the population being served by education?

Paulo Freire in Pedagogy of the Oppressed writes, "It is only when the oppressed find the oppressor out and become in the organized struggle for their liberation that they begin to believe in themselves. This discovery cannot be purely intellectual but must involve action; nor can it be limited to mere activism, but must include serious reflection: only then will it be praxis." What do you see are the necessary elements to social justice leadership as praxis? How should CAPEA commit ourselves to this process?

By not always waiting around for some supposedly objective, data-driven piece of evidence to "prove" that equity and justice are important or somehow critical to the educational mission. I mean, I think that evidence is out there. But we find it by taking action, by having this conversation in the communities served by our schools. That's what Freire meant by praxis: acting and learning as complementary elements of the whole. To wait until all the evidence is clear to you is to invite paralysis. Likewise, to act but not be open to new learning, new evidence and the inputs of the marginalized would be equally destructive. It wouldn't be paralysis, but it would amount to colonialism. So educators should be opening the discussions about school governance, classroom management and core mission to the community. Not because the community is going to completely take over or make the decisions over the wishes of the principals or teachers, but because unless school leaders and the community make those decisions together, it isn't just equity and social justice that get compromised. Democracy itself is undermined.

CAPEA Spring 2012 Conference
Leading Equity-Principled Communities of Practice

Reflections on a Dialogue with Dr. Linda Lambert

With CAPEA's renewed and reinvigorated focus on leadership for social justice, a critical dialogue facilitated by one of the organization's former Presidents and a leading scholar-practitioner in the field of education, none other than Dr. Linda Lambert herself, was thought provoking, relevant, and inspiring. Dr. Lambert is a professor emeritus at California State University, Hayward. She began her career in the field of probation where, after a relatively short time, she would come to find that to better influence the lives of children one needed to help shape education. Subsequently, Dr. Lambert has served as a teacher leader; a site principal; a district and county professional development director; the coordinator of the Principals' Center and Leadership Academy at California State University, Hayward; the designer of major restructuring programs; an international consultant; a professor; and most recently, a world renowned novelist. Dr. Lambert's research and consultancy interests include, but are not limited to, leadership, leadership capacity, professional and organizational

development, and school and district restructuring. Some of her key leadership texts include: *The Constructivist Leader* (1995), *Who Will Save Our Schools: Teachers as Constructivist Leaders* (1997), *Building Leadership Capacity In Schools* (1998), and *Leadership Capacity For Lasting School Improvement* (2003).

One weekend in October 2012, Dr. Lambert delivered a keynote address at the annual conference of the California Association of Professors of Educational Administration entitled, *Constructivist Leadership and Equity* (Lambert, L. 2012). More than a mere address, Dr. Lambert led the participants down a path of self-discovery and reflection centered on values, beliefs, and professional practice, poignantly pivoting about the notion of constructivist leadership and equity. Dr. Lambert and participants explored the concept of shared purpose and the crucial link between teaching, leading and learning. The purpose for the day long conversation with Dr. Lambert was to examine how would **attention to leadership as “purposeful, reciprocal learning in community” create an equitable culture in which all could learn and could lead.**

Dr. Lambert’s vision of leadership is centered on an organizational approach that reflects the importance of engaging all stakeholders’ voices in improving schools. As described by Dr. Lambert, leadership is about learning together toward a shared purpose. Leadership is a form of learning that moves the community toward their shared purpose. Furthermore, this conscientious practice, that includes all voices in the dialogue to construct knowledge and meaning, then poises all constituencies for action that inextricably ties leadership to equity. This notion proposes that building leadership capacity through broad-based, skillful participation in the work of leadership invites all into the dialogue, process, and actions of leadership.

Dr. Lambert continued her conversation by inviting participants to examine their assumptions of leadership. To those ends, Dr. Lambert and conference attendees delved into topics exploring the right, responsibility and capability to lead; leadership as inherently reciprocal and equitable; leadership as a form of learning; and the inevitability that how leadership is defined will determine who will lead and how they will lead. In other words, how leadership is defined, what assumptions we hold about leadership, and how we situate them within the framework of leadership capacity, together provide a clear context for equity. Working from Linda’s definition that constructivist leadership is reciprocal, purposeful learning in community as our point of departure, we then began the journey to deconstruct the definition so as to ultimately construct newly shared knowledge and meaning of our own. Next examined was leadership as a form of learning, an autopoietic process of transformation. Dr. Lambert shared that autopoiesis, or self-making (self-organization), is a network pattern in which the function of each part is to participate equally (reciprocally) in the creation or transformation (learning) of other parts of the network.

As with any skillfully scaffolded lesson, the notion of emergence was introduced into the discussion. Linda explained that emergence is the way complex systems arise out of the interaction of simpler parts. Learning, leading, consciousness, school reform, societies, civilizations are all considered to be the result of emergence. She continued by tasking participants, albeit rhetorically, to figure out what parts or elements interact best to construct equitable systems.

Attention was then directed on three emergent properties in organizational change that when reciprocal, in that they influence and inform one another, lead to transformation:

relationships ↔structures↔ learning. We once again considered the definition of constructivist leadership by assigning meaning to each term used. *Reciprocal relationships* means being invested in and responsible for the learning of others while expecting others to assume similar responsibility for your own learning. *Purpose* carries the weight of sharing a vision, set of beliefs, and goals about schooling and student learning. *Learning* entails constructing meaning and knowledge together through dialogue, reflection, inquiry and action. A community is composed of a group of people who share common goals, aspirations for the future and who care about one another.

We concluded close to where we began – Constructivist leadership is “purposeful, reciprocal learning in community” where equity emerges from reciprocity, where learning is an autopoietic process from which leadership emerges, and where emergence arises from experiences that interact and create conditions greater than their sum of its parts (leadership capacity).

CAPEA was exuberant to have the opportunity to dialogue with one of their own and we thank Dr. Linda Lambert for spending the day in purposeful conversation with CAPEA Conference participants.

CAPEA Spring 2012 Conference
Leading Equity-Principled Communities of Practice
Reflections on a Conversation with Etienne Wenger

As professors of educational leadership and administration, CAPEA members paused to deepen our understanding of learning and communities of practice, and to dialogue about our role and responsibility in contributing to policy and instructional practice as we educate our current and future educational leaders. Etienne Wenger spoke with passion and conviction on the value of communities of practice for informing both policy and practice, and the implications for leading learning in the 21st century. This reflection on our conversation with Wenger will examine (a) a deeper understanding of the meaning of learning; (b) distinctions between horizontal and vertical dimensions of learning, and the importance of why the two should be integrated; (c) the meaning and characteristics of communities of practice; and (d) the implications for our work as CAPEA, professors of educational leadership and administration.

The Meaning of Learning

Wenger spoke of the notion of *meaningfulness* as a critical part of human learning. Meaningfulness, or making meaning, is a result of learning and is part of forming one’s identity through interactions and dialogue with others. We are, and learn, as social beings. Wenger shared how traditional education is grounded in isolated individual learning followed by testing that is based on a set curriculum generally created from a specific political perspective. Wenger shifted our thinking to learning within a community of practice, learning with others who have a shared identity, shared interests, and shared passions. What if...students directed their own learning based on their talents, interests, and passions, and engaged as communities of practices, interacting with experts relevant to those interest and passions? Wenger proposed that when we engage in learning within a community of shared interests and passions, we learn to answer the following questions: Where do we belong—*Who*

is our community? Who are we becoming—What is our identity? What are we doing—What is our practice? What is our experience—What is the meaning? Wenger believes that people who are contributions to a learning community “are passionate, engaged, suffer through passions, and are a wellspring of creativity.” We ask ourselves, “In our classrooms, when and where have our students participated in meaningful learning?”

Integrating Vertical and Horizontal Learning

Wenger noted how we are struggling with accountability in today’s educational systems and proposed that two opposing constructs—horizontal learning and vertical learning—might be integrated in order to provide the most meaningful learning for today’s students. Communities of practice—individuals sharing the same identity, interests, and passions—engage in horizontal learning as they construct meaning through dialogue, interact with experts, and hold each other accountable to the community’s standards of knowledge and skills. This, Wenger states, is known as horizontal learning and horizontal accountability. In horizontal systems, members of the community are equal as learners, and hold each other accountable for the knowledge and skills that bring meaning to their identity as a community of practice. Diversity and diverse perspectives are valued and enrich the learning of all members. Taylorism, on the other hand, is a vertical system of learning that has resulted in a set curriculum generally based on the dominant culture’s political perspectives and beliefs. These boundaries for learning and criteria for accountability can many times be meaningless to those who are doing the “learning.” Learning is in quotation marks because according to Wenger’s definition, learning requires the learner to create “meaning” in order to “learn.”

Wenger believes that horizontal and vertical learning and accountability are not exclusive of each other. He emphasized the need to make horizontal and vertical dimensions visible to each other, and to integrate the knowledge and perspectives from the *horizontal learning* of communities of practice with *vertical learning* from traditional organizational management. Vertical systems generally focus on what Wenger calls “currency,” a numbers game of money in business and student scores in education. In horizontal systems, the “currency” is much more difficult to measure, as the currency is understanding and meaningfulness generated through dialogue within communities of practice. By integrating horizontal and vertical learning and accountability, each informs the other. The outcomes are more effective policy and meaningful learning, providing the foundation for students’ education and preparation for thriving in today’s world. While there is a tension between vertical policy and horizontal experience, making distinctions in language allows us to negotiate the tensions and be more intentional and rigorous in our learning.

Communities of Practice

Wenger defined Communities of Practice as groups of people who share a concern, a set of problems, or a passion about a topic, and who deepen their knowledge and expertise in this area by interacting on an ongoing basis. Communities of practice are identified by three primary elements: (a) Those within the community of practice share a *common domain* of interest, commitment, and competence; (b) They build *strong relationships* and engage in dialogue, discussions, and activities to support each other and learn from one another; and (c)

Through shared experiences, stories, and problems solving, they build a history of *shared practice* that provides resources for the entire community of practice.

Implications for Our Work

Wenger cautioned against the danger in mediocrity, inviting us to cut across traditional boundaries as we engage in our communities of practice. Why? Because innovation happens at the boundaries of communities. Know that practice is local. Use the voice of practice to inform policy. Manage the tensions of the polarity of vertical and horizontal learning, knowing that communities of practice are a significant and valuable partner with management. Understand that what are important are people coming together, caring passionately about something, and creating meaning and deep learning.

Wenger's constructs of horizontal learning and communities of practice offer promise for bringing about *greater equity*—through valuing diversity within horizontal learning—and *greater quality*—by embracing meaningfulness—to our students' educational experiences. In *Outliers*, Malcolm Gladwell stated that to be good at something required 10,000 hours of practice. To practice something for 10,000 most likely requires interest. Through interest, we engage. Wenger charged us to ATTEND to student interest. In closing, Wenger posed this question for our reflections: “What if...“fun” was a requirement for learning?”

A more in-depth examination of communities of practice and implication for us as educators maybe explored in “A Commentary on Etienne Wenger’s Keynote Presentation at the 2012 California Association of Professors of Educational Administration (CAPEA) Conference” by Drs. Philip Mirci and Linda Jungwirth.

CAPEA Fall 2012 Conference

Equity and Excellence: Leading Change in Educational Policy

Reflections on a Conversation with Dr. Ken Magdaleno

Speaking on the topic *Developing Leadership for Equity*, Dr. Magdaleno, Associate Professor, California State University, Fresno, led a rich discussion with interactive activities that evoked reflection from participants on our values, practices and policies with our diverse student populations. Dr. Magdaleno shared his concern about the loss of Mexican American students from K-16, reminding us that less than 1% gain a doctorate. Dr. Magdaleno said that our indifference to such outcomes is the opposite of love, faith and affirmation of life. We must acknowledge the gap and do something about it. A quote from James Baldwin was employed to make his points: “*Not everything can be changed, but nothing can be changed until it is faced...*”

Dr. Magdaleno's teaching tool provided 3 categories of focus for the attendees: STOP DOING, KEEP DOING and START DOING (see Table 1). We focused on policy and practices at the most local level, within our spheres of influence. Selected responses included the following:

Dr. Magdaleno's Teaching Tool

Stop Doing	Keep Doing	Start Doing
Being indifferent!	Develop a PreK-16 pipeline.	Align assessments with learning goals and objectives.
Assuming that social Justice is a given; that it's found elsewhere.	Targeted recruitment for equity in representation of leaders.	Provide coherence-align and ground education doctoral program with roots of equity principles.
Backing up when students resist.		

Dr. Magdaleno commented, “Although change is slowly occurring....there is a belief system of deficit thinking that still permeates our schools and society”. He stressed the importance of addressing the “school to prison pipeline” issue and to keep working to increase the effectiveness of education leaders in addressing equity issues. Dr. Magdaleno shared that we must acknowledge and act upon the reality that issues of race, ethnicity, class and culture affect student learning and workforce attitudes.

Dr. Magdaleno reminded us of the words of Paulo Freire that we must act and reflect together. We were admonished to discontinue operating from a deficit model of looking at students and their vulnerabilities. Rather, we must operate from a lens that acknowledges their strengths and incorporates their lives and knowledge into our teaching.

In summary, a definition of social justice by Scott (as cited in Marshall, C. & Olivia, M., 2010) applies to Dr. Magdaleno’s presentation. It defines systemic equity “as the transformational ways in which systems and individuals habitually operate to ensure that every learner – in whatever learning environment that learner is found – has the greatest opportunity to learn enhanced by the resources and supports necessary to achieve competence, excellence, independence, responsibility, and self-sufficiency for school and life” (p. 262). We must develop leaders who will create such socially just systems and sites.

Doctoral Students Expand CAPEA’s Community of Practice

The incorporation of a doctoral poster session in CAPEA conferences came about for several important reasons. First and foremost, CAPEA needed to expand in two very important ways. Membership needed to be challenged by our current students so we could see the needs of leaders across the state and our students are also a reflection of the ever changing demographics of our teachers/leaders across the State. We believed that doctoral poster sessions would bring a much needed student voice to the conference and at the same time push members to grow in their understanding of the diverse leadership in schools today. These sessions have helped bring a new voice to our CAPEA conferences, allowed membership to provide students helpful feedback on their research, and most importantly helped CAPEA grow as an organization. Student voices provide a needed element to the

CAPEA conferences. Understanding who and what our students are doing statewide can only help the entire organization grow.

As CAPEA's commitment to equity and social justice gained momentum, it seemed only logical to recruit doctoral students to participate in conferences. Along with private institutions, the California State University system was graduating the first and second cohorts of scholar-practitioners who were charged to lead K-12 school improvement efforts throughout the state. The spring 2011 CAPEA conference invitation included a call for doctoral poster presentations. Six students had proposals accepted, two from CSU East Bay, two from CSU Fresno and two from San Diego State University. The poster session was scheduled as a late afternoon reception before dinner. CAPEA members gathered around the poster displays entering into serious, but supportive dialogues on a variety of important research areas. The symbiotic nature of these conversations was palpable. For instance, Sylvia Greenwood submitted the abstract below for a study titled Teaching for Whom: Culturally Responsive Pedagogy.

In public education, we are faced with three realities: (1) our teacher force is mostly White, (2) our student population is highly diverse and growing in children of color and (3) children of color are precisely the students most at risk of being caught on the negative end of the achievement gap. There is a need to integrate culturally responsive practices to engage and promote success for our increasingly diverse student population. There is a plethora of theoretical work on culturally responsive pedagogy and a lack of work on how to implement pedagogies. The purpose of the study is to examine the experiences of teachers attempting to implement culturally responsive practices. The methodology includes surveys, classroom observations, and dialogues. Culturally responsive pedagogy, critical race theory, and equity pedagogy formed the conceptual framework for this study. This study informs educational leaders on how to support teachers in using culturally responsive practices.

CAPEA members were intrigued by Sylvia's description of her "back door" approach to discussions of race and equity. As an African American principal of a predominately white faculty serving a predominately African American and Latino student population, she supported teachers in developing responsive teaching practices to increase their sense of efficacy before engaging them in conversations about institutional racism. Sylvia gained confidence as she answered questions and received positive feedback on her participatory action research. While Sylvia received this induction into the academy, these interactions also benefited CAPEA members as they considered a unique staff development approach to bridging the opportunity gap.

The other doctoral research topics for the conference including: Social Justice Leadership at a Charter School, Understanding Assessment Leadership in Schools, Intra-district Resource Allocation to Schools to Promote Equity, Factors Affecting the Attrition and Retention of Middle and High School Math Teachers, Administrator Development from Transactional to Transformational Under Federal and State Accountability Mandates, provided equally stimulating exchanges of ideas and resources. This inaugural event offered doctoral students an occasion to vet their research and CAPEA an opening to expand our understandings of as well as influences on the field of leadership for social justice.

The next CAPEA conference in fall of 2011 incorporated eight doctoral poster presentations: two from California State University at San Bernardino, one from Pepperdine University, and five from San Diego State University. Topics ranged from: African American Identity, Academic Persistence, and Career Aspirations in Education; Addressing Articulation Between High School and College Level English Courses; Perceptions, Motivations and Barriers of Earning a High School Diploma and Achieving Higher Education Among African American and Latino Adult Students; System-wide Change and Use of Data to Inform Instructional Practice; The Role of the District in Leading Systemic Reform; Special Education Teacher Leaders: Supports for Speech Language Pathologists; How Do Current Principal Evaluation Systems Impact Leadership Behaviors; and Teaching and Learning for the 21st Century: A Study of District Level Technology-focused Reform. CAPEA members had the opportunity to share in these research conversations and expand knowledge in the areas of cultural diversity, addressing needs of students of various backgrounds and leadership in schools.

The spring CAPEA 2012 conference in Sacramento elicited the largest group of doctoral students with six from California State University East Bay, one from Sacramento State University, one from Loyola Marymount University and one from CSU Fresno. The titles of dissertations represented a breadth and depth of research on leadership for social justice: The impact of administrative practices on freshman students' Knowledge of the Jeanne Clery Act; Finding Poetic Justice: How Teacher Collaboration and Communication Impact Elementary Math Instruction; The Perceptions of Secondary Students Overcoming Systemic Disciplinary Issues; An Exploration of How Teacher Collaboration Factors Impact Teacher Retention in an Urban High School Setting; The Impact of Coaching on New African American Female Principals; Algebra is a Civil Right: Increasing Achievement for African American Males in Algebra Through Coaching and Collaboration; Women Principals of Jewish Secular High Schools in Israel: Access and Progress; and The Effect of Leadership for Positive Behavior Intervention and Equity. One doctoral poster presentation titled, *Does 'Safe Schools Work' Really Create Safe Schools?* outlined a study evaluating a program designed to create a safe climate for Lesbian, Gay, Bi-sexual, Trans-gender, and Queer (LGBTQ), youth. This Safe Schools program included board policy, inclusive curriculum, teacher professional development, and student support groups. While issues of race, poverty, language, gender and religion have been consistently examined at CAPEA conferences, one member stated that this was the first time she recalled gender identity being brought to the table.

Though we only had the pleasure of hosting three doctoral presentations at our fall 2012 Conference (one from the University of San Francisco, and two from Pepperdine), the topics continued to provoke lively dialogue on Filipino American Educational Leaders in a Northern California K-12 Public School: Challenges and Opportunities; The Disparity in a Free Appropriate Public Education: Disadvantaged Families; and Access Through Advocacy:

Empowering Economically Disadvantaged Parents via Support and Resources. We see common threads woven throughout these doctoral presentations: cultural diversity in many different ways (ethnic, economic, special needs), leadership in 21st century schools, collaboration, social justice issues, and administrative and teacher practices.

Etienne Wenger (2009) emphasizes the importance of an organization to build a community of practice. "Communities of practice are groups of people who share a concern or a passion for something they do and learn how to do it better as they interact regularly" (p. 1). By encompassing doctoral student research within CAPEA we are building and expanding

our communities of practice. Wenger (2009) states that “ as a community of practice we take collective responsibility for managing the knowledge, providing a link between learning an performance, sharing and creating knowledge, and creating connections among people across the organization and geographical boundaries” (p. 3). If we are to model what will be expected of our future school leaders and serve our surrounding school districts and communities, it is incumbent upon us as a faculty to, not only build collaboration in our classrooms, but also to expand our practice into the districts, organizations, and communities we serve.

CAPEA Future Directions in Pursuit of Equity and Excellence in Educational Leadership Preparation

As this article has highlighted, CAPEA leadership has been working to change historic practices in the organization. The changes that have been highlighted were needed, but we as an organization cannot be content with these initial changes in our practice. Striving to be an organization that is focused on combining equity and excellence in leadership preparation is not easy. As a group of professors, we are a very privileged group of individuals in that we have a real opportunity to change how leaders are prepared across the state. We will become irrelevant to the field and the students we serve if we do not continue to change our practice. Issues of equity and social justice can no longer be an add-on to what we do, but should be embedded across all coursework and training. There are some who may challenge this notion, but every school leader across this state deals with issues of injustice and inequity (i.e. race, class, gender, sexuality, religion, and so on). It is our job as professors of education leadership to challenge our students and ourselves to figure out ways to confront and address issues of inequity that confront students and communities each and every day. CAPEA as organization must continue to push our membership to embed new practices and theories that challenge how we best train our school leaders for the future. CAPEA must diversify membership (i.e. race, class, gender, sexuality, religion), listen and learn from practitioners, and be the innovators of change in practice that is focused on creating social justice leaders for the future. We have to be proactive in changing the way we do business and can never be content with our practice in training school leaders. We are confident that our current leadership and the future leaders of CAPEA will set forth a plan that will continue to challenge the organization and its membership to develop social justice leaders across the state that not only are exceptional instructional leaders, but change agents that are equipped to challenge and address the issues of inequity for the children of California.

References

- California Department of Education Accountability Performance Index (2011). Overview of Accountably. Retrieved from <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ap/>
- CAPEA Fall Conference (2011). *Leading for Equity and Excellence in Leadership Preparation*
- Edmonds, R. (1982). Programs of school improvement. *Educational Leadership*, 40(3), 4-11.
- Edmonds, R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. *Educational Leadership*, 37(1), 15-24
- Gladwell, M. (2011). *Outliers: The story of success*. New York, NY: Little, Brown and Company.

- Lambert, L. (2012, October). *Constructivist Leadership and Equity*. Keynote address presented at the annual conference of the California Association of Professors of Educational Administration, Sacramento, CA.
- Long Beach Unified School (2011). Strategic Plan
- Marshall, C. & Olivia, M., (2010). *Leadership for social justice: Making revolutions in education*. (2nd Ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- San Diego Unified School District (2013). School Accountability Report Card for Edison Elementary School. Retrieved on June 10, 2013 from <http://www.sandi.net/cms/lib/CA01001235/Centricity/Domain/121/research/sarcs/2012-13/SARC089.pdf>
- San Diego Unified School District (2013) School Accountability Report Card for Garfield Elementary School. Retrieved on June 10, 2013 from <http://www.sandi.net/cms/lib/CA01001235/Centricity/Domain/121/research/sarcs/2012-13/SARC124.pdf>
- San Diego Unified School District (2011) School Accountability Report Card for Garfield Elementary School. Retrieved on June 10, 2013 from <http://www.sandi.net/cms/lib/CA01001235/Centricity/Domain/121/research/sarcs/2010-11/sarc361.pdf>
- Teach for America (2013). Teach for America Home Page. Retrieved from <http://www.teachforamerica.org/our-mission>.
- United States Department of Agriculture (2013). National school lunch program. Retrieved from <http://www.fns.usda.gov/cnd/lunch/>.
- Wenger, E. (2009). *Communities of practice: A brief introduction*. Retrieved from <http://www.ewenger.com/theory/> on October 16, 2012.
- Wenger, E. 1999. *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.