

The Preparation of Inclusive Social Justice Education Leaders

Davide Celoria

Abstract

This article is intended to spark dialogue and debate related to the preparation of inclusive social justice education leaders in a time of colorblindness. Drawing attention to the reductionist construction of the professional standards for educational leaders when it comes to preparing educational leaders who are ready to address and eliminate racism, inequalities, and injustices. And calls for the preparation of education leaders and aspiring principals who understand that all isms are endemic and engrained in the fiber of our society and are prepared to address and abolish marginalization in schools and promote places of learning that are inclusive and diverse through the use of three existing frameworks.

Keywords: *social justice, education leadership preparations, standards, inclusiveness*

This article is interested in countering exclusionary schooling that isolates those who are othered through inclusive education and inclusive schools as a form of transformation. Inclusion and inclusiveness in education is about the education of all students. In the words of Gloria Ladson-Billings, it is about “Justice...Just Justice” (AERA, 2015). Although inclusion and inclusive education in the literature most often refers to students with disabilities, it also refers to bilingual learners (most often referred to as English language learners) and other marginalized students. In keeping with Theoharis (2007), the definition of social justice leadership I use in writing this article “centers on addressing and eliminating marginalization in school...[through] inclusive schooling practices for students with disabilities, English language learners (bilingual learners), and other students traditionally segregated in schools...” (p.222). Inclusion is not about disability [or language status], nor is it about schools.

“Inclusion is about social justice. Inclusion demands that we ask, What kind of world do we want and how should we educate students for that world?” (Sapon-Shevin, 2003, p. 25).

In a review of the Professional Standards for Educational Leaders 2015 [formerly known as ISLLC Standards] (National Policy Board for Educational Administration, 2015) and the Administrative Services Preliminary and Clear Induction Credential Program Standards (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/standards/SVC-Admin-Handbook-2014.pdf>) I was struck by what was included and what was excluded, as well as the language used and not used in the writing of these standards documents. Making me pause to ask whether or not the language used in these two sets of standards reflect racism in an era of colorblindness (Alexander, 2012; Ullucci & Battey, 2011)? And to ask, What kind of social justice leaders do we want leading our schools and how should we prepare these leaders? In considering these questions what hit me was the inadequacy of these standards—particularly when it comes to inclusiveness and social justice education leadership, due to the vagueness of the language used. An inadequacy that makes clear the need to critically review these two sets of standards from a social justice perspective. What was also striking is the need to rethink how we prepare social justice principals and other social justice educational leaders within the context of programs aligned with either set of standards.

Although educational leadership is widely acknowledged as complex and challenging (Bush, 2009; Schmidt, 2010; Shields, 2004) and professors of education prepare thousands of aspiring school leaders every year there is not a plethora of scholarship in the area of administration preparation (Capper, Theoharis, & Sebastian, 2006). Even more startling is the lack of teaching about historically underserved, underrepresented, and marginalized populations (Pazey & Cole, 2012). “According to the U.S. Census Bureau, in 2014 there were more than 20 million children under 5 years old living in the U.S., and 50.2 percent of them were minorities”(U.S. News, July 6, 2015).

Additionally, the inadequate attention paid to the possible negative and perhaps unintended impact of standards-based educational leadership preparation programs, especially when it comes to inclusiveness and social justice, is another area of concern. Although the stated purpose of the ISLCC standards was to reshape

the profession through a systematic set of curriculum, content, and performance standards (Jackson & Kelley, 2002; Murphy, 2005) this is not the same as preparing social justice educational leaders. English (2006) argued that as opposed to raising the bar for preparing educational leaders, standards have lowered them, are reductionist, and serve as a form of deprofessionalization. Celoria and Hemphill (2014) raise concerns about educational leadership preparation programs that are top down, rely on experts imparting knowledge, and employ an overly articulated curricula, or list of discrete skill sets—and argue the value of using a constructivist process-oriented focus when preparing educational leaders. In a similar manner, Brown (2004) makes a case for process-oriented models that create the space for educational leaders to engage in the “...examination of ontological and epistemological assumptions, values and beliefs, context and experience, and competing world views ...[to be] better equipped to work with and guide others in translating their perspectives, perceptions, and goals into agendas for social change” (p. 99).

So what can be done to better prepare aspiring educational leaders in university credential programs that are aligned with either the Professional Standards for Educational Leaders 2015 (National Policy Board for Educational Administration, 2015) or the Administrative Services Preliminary and Clear Induction Credential Program Standards (<http://www.etc.ca.gov/educator-prep/standards/SVC-Admin-Handbook-2014.pdf>)? Becomes a critical question if we want inclusive social justice school leaders who refuse to use colorblindness as a form of racism and marginalization, and who are well positioned to enact and support socially just strategies and practices, including inclusive schooling. However, before answering this question, we need to consider what is included and what is excluded in these two sets of standards. It is also important to take into account the extant body of literature related to social justice leadership, transformative leadership, critical race theory and critical social theory, and principal preparation for their potential contribution to the evaluation and rethinking of programs for aspiring social justice principals and other educational leaders. It is also essential that we “...recognize how our own habitus restricts equity and social justice and then to find ways to overcome these constraints. To do this, we must learn to acknowledge and validate difference without reifying it or pathologizing it” (Shields, 2004, p.

113). Leading to a discussion of three potentially beneficial frameworks for advancing the preparation of principals as social justice leaders.

Looking at the Standards from a Social Justice, Equity and Inclusion Lens

Standards are not unique to education, “Almost every profession has its own professional set of rules or guidelines by which members of the professional association measure their conduct and performance” (Pazey & Cole, 2012, p. 252). Nonetheless, there are critics of standards based preparation programs, including English (2006) and Celoria & Hemphill (2014). Although I believe that the in-depth questioning of any particular set of standards in terms of correctness and value is a worthwhile endeavor—that is a topic for another paper. This article comprises a review of the 2015 Professional Standards for Educational Leaders and the Administrative Services Preliminary and Clear Induction Credential Program Standards (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/standards/SVC-Admin-Handbook-2014.pdf>) and tries to understand how these two sets of standards relate the preparation of social justice “...principals [and other educational leaders who] make issues of race, class, gender, [gender identity, language status], disability, sexual orientation, and other historically and currently marginalized conditions in the United States central to their advocacy, leadership practice, and vision” (Theoharis, 2007, p. 223). In writing this article it is my hope to spark critical reflection, dialogue, and debate.

In other words, to collectively consider how we might best prepare social justice educational leaders who advocate and actively engage in promoting inclusive schooling practices for students with disabilities, bilingual learners, and other students excluded, marginalized, and segregated in schools. Given educational leadership, and principal leadership in particular, are pivotal to creating and sustaining inclusive school practices that work for all students (Capper, Frattura, & Keys 2000; Riehl, 2000; Theoharis & Causton-Theoharis, 2008)

The broader context of equity and social justice. The Administrative Services Preliminary and Clear Induction Credential Program Standards (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator->

[prep/standards/SVC-Admin-Handbook-2014.pdf](#)) at best suggest an opening for the standards to be presented in a way that promotes *equity* and *social justice* through two very nebulous statements. The first statement references “a commitment to social justice and equity”:

Learning to Lead provides a coherent, comprehensive, and robust system of professional preparation and development that will cultivate and support school leaders who can facilitate powerful instruction for all students and ongoing school improvement through effective management practices, a commitment to social justice and equity, ethical behavior, professional courage, and personal integrity (p.11).

The second statements references “a fairer society, ...opportunity to fulfill...potential, and diversity”:

Equity and diversity are woven throughout the candidates' administrative services credential experiences, aiming to create a fairer society, where everyone can participate and have the opportunity to fulfill his/her potential (equity) and recognize individual as well as group differences, treating people as individuals, and placing positive value on diversity in the community and in the workforce (diversity) (p. 35).

Although the language used in these two passages suggests *equity*, *social justice*, and *creating a fairer society* as a consideration, they raised more questions than they answered. In particular—What is actually being said? What is actually meant? Why is the language so vague? What does fairer society, equity, diversity, and social justice mean to the authors? What is the intent? The use of vague language and undefined words is worth noting and reason for concern as there are numerous definitions of social justice in the literature and a lack of agreement (Blackmore, 2001; Blackmore, 2002; Bogotch, 2002; Furman & Gruenewald, 2004; Goldfarb & Grinberg, 2001; Theoharis & Brooks, 2012).

The same pattern and concern is reflected in how the Professional Standards for Educational Leaders 2015 (National Policy Board for Educational Administration, 2015) uses *equity* and *social justice*. According to this set of standards educational leaders need to

be able to, “Articulate, advocate, and cultivate core values that define the school’s culture and stress the imperative of child-centered education; high expectations and student support; *equity*, *inclusiveness*, and *social justice*; openness, caring, and trust; and continuous improvement” (p. 9). “Effective educational leaders strive for [and address] *equity of educational opportunity* and *culturally responsive practices* to promote each student’s academic success and well-being” (p. 11). Yet, nowhere in the professional standards is there an articulated definition of these terms.

From a positive perspective, the two documents reviewed make reference to *equity* and *social justice*, albeit the references are undefined and underdeveloped, which is reason for celebration and unease as these two words are often used widely by both liberals and conservatives to rationalize stances and strategies that are similar as well as polar opposite (Cambron-McCabe & McCarthy, 2005).

Inclusion, inclusive and inclusiveness. Looking for the use of *inclusion*, *inclusive*, and *inclusiveness* while reading the two set of standards resulted in five findings: 1) The word *inclusive* appears two times in the Professional Standards for Educational Leaders 2015 (National Policy Board for Educational Administration, 2015) and three times in the Administrative Services Preliminary and Clear Induction Credential Program Standards (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/standards/SVC-Admin-Handbook-2014.pdf>); 2) The word *inclusiveness* is used once in the Professional Standards for Educational Leaders 2015 (National Policy Board for Educational Administration, 2015); 3) These two sets of standards do not adequately address *inclusion*; 4) Neither of the two documents includes the words *inclusion*, *inclusive*, nor *inclusiveness* specifically related to special education or bilingual learners; and 5) The words *inclusion* and *inclusiveness* are not in either document.

In the 2015 Professional Standards for Educational Leaders *inclusive* is used in reference to Standard 1: Mission, Vision and Core Values (see prior section) and Standard 5: Community of Care for Students. “Effective educational leaders cultivate an inclusive, caring, and supportive school community that promotes the academic success and well-being of each student” (p. 13).

In the Administrative Services Preliminary and Clear Induction Credential Program Standards (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/standards/SVC-Admin->

Handbook-2014.pdf) *inclusive* is used twice in reference to the California Content Knowledge Expectations for Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Programs: “A-9. Examine and respond to equity issues related to race, diversity, and access, using inclusive practices” (p. 39); and “F-1. Defining an inclusive “school community” (p. 45). In addition, it is used once in the California Administrative Performance Expectations:

CAPE 7: Demonstrating Understanding of the School and Community Context, Including the Instructional Implications of Cultural/Linguistic, Socioeconomic, and Political Factors... The principal helps teachers and staff access community resources, including parents and other community members, to promote learning about students and families, and to promote culturally and linguistically inclusive instructional practices (p. 47).

Literature Review

Social Justice Educational Leadership

The literature on social justice leadership suggests three main limitations of *social justice* as a term: 1) It is too often used as buzzwords rather than a substantive core of education as a profession, “...it is little more than meaningless rhetoric” (Haas & Poyner, 2005, p. 61); 2) “...is a politically loaded term, subject to numerous interpretations (Shoho, Merchant, & Lugg, 2005. p. 48), and 3) Policy praxis that is not aimed on undoing what Freire & Macedo (1995) refer to as oppressive structures and practices.

This is not to say that social justice scholars within education have not explored the meaning, nature and implications of social justice for educational leadership programs. Many social justice scholars reason the social and moral responsibility of educational leaders to engage in critical reflection, exercise professional agency, and act in ways that make evident actions that value rather than marginalize, and result in more equitable and just schooling for students (Brown, 2004; Cambron-McCabe & McCarthy, 2005; Capper et al., 2006; Evans, 2007; Shields, 2004). Nonetheless, the need remains for theory, research, and practice to be interwoven to

support the type of schooling and society that is inclusive, and empowers rather than marginalizes. Too few scholars propose cutting edge, practical approaches that support the development and practice of truly transformative [inclusive social justice] leaders (Brown, 2004).

There is also a body of work on the dispositions and actions of school leaders who self-identify as working for social justice (Brown, 2004; Furman & Shields, 2005; Shields, 2004; Theoharis & Causton-Theoharis, 2008). Capper et al. (2006) identify a focus on dispositions, knowledge, and skills as a traditional way of categorizing leadership preparation. Citing Hafner (2004) as defining “dispositions to encompass three aspects: awareness, attitudes, and action. The nine students preparing for school leadership positions reported that the course ‘opened my eyes’, that they were made aware of issues such as deficit thinking, and that they learned new ideas for action” (p. 217). Arguing, “Students [of educational leadership] need time to think, reflect, assess, decide, and possibly change...[as they are exposed] to information and ideas that...stretch beyond their comfort zones, a critique and transformation of hegemonic structures and ideologies...” (Brown, 2004, p. 78). If we are going to prepare educational leaders who possess a critical consciousness and deep understanding about class structures, power relationships, White privilege, misogyny, poverty, and heterosexism (Capper et al., 2006).

Through a comprehensive review of the literature three areas of scholarly work surfaced as being particularly useful in considering how professors and leaders of principal preparation programs might use the standards outlined in the Professional Standards for Educational Leaders 2015 (National Policy Board for Educational Administration, 2015) and the Administrative Services Preliminary and Clear Induction Credential Program Standards (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/standards/SVC-Admin-Handbook-2014.pdf>) while maintaining and supporting an *equity*, *inclusiveness*, and *social justice* agenda. The areas are: 1) Transformational and Transformative educational leadership, 2) Critical Race Theory and Critical Social Theory, and 3) The Preparation of social justice principals and educational leaders.

Transformational and Transformative Educational Leadership

According to Dugan (2012), “ it is not uncommon for some leaders to effect change by encouraging instructional leadership, distributed leadership, or transformational leadership models to support effective instruction... to explicitly address inequities...lead[ing] for social justice” (p. 122). Although some confusion exists between transformational leadership and transformative leadership—Shields (2010) establishes a clear distinction between the two. In transformative leadership questions of justice, equity, and democracy are key, as is a critique of inequitable and unjust practices with an eye on both greater individual achievement and a better life within society. Placing educational leadership in the wider context within which it is embedded.

Furman (2012) identified a lack of specifics in the literature when it comes to the preparation of educational leaders and the actual practice and capacities needed for inclusive social justice leadership in schools. Maintaining most current social justice educational leadership preparation programs tend to emphasize critical consciousness, what the former ISSLC standards refer to as dispositions, also referred to in the literature as beliefs and values; and do not adequately prepare leaders to have the requisite knowledge and skill needed to make social justice and equity-based changes in schools. Suggesting the need to expand the pedagogical approaches used so that we prepare “...transformative educational leaders [who] foster the academic success of all children through engaging in moral dialogue that facilitates the development of strong relationships, supplants pathologizing silences, challenges existing beliefs and practices, and grounds educational leadership in some criteria for social justice” (Shields, p. 109).

Transformative leadership then, as detailed in the literature, is about making societal change, while reformative educational leadership aims create school communities in which educators take seriously their responsibility for advancing equity, social justice, and quality of life through access and opportunity, respect for difference and diversity, advancement of knowledge and personal freedom along with accountability (Shields, 2012). Leaders who are actively involved in transformative learning, learning that tests the way people perceive themselves in their world. Aware that experiences and expectations are linked with cultural assumptions and presumptions (Brown, 2004).

In writing about transformative leadership, Shields (2004) talks about the use of dialogue and strong relationships to provide access and opportunity. Overcoming silence about all aspects of race, ethnicity, social class, marginalization, and exclusion to make certain we produce schools that are socially just and equitable. Genuine striving for societal change and social justice necessarily involves both critique and transformation through the process of identifying and examining injustices before they can be responded to through the processes of deep democracy (Furman & Shields, 2005). Furman (2012) believes, "...social justice leadership spans several dimensions, which serve as arenas for this leadership praxis—the personal, interpersonal, communal, systemic, and ecological" (p. 202).

Critical Race Theory and Critical Social Theory

Placing an emphasis on the need to examine the persistence of racism, and the othering of individuals and communities based on socioeconomic status, gender, gender identification, cultural, language status, disability, and sexual orientation is consistent with both Critical Race Theory and Critical Social Theory. Grounded in Critical Race Theory, Gloria Ladson-Billings and Tate IV (1995) theorized race and used it as an analytical tool, for a discussion of race and property and their intersection to "move beyond the boundaries of educational research literature to include arguments and new perspectives from law and the social sciences" (p. 11). Rooting the examination of social inequity and school inequity in three central propositions: 1) "Race continues to be a significant factor in determining inequity in the us"; 2) "U.S. society is based on property rights"; and 3) "The intersection of race and property creates an analytical tool through which we can understand social inequity (and, consequently, school inequity)" (p. 12). Central to these propositions is the understanding that "Racism is Endemic and Ingrained in American Life (p. 18).

Cherner, Howard & Delport (2015) present activism as core principal of Critical Race Theory

It is not enough to recognize racism, inequalities, or injustices...individuals must take actions to stop it, and this call is true in education as well... in our classroom, our course

materials, our students, and in ourselves (if we dare to look)...[and respond to] demographic imperatives by teaching [and leading] for equality and social justice, bringing democracy into our schools and classrooms, and being teacher [and leader] activists...(p. 8).

Similarly, in critical social theory, activism "...stands between the constituent base and the powerholders" working as an ally with the community, bringing constituents together to act politically and to advocate individually and collectively for themselves and other marginalized groups with the aim of shifting power (Brown, 2004, p. 86). It involves naming one's own reality through the use of chronicles, stories, counterstories, and revisionist histories... (Dixson & Rousseau, 2006). Using informed constructive discourse with people who have different experiences and beliefs, adult learners are positioned to examine how privilege, power, and dominance are expressed and reinforced (Brown, 2006). Evans (2007) maintains critical approaches to educational leadership provide valuable alternatives for individuals interested in pursuing issues of social justice through emancipatory practices, and critical leadership strategies. Putting issues of race, culture, ethnicity, gender identity, gender, sexual orientation, and disabled students at the heart of democracy. It is about action working with theory:

However, to date, the literature offers few specifics about the actual practice of social justice leadership in K-12 schools and the capacities needed by school leaders to engage in this practice. In turn, the literature on leadership preparation is thin in regard to explicit methods for developing these capacities (Furman, 2012, p. 192).

Leadership within the context of Critical Race Theory involves deliberate reflection and consideration of the moral and ethical consequences of schooling on students. "Self-reflection adds the dimension of deep examination of personal and professional belief systems, as well as the deliberate consideration of the ethical implications and effects of practices (Brown, 2004, p. 89)."

The Preparation of Social Justice Principals and Educational Leaders

In the broad sense there is a need for principal and leadership preparation programs to support candidates in developing the disposition, knowledge, and skills necessary to address inequities and marginalization related to class, language, gender, race, ethnicity, gender identity, disability, and economic status. In programs that are primarily driven by either the Professional Standards for Educational Leaders 2015 (National Policy Board for Educational Administration, 2015) or the Administrative Services Preliminary and Clear Induction Credential Program Standards (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/standards/SVC-Admin-Handbook-2014.pdf>) there is a risk of being subsumed into a trend towards colorblindness, a form of racism. Given the standards use of vague language and a lack of clarity and agreement when it comes to inclusiveness, equity, social justice, democracy, and culturally responsive practices. Additionally, the standards do not make any reference to White privilege.

Preparing educational leaders who are well prepared to serve as activists and advocates for change based on their awareness of explicit and implicit forms of oppression and marginalization within schools is essential. Prepared well "...school leaders [will serve as] the architects and builders of a new social order wherein traditionally disadvantaged peoples have the same educational opportunities, and by extension social opportunities, as traditionally advantaged people" (Jean-Marie, Normore, & Brooks; 2009, p. 4). It takes more than standards to accomplish this—it takes a moral stance, knowledge and a change in praxis.

The preparation of social justice educational leaders can be thick or thin. Thick when preparation programs provide a holistic, active, emancipatory, and inclusive curriculum and pedagogical approach that encourages depth involving both societal change and political action. In contrast, preparation programs are thin when the language is unclear and undefined, and does not lead to action and activism. The following three frameworks are useful when it comes to conceptualizing and thinking about our work at the programmatic, and instructional levels in a manner that is thick: 1) Furman (2012), 2) Brown (2004), and 3) Capper, Theoharis, & Sebastian (2006).

Social Justice as Praxis

The conceptual framework for leadership preparation developed by Furman (2012) is organized around three central concepts of social justice leadership: 1) Praxis involves both reflection and action in a Freireian sense; 2) Spans several dimensions of leadership praxis—the personal, interpersonal, communal, systemic, and ecological; 3) Each dimensions involve certain capacities on the part of the school leader, while all of the dimensions involve reflection and action. Although as Furman (2012) stated, “These ideas are just beginning and intended to be suggestive of the possibilities of for program design” (p. 213). I found them extremely useful when reflecting on an existing program and preparing the Commission on Teacher Credentialing Preliminary Administrative Services Transition Document to ensure the program is both aligned with the newly approval standards and positioned to prepare educational leaders committed to *inclusiveness*, *equity*, and *social justice*.

Employing the work of Furman (2012) to evaluating the program in terms of “Social Justice Leadership as Praxis” was particularly beneficial in thinking through how the program does and does not promote both reflection and action at a programmatic level, course level, professional level, and personal level. Using critical reflection as a process to explore “values, assumptions, and biases in regard to race, class, language, sexual orientation, [gender identity,] and so on and in turn affects our leadership practice” (p. 205).

The seven dimensions of social justice leadership praxis identified by Furman (2012): Personal, Interpersonal, Communal, Systemic, Ecological, Reflection and Action offer considerable utility. That said, the programmatic suggestions provided are based on her review of the literature and while not exhaustive, they are practical and useful.

A Process-oriented Approach to Preparing Social Justice Educational Leader

Brown (2004) offers a process-oriented approach to preparing social justice educational leaders who are committed to equity using a weaving metaphor where the warp refers to the “theoretical underpinnings of a transformative framework... and the pedagogical strategies as the woof” (p. 78). The warp involves three theoretical interwoven perspectives—adult learning theory/development,

transformative learning theory/processes, and critical social theory that support the development of transformative leaders. “Through a wide array of roles, methods, and techniques, they ...take responsibility for growth by questioning the learner’s expectations and beliefs” (p. 87). Preparing transformative social justice leaders involves “a fundamental rethinking of content, delivery, and assessment. Offering courses that are fashioned and infused with critical reflective curricula and methodologies and stimulate students to go beyond current behavioral boundaries ...” (p. 88).

Given Brown’s definition of a transformative educational leader “...it makes sense for preparation programs to include approaches that enable participants to challenge their own assumptions, clarify and strengthen their own values, and work on aligning their own behaviors and practice with these beliefs, attitudes, and philosophies” (Brown, 2004, p. 81). As well as the need to replicate what Brown (2004), refers to as “alternative approaches” by attending to the skill and attitude development of aspiring social justice educational leaders through the use of cultural autobiographies, life histories, prejudice reduction workshops, cross-cultural interviews, educational plunges, diversity panels, reflective analysis journals, and activist assignments at the micro, mesa, and macro levels allowing students and professors to acquire and expand their ability to reflect, act, and be more successful.

Attending to What School Leaders Beliefs and Knowledge

Capper, Theoharis, & Sebastian (2006) proposed a worthwhile framework for conceptualizing the preparation of leaders for social justice that attends to “what school leaders must believe, know, and do to lead socially just schools that [they] refer to as critical consciousness, knowledge and skills” (p. 212). The framework proposes, “Educational leadership programs need to attend to critical consciousness, knowledge, and practical skills focused on social justice...requir[ing] curriculum, pedagogy, and assessment oriented toward social justice... (p. 212).

...all seven aspects of the framework must be attended to if preparation programs are to realize the full potential of leadership for social justice in their graduates. The two primary dimensions of the framework, that is the curriculum,

pedagogy, and assessment that preparation programs engage with in order to develop the critical consciousness, knowledge, and skills of future leaders for social justice synergetically inform each other. For example, the consciousness, knowledge, and skills that school leaders need to lead socially just schools must align with the curriculum, pedagogy, and assessment in preparation programs and vice versa. At the same time, this leadership development for social justice can only take place if professors intentionally create an atmosphere of emotional safety for social justice risk taking in their programs and in the courses and other learning experiences in those programs

Conclusion

Neither the Professional Standards for Educational Leaders 2015 (National Policy Board for Educational Administration, 2015) or the Administrative Services Preliminary and Clear Induction Credential Program Standards (<http://www.ctc.ca.gov/educator-prep/standards/SVC-Admin-Handbook-2014.pdf>) are adequate when it comes to the preparation of inclusive social justice educational leaders who are competent to confront the use of race, class, gender, gender identification, disability, sexual orientation, language status, and othering for purposes of exclusion, marginalization and oppression. What Furman (2012), Brown (2004), Capper, Theoharis, & Sebastian (2006) offer are three frameworks that encourages us to reimagine our work and can be useful as a guides in developing program frameworks and courses for the preparation of social justice educational leaders. They expand the focus of critical consciousness to include “disability, homophobia and heterosexism, and language diversity in children” and other historically and currently marginalized students (Capper, Theoharis, & Sebastian, 2006, p. 218).

Each framework presented provides an excellent starting point. As a whole the three frameworks go a long way in enabling principal preparation programs to expand the use of either set of standards in a socially just manner.

Discussion

In this paper I strategically position the conversation of inclusion and inclusiveness within a broader context of social justice leadership that includes class, language, gender, race, ethnicity, gender identity, sexual orientation, and other historically and currently marginalized students, families and staff. Centering on issues related to the preparation of social justice education leaders and aspiring principals who understand that all *isms* are endemic and engrained in the fiber of our society and are prepared to address and abolish marginalization in schools and promote places of learning that are inclusive and diverse. Preparing educational leaders to serve as change advocates based on their awareness of explicit and implicit forms of oppression and marginalization within schools, and who are committed to eradicating the predictive power of demographics calls for more than adherence to a set of standards.

The frameworks identified and discussed in this paper go beyond the standards and make a significant contribution to the preparation of social justice educational leaders.____Providing potentially excellent starting points to consider: 1) What kind of world do we want and how should we educate students for that world? 2) Whether or not the language used in these two sets of standards reflects colorblindness? 3) What kind of social justice leaders do we want leading our schools and how should we prepare these leaders? And 4) what would it take for our programs to prepare these educational leaders?

Each of the three frameworks serves as a resource and provides tools for the preparation of educational leaders equipped to confront injustice of every type as they struggle to create a world that rejects racism, and classism—indeed all forms of exclusion and oppression. Educating all students to become productive and responsible citizens in the 21st century world that is theirs. Individuals with critical media proficiency, who have the ability to deal with the increasingly complex information that assaults them on a multi-sensory level everyday. Able to examine and confront the persistence of racism, and the othering of individuals and communities based on socioeconomic status, gender, gender identity, cultural, language status, disability, and sexual orientation.

References

- Alexander, M. (2012). *The new Jim Crow: Mass incarceration in the age of colorblindness*. New York City, NY: The New Press.
- Barnes, C. (2012). Understanding the social model of disability. *Routledge handbook of disability studies*. Oxon and New York: Routledge.
- Blackmore, J. (2001). Leadership for socially just schooling: More substance and less style in high-risk, low-trust times?. *Jsl* 12-N2, 12, 198.
- Blackmore, J. (2002). Globalisation and the restructuring of higher education for new knowledge economies: New dangers or old habits troubling gender equity work in universities?. *Higher education quarterly*, 56(4), 419-441.
- Bogotch, I. E. (2002). Educational leadership and social justice: Practice into theory. *Journal of School Leadership*, 12(2), 138-156.
- Booth, T., Ainscow, M., Dyson, A. (2006). *Improving Schools, Developing Inclusion*. Routledge, London.
- Brantlinger, E. A. (Ed.). (2013). *Who benefits from special education?: Remediating (fixing) other people's children*. Oxon and New York: Routledge.
- Brown, K. M. (2004). Leadership for social justice and equity: Weaving a transformative framework and pedagogy. *Educational administration quarterly*, 40(1), 77-108.
- Brown, K. M. (2006). Leadership for social justice and equity: Evaluating a transformative framework and andragogy. *Educational administration quarterly*, 42(5), 700-745.
- Bush, T. (2009). Leadership development and school improvement: Contemporary issues in leadership development. *Educational Review*, 61(4), 375-389.
- California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (2015). *Administrative Services Preliminary and Clear Induction Credential Program Standards*.
- Cambron-McCabe, N., & McCarthy, M. M. (2005). Educating school leaders for social justice. *Educational Policy*, 19(1), 201-222.

- Capper, C. A., Frattura, E. M., & Keyes, M. W. (2000). Meeting the needs of students of all abilities: How leaders go beyond inclusion. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Capper, C. A., Green, T. L., Tillman, L., & Scheurich, J. J. (2013). Organizational theories and the development of leadership capacity for integrated, socially just schools. *Handbook of educational leadership for equity and diversity*, 62-82.
- Capper, C. A., Theoharis, G., & Sebastian, J. (2006). Toward a framework for preparing leaders for social justice. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 44(3), 209-224.
- Celoria, D., & Hemphill, D. (2014). Coaching from the coaches' perspective: a process-oriented focus. *International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching in Education*, 3(1), 72-85.
- Cherner, T. S., Howard, N., & Delpont, J. (2015). Social justice in education: Just another buzz word or a true daily struggle?. In *Catalyst: A Social Justice Forum* (Vol. 5, No. 1, p. 8).
- Christensen, C. A., & Dorn, S. (1997). Competing notions of social justice and contradictions in special education reform. *The Journal of Special Education*, 31(2), 181-198.
- Cooper, C. W. (2009). Performing cultural work in demographically changing schools: Implications for expanding transformative leadership frameworks. *Educational administration quarterly*.
- Dixson, A. D., & Rousseau, C. K. (2006). *Critical race theory in education: All God's children got a song*. Taylor & Francis.
- Dugan, T. (2012). Davis K-8 School: Utilizing Transformational Leadership to drive inclusive practice. *Advances in Educational Administration*, 14, 121-137.
- English, F. W. (2006). The unintended consequences of a standardized knowledge base in advancing educational leadership preparation. *Educational administration quarterly*, 42(3), 461-472.
- Evans, A. E. (2007). Horton, Highlander, and leadership education: Lessons for preparing educational leaders for social justice. *Journal of School Leadership*, 17(3), 250.
- Foster, W. (1986). *Paradigms and promises: New approaches to educational administration*. Amherst, New York: Prometheus Books.
- Freire, P., & Macedo, D. (1995). A dialogue: Culture, language, and race. *Harvard Educational Review*, 65(3), 377-403.

- Furman, G. (2012). Social justice leadership as praxis developing capacities through preparation programs. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 48(2), 191-229.
- Furman, G. C., & Gruenewald, D. A. (2004). Expanding the landscape of social justice: A critical ecological analysis. *Educational administration quarterly*, 40(1), 47-76.
- Furman, G. C., & Shields, C. M. (2005). How can educational leaders promote and support social justice and democratic community in schools. *A new agenda for research in educational leadership*, 119-137.
- Goldfarb, K. P., & Grinberg, J. (2001). Leadership for social justice: Authentic participation in the case of a community center in Caracas, Venezuela. *Jsl Vol 12-N2*, 12, 157.
- Haas, E., & Poyner, L. (2005). *The Sage handbook of educational leadership: Advances in theory, research and practice*.
- Imrie, R. (2004). Demystifying disability: a review of the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health. *Sociology of Health & Illness*, 26(3), 287-305.
- Jackson, B. L., & Kelley, C. (2002). Exceptional and innovative programs in educational leadership. *Educational administration quarterly*, 38(2), 192-212.
- Jean-Marie, G., Normore, A. H., & Brooks, J. S. (2009). Leadership for social justice: Preparing 21st century school leaders for a new social order. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, 4(1), 1-31.
- Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate IV, W. F. (2014). Toward a critical race theory of education. *Critical Race Theory in Education: All God's Children Got a Song*, 11.
- Murphy, J. (2005). Unpacking the foundations of ISLLC standards and addressing concerns in the academic community. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 41(1), 154-191.
- National Policy Board for Educational Administration (2015). *Professional Standards for Educational Leaders 2015*. Reston, VA: Author.
- Norwich, B. (2015). Inclusive education in Italy: a response to Anastasiou, Kauffman and Di Nuovo. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, (ahead-of-print), 1-4.
- Pazey, B. L., & Cole, H. A. (2013). The role of special education training in the development of socially just leaders building an

- equity consciousness in educational leadership programs. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 49(2), 243-271.
- Riehl, C. J. (2000). The principal's role in creating inclusive schools for diverse students: A review of normative, empirical, and critical literature on the practice of educational administration. *Review of educational research*, 70(1), 55-81.
- Sapon-Shevin, M. (2003). Inclusion: A matter of social justice. *Educational Leadership*, 61(2), 25-29.
- Schmidt, M. J. (2010). Is there a place for emotions within leadership preparation programmes?. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 48(5), 626-641.
- Shields, C. M. (2004). Dialogic leadership for social justice: Overcoming pathologies of silence. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 40(1), 109-132.
- Shields, C. M. (2010). Transformative leadership: Working for equity in diverse contexts. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 46(4), 558-589.
- Shields, C. M. (2012). *Transformative leadership in education: Equitable change in an uncertain and complex world*. Routledge.
- Shoho, A. R., Merchant, B. M., & Lugg, C. A. (2005). Seeking a common language. *The Sage handbook of educational leadership: Advances in theory, research, and practice*, 47.
- Theoharis, G. (2007). Social justice educational leaders and resistance: Toward a theory of social justice leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 43(2), 221-258.
- Theoharis, G., & Brooks, J. S. (Eds.). (2011). *What every principal needs to know to create equitable and excellent schools*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Theoharis, G., & Causton-Theoharis, J. N. (2008). Oppressors or emancipators: Critical dispositions for preparing inclusive school leaders. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 41(2), 230-246.
- Ullucci, K., & Battey, D. (2011). Exposing color blindness/grounding color consciousness challenges for teacher education. *Urban Education*, 46(6), 1195-1225.
- Wazwaz, N. (July 6, 2015). It's Official: The U.S. is Becoming a Minority-Majority Nation. *U.S. News and World Report*. Retrieved from

<http://www.usnews.com/news/articles/2015/07/06/its-official-the-us-is-becoming-a-minority-majority-nation>
White, R. E., & Cooper, K. (2012). Critical Leadership and Social Justice: Research, Policy and Educational Practice. Online Submission. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED534295.pdf>