

A CLEAR AND PRESENT CHOICE: GLOBAL OR PROVINCIAL SCHOLAR?

This manuscript has been peer-reviewed, accepted, and endorsed by the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration (NCPEA) as a significant contribution to the scholarship and practice of school administration and K-12 education.



Jenny S. Tripses
Bradley University

Globalization provides rich opportunities to educational administration professors for teach and learn. This position paper explores globalization realities and role options for educational leadership professors: (1) to understand globalization implications for education, (2) collaborate at multiple levels with like minded educational experts, and (3) to engage in international program offerings. Educational leadership is an agent of reform on a global rather than national scale. Preparation and career-long development of school leaders throughout the world are integral to the well being of societies everywhere (English, Papa, Mullen, & Creighton, 2012). The American knowledge base on educational leadership is valued worldwide and American educational leadership scholars have rich opportunities to engage in processes of creating future school leaders capable of addressing challenges of globalization.

Background

There are rich opportunities for the American educational administration professorate to extend leadership knowledge, expertise, and experience acquired over the years to school leaders outside the United States. Benefits to American students and educational administration faculty include opportunities to gain broader perspectives of school leadership. “Faculty currently in leadership preparation programs can simply try to keep up with and respond to the rapid technological advances in the external environment, or they can be at the forefront in anticipating issues that need to be addressed in a thoughtful manner” (Hackmann & McCarthy, 2011, p. 284). The opportunity to thoughtfully consider ways to share knowledge and expertise of effective school leadership on a global scale and just as importantly, to learn from others awaits American educational leadership faculty.

In the United States, university-based school leader preparation programs no longer enjoy the relative monopoly experienced in the past. Other entities seek to prepare a proportion of future school leaders (English, et al, 2012; Hackmann & McCarthy, 2011). In some cases, those “competitors” operate outside of boundaries prescribed by both national and state accrediting bodies for school leadership programs. There is no doubt that conditions for educational leadership programs are changing at the local (national) level. However, opportunities exist in other venues internationally for educational leadership programs and professors who understand changing contexts.

Internationally, others are interested in learning more about leadership and effective administration (Edwards, 2007; Leithwood & Levin, 2008, Crow, Lumby & Pashiardis, 2008). Fortunately, there is an increasing body of evidence on what constitutes effective school leadership. Leithwood, Day, Sammons, Harris and Hopkins (2006) summarize evidence about effective school leadership.

With all this confusion about the concept of leadership in our environment, we might be persuaded to think that hard evidence about what is good or successful or effective leadership in education organizations is lacking – or at least contradictory – but we would be wrong. We actually know a great deal about the leadership behaviors, practices, or actions that are helpful in improving the impact of schools on the pupil outcomes that we value” (p. 8).

International organizations are coming to appreciate the key role of school leaders. Education ministers of countries participating in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) have emphasized the need to improve school leadership (Crow et al, 2008). Currently, scant attention has been given to international perspectives on school leadership development and preparation. As of 2008, three international professional organizations (the University Council for Educational Administration; the British Educational Leadership, Management, and Administrative Society; and the Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration and Management) have acknowledged the lack of sufficient international research on leadership development (Crow, et al, 2008). More recently, the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration (NCPEA) adopted guidelines for working with international programs in educational leadership (NCPEA News, 2014). Opportunities to

share leadership expertise and to learn from others who prepare and develop school leaders are abundant for those willing to seek them.

English et al (2012) persuasively argue that programming in educational administration is an instrument of reform” (p.ix). The remainder of their work develops further the case that leadership preparation programs need to reconsider content, delivery, and focus of leading for learning in ways that move away from 20th century emphasis on “managerial efficiency, bureaucratic expediency, and student and adult accountability” (p.x) towards school leadership focused on the core technology of education – teaching and learning. School leaders as chief executives and general managers are expected to have capacities to see the big picture. They should look beyond their own background, experience, and specialization to understand the various components of their organization or constituency, to think systematically about what is and is not working, and what needs to change to achieve ends that are beneficial to all (Gardner, 2008). Howard Gardner writes, “ The world will not be saved by high test scores” (Gardner in Mansilla, V. & Jackson, A. (2011, p. xi), which seems only more evident when stated so simply.

The term educational leadership rather than administration is used throughout this paper to express agreement with English et al. (2012) that school leadership preparation in the past focused primarily on bureaucratic administrative ideas based upon 20th century Industrial Age conceptualizations. The term leadership/development is used to acknowledge differences between methods used by American schools to prepare school leaders prior to assumption of actual leadership roles. Much of the rest of the world taps teachers to become school leaders and then provide training and support. In either case, whether school leaders are prepared prior to or during service, school leaders of the future must focus on the core technologies of their organizations. The core technology of schools is teaching and learning (Crow et al., 2008; English et al., 2012; Hackmann & McCarthy, 2011). School leaders of the future will also need to understand how those technologies are changing in rapidly shifting environments.

During the last century, American educational administration professors trained aspiring educational leaders to “manage an expanding educational enterprise that went from rural to suburban, small to large, organizationally simple to organizationally complex” (English, et al., 2012, p. viii). Given rapidly changing conditions of globalization where progress is always measured by and dependent upon education, American school leadership professors have the possibility to engage on a global scale. Recognizing cultural and organizational differences between American and schools in other parts of the world, the dynamics of human behavior and organization issues of power, respect, hierarchy, and acceptance require ongoing management and understanding (Leithwood and Levin, 2008; Crow et al, 2008). The core knowledge of leadership possessed by American educational administration professors is valued as one voice in global initiatives to strengthen schools and those who lead them.

Review of the Literature

Globalization and Internationalization

Friedman & Mandelbaum (2012) explain “the merger of globalization and the Information Technology (IT) revolution that coincided with the transition from the

twentieth to the twenty-first century is changing everything- every job, every industry, every service, every hierarchical institution....this merger has raised the level of skill a person needs to obtain and retain any good job, while at the same time increasing the global competition for every one of those jobs” (p. 121). Their prediction is as relevant for schools, school leadership preparation/development, and universities as it is for other segments of society. Figuring out effects upon a particular profession, in this case school leadership preparation/development, require understanding the fundamental restructuring that is occurring in global economies, communication, the environment, and so on.

Friedman & Mandelbaum (2012) go on to categorize workers of the future into creators and servers and they subdivide each of those two labels into creative or routine creators and creative or routine servers. The challenge for individuals charged to lead education and successfully navigate unforeseen forces of globalization is enormous. While American society does not necessarily hold educators in high regard, anyone who understands the challenges and complexities of school leadership can identify that the best school leaders and the professors who prepare them must strive to fit into the creative creator category.

Apple (2011) explains education’s role in internationalization this way:

It has become ever more clear that education cannot be understood without recognizing that nearly all educational policies and practices are strongly influenced by an increasingly integrated international economy that is subject to severe crisis..... all of these social and ideological dynamics and many more are now fundamentally restructuring what education does, how it is controlled, and who benefits from it throughout the world. (pp. 222-223)

Altbach & Knight (2007) make an important distinction between the interrelated terms internationalization and globalization. Globalization is the context of economic and academic trends of the 21st century. Internationalization includes the policies and practices undertaken by academic systems and institutions, including individuals as part of the global academic environment. Government, state, and local entities all have a vested interest in internationalization due to the increased interdependence whether in the realm of education, politics, business, or non-profits of globalization factors (Begalla, 2007).

Howard Gardner (2008), the American psychologist who revolutionized thinking about human intelligence, identified four unprecedented trends of globalization: (1) movement of capital and other market instrument around the globe, (2) movement of human beings across borders, (3) movement of information across cyberspace to anyone with access to a computer, and (4) movement of popular cultures. Gardner speculates that human beings are engaged in what may be the “ultimate, all-encompassing episode of globalization.” (p.16). He contends that education worldwide prepares students more for the world of the past rather than for the potential worlds of the future.

While university business programs may be more conscious of globalization than education programs because of the global nature of their work, much of the preparation in those disciplines focuses on learning skills. Educators should avoid making the mistakes made by some business programs of simply passing along technical knowledge acquired over the last century based upon the assumption that these skills are needed in other parts of the world. Gardner (2008) asserts, “We do not think deeply enough about the human qualities that we want to cultivate at the workplace, so that individuals of diverse

appearance and background can interact effectively with one another” (p. 17).

Several years later, Gardner identified important obstacles to global ways of thinking (Gardner foreword in Mansilla & Jackson, 2011). First, the vast majority of educators and policymakers concerned with education have not thought about the implications of education on global terms, nor have educators engaged in the necessary preparation for effective action. The second point Gardner makes is that a lack of deep motivation, whether individually or on a societal level, to understand how innovative education differs from past practice. At most, innovations are tolerated as long as they lead to adequate performance on traditional measures. Assessments are almost all geared for classical subject matter and rarely offer the means to assess the flexible, cooperative thinking required for interdisciplinary thought. Finally, Gardner identifies what he terms a “pernicious” and deep distrust towards education particularly in the United States. “Cosmopolitanism, internationalism, and globalism are often considered dangerous concepts or even “fighting words” (p. x). “What is needed more than ever is a laser-like focus on the kinds of human beings that we are raising and the kinds of societies—indeed, in a global era, the kind of world society— that we are fashioning” (p. xi). In other words, American and other educational leaders are likely “stuck” in mindsets of the past that do little to allow for effective engagement for the future. Educators engaged in school leadership preparation/development, then need to consciously shift thinking involved in planning future programs and delivery. Gardner poses a powerful question, “What kinds of school leaders do schools throughout the world need” (as cited in Mansilla & Jackson, 2011, p. xi). The answer will require simultaneous local and global consideration of conditions likely to be faced by future school leaders.

Educators can anticipate that effective schools for the future will abandon preoccupation with test scores that purport to improve schools, but actually measure classical subject matter. In fact, countries whose students score highest on international standardized test scores such as Finland, Korea, and Singapore devote no resources to examination systems prior to college entrance (Darling-Hammond, 2010). Effective or innovative schools of the future will turn instead to focus on the flexible, interdisciplinary thinking that global societies so desperately need.

American school leadership preparation faculty interested in providing coursework internationally must understand the limitations of the American educational system pk-12 through graduate school. Darling-Hammond (2010) contends that innovative reform efforts, even those proven to be successful, are rarely sustained in the United States due to various factors. Former Seattle teacher union leader, Roger Erskine has dubbed such endeavors as “random acts of innovation” (p. 265). The United States lacks and desperately needs a systemic approach to developing and distributing expert teachers and school leaders to improve schools. Such change will require a new policy environment that recognizes and encourages successful innovation.

There are different ways to describe the type of individuals societies need right now, and into the future. Noddings (2005) terms a global citizen as one “who can live and work effectively anywhere in the world. A global way of life would both describe and support the functioning of global citizenship” (p. 2-3). Global citizens then display affection, respect, care, curiosity, and concern with the well being of all human kind (McIntosh, 2005). Universal well-being, or progress towards it, includes the elimination of poverty, concern for the environment, and world peace (Noddings, 2005). Other

conceptions of global competency include the ability to work effectively in international settings; awareness and adaptability to diverse cultures, perceptions, and approaches; familiarity with the major currents of global change and the issues they raise; and capacity for effective communication across cultural and linguistic boundaries (Brustein, 2007). All students need to understand the worldwide circulation of ideas, products, fashions, media, ideologies, and human beings on a much deeper level than is currently included in most curriculums worldwide. These phenomena are real, powerful, and ubiquitous. School leaders coming up through the ranks today need preparation to tackle the range of pervasive problems from human conflict, climate change, poverty, the spread of disease, and the control of nuclear energy (Altbach & Knight, 2007).

In order to think and act differently, individuals and societies must come to grips with the attitudes, perceptions, indeed culture, that may inhibit learning. Hunter, White, & Godbey (2007) caution that while there may be some similarities in the definitions or conceptions of global competence, there is limited commonality and, in almost all cases, these definitions are American derived. Walker, Bridges, & Chan, 1996 (as cited in Crow et al., 2010) contend that preparation and development of educational leaders be constructed and delivered within knowledge and understanding that embrace both local and global considerations. Americans in general are not as familiar with other cultures and so have a need to intentionally develop more globally focused perspectives. College-bound students in other countries know far more about the wider world, including the United States, than American students. Stearns (2009) commented, "Our parochial gap is not only striking, but dangerous, depriving us (Americans) of the knowledge we should have to operate effectively" (p. 9). Americans may tend to assume other professionals eagerly await opportunities to learn from our practices, when indeed, that may not be the case. Americans who are open to learning practices from other cultures will in many cases gain far more knowledge and understanding than they impart.

Edwards (2007) observes that education systems around the world have leaned recently towards adopting the American educational model. Coupled with an increase in the use of English language globally, places American universities in a position of significant importance and influence in international exchanges of knowledge and expertise. Major changes brought about through the Bologna Agreement (essentially a European higher education initiative to coordinate higher education among participating countries), radical changes in education in China, the growth of for-profit ventures throughout the developing world, and other globalization shifts, contribute to a model of higher education that resembles the modular, flexible, incremental form associated with the American system. Understanding implications of globalization and the roles American educational leadership preparation professorate should play in the radical changes worldwide, several options for active participation are presented with advantages and what's involved.

Consistent with Gardner's observations, Altbach and Knight (2007) note that global capital has, for the first time, heavily invested in knowledge industries worldwide, including higher education and advanced training. This investment reflects the emergence of the knowledge society, the rise of the service sector, and the dependence of many societies on knowledge products and highly educated personnel for economic growth.

Alternative courses of action involve intentionally acquiring broader level of awareness of globalization. American professors may elect to seek ways to more fully

understand the implications of globalization and include new knowledge and skills in coursework. Another option might be to seek out collaborations with school leadership preparation/development scholars in other parts of the world. A third and admittedly the most ambitious course of action would be to create educational leadership course or program delivery to international students.

Alternative 1: Understanding Implications of Globalization

As in almost every human endeavor in the early decades of the 21st century, education is changing rapidly, everywhere. Leadership programs will not prepare leaders as they did in the recent past, for homogenous communities existing in the relatively stable environments (Crow et al., 2008). Rather educational leadership programs are preparing leaders as part of global knowledge or learning communities committed to local cultures, issues and practice that are at the same time engaged in global problems and solutions (Crow et al, 2008). In the United States, reform efforts intended to address shifting conditions come from multiple directions including revision of administrator licensure requirements by state education departments, modification of program standards by national accreditation agencies, and from recommendations from national task forces (Hackman & McCarthy, 2011). “The increasing emphasis on accountability is one instance of global flow of policy that appears to have been caught as a quasi disease” (Crow et al, 2008, p. 8). Confusion or complexity appear to reign.

Admiral Carlisle Trost, former chief of naval operations who knows something about leadership opined, “The first responsibility of a leader is to figure out what’s going on... That is never easy to do because situations are rarely black or white, they are a pale shade of gray... they are seldom neatly packaged” (as cited in Bolman and Deal, p. 36, 2013). At a very basic level, then it is incumbent upon American school leadership preparation faculty to more fully understand what is going on in a rapidly changing environment in order to more adequately prepare future school leaders for the roles they will accept upon completing our programs.

Alternative 2: Actively Seek International Collaborations with School Leaders

Collaboration can take many forms from investigating more thoroughly the existing international opportunities on one’s campus, investigating educational leadership professional organizations’ international endeavors, attending international conferences where other educational leaders will be present, engaging in collaborative projects, and seeking opportunities to actually go to another culture for an extended length of time to work and study in educational leadership. “If the good news is that there are many exciting examples of collaboration from which to learn and the bad news is that we have a very long way to go, the challenging news is that there is little choice anymore” (Linden, 2010, p.8).

Cultural differences require consideration. Self-knowledge about American cultural values is important. Not all, but much of the research on leadership in organization has been conducted in a Western context (Bolman and Deal, 2013). Self-knowledge about how one’s own culture influences perspectives is critical. Globalization creates a need to better understand the dynamics when individuals of different cultures

agree to collaborate on issues of mutual importance (Bolman and Deal, 2013; Linden, 2010; Mansilla, V. & Jackson, A., 2010). Michael Rawling (as cited in Linden, 2010) offers important observations about intercultural collaborations. Relationships are critical, learn the other culture, check assumptions regularly, develop sensitivity to others' paradigms, be humble, be patient, focus on mid and long term progress, remain in a learning mode, if possible find someone native to the culture and also familiar with American (higher education) culture for coaching, and finally be authentic (p. 153).

There are likely multiple opportunities already available on university campuses to connect with international school leaders. Educational leadership faculty should explore these local opportunities for international connections.

Globalization offers multiple opportunities to network professionally. LinkedIn (2015), a business-oriented social networking service is a good place to begin to find professionals with common interests. LinkedIn is only one of many avenues for international collaboration. If you are already on LinkedIn, then revisit your profile to see how you can communicate to others worldwide your professional areas of expertise. See what happens.

Professional organizations play an increasingly critical role in professions of every kind because the rapid changes in all professions. Two American school leadership preparation professional organizations, the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration (NCPEA) and the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA), have international initiatives that address international school leadership. These organizations are a natural place to begin for American faculty seeking international collaborations. Those interested in learning more can go to the NCPEA Educational Leaders without Borders site at <http://www.educationalleaderswithoutborders.com/who-we-are.html> or the UCEA Center for International Study of School Leadership site at www.ucea.org/ucea-center-international-study-school-leadership/.

After devoting some time to understand how international networking works, the next step is to review key strategies for successful collaborations. Keep in mind the importance of shared interests or purpose, willingness of others to contribute to collaborative solutions, finding the right people (this likely will take some trial and error), creation of an open credible process, establishing trust, and the skills of collaboration (Linden, 2010).

While in Ukraine for four months in 2012, I learned that what Americans often mean when they speak of honoring diversity is helping others to become more like us. The most vivid realization remains with me today. I taught in a Foreign Language program (English, not so tricky for me). While my students admired my fluency, I was humbled to recognize that I speak my native language reasonably well. My students on the other hand, were learning their fourth language (Ukrainian, Russian, English, German). In other part of the world, learning a foreign language is the mark of a well-educated person. In the United States, too often, children of immigrants are regarded as deficient until their language skills are adequate to score well on our accountability tests. Americans have much to learn from other cultures. This cultural insight into American mindsets troubles me even now.

My collaborative writing experiences with Ukrainian colleagues, whom I know well has taught me the importance of self-knowledge about my American tendencies regarding project organization, development of mutual understanding related to the topic,

standards for professional writing and research, and the importance of clarification of differences in educational systems. These collaborations started with colleagues where mutual trust and respect was clearly established, but even so, the process was at times challenging. The results were worth the obstacles. I offer this personal experience as advice in case progress isn't going along as smoothly as you might have predicted. Cultural differences can be challenging, but they are not insurmountable.

Alternative 3: International Educational Leadership Program Planning and Delivery

The final and most challenging response to globalization would be to create a middle manager leadership program for school and other non-governmental organization (NGO) leaders. Business, engineering, and IT programs at many universities already have in place some version of programs designed for international students. International students are also present in educational leadership doctoral programs. What are less common are course delivery systems that result in a degree at the master's level. This makes sense when the connection between state educational bodies that certify school leaders and preparation programs is considered. So at the program level, designers must figure out how to determine knowledge needed by targeted international audiences and from there uncouple existing program delivery with state requirements for school leader roles that define curriculum and delivery for school leadership programs.

At the program planning level, designers must be aware that internationally there are two basically different approaches to school leadership preparation and development (Huber, 2008; Darling-Hammond, 2010). The American system focuses on the individual. Graduate programs aim to impart relevant competencies to future school leaders. Other models link school leader development closely to school development and developing the leader is regarded within the context of school improvement. Uncoupling school leadership knowledge, skills, and understanding from American highly prescribed systems of standards, standardized testing, and alignment is a critical stage in order to offer coursework or training to others internationally.

Edwards (2007) analyzed contrasting approaches towards internationalization taken by two leading American universities, Harvard and Yale. Termed opportunistic and planned, the analysis provides implications for each approach including negotiations in other countries. The relevance of the analysis for educational leadership professors is to simply identify what seems to be the prevailing strategy (or happenstance) towards internationalization currently employed by a university.

Yale employed the planned approach, that involved strategic initiatives by the university president. The advantage of this approach is that planning and implementation gives a high degree of control. The disadvantage is that strengths of faculty and existing curricular opportunities may be overlooked in the quest to achieve university-wide goals.

Harvard on the other hand, employed an institution-wide but opportunistic mode of response. Harvard's president, Laurence Summers, pledged that Harvard would exploit its global reach and reputation to develop leaders and create knowledge that would serve the world beyond the nation's borders. This focus was intended to create particular kinds of international interactions. Coordination was elusive and given the high degree of decentralization and autonomy of faculty and of divisions at Harvard meant that there

was almost no work done to maximize anything. Relationships developed with institutions abroad were local and many opportunities were lost that could have led to multifaceted relationships with partner institutions abroad that could have been productive for both sides. Faculty buy-in led to initiatives with some likelihood for endurance, all things being equal. The vast majority of American universities have faculty with international research collaborations that are very stable, and most have faculty-led programs abroad that function well for decades. The disadvantage of this model is a lack of coherence.

There are multiple issues to consider in planning an international program. Altbach and Knight(2007) identify challenges related to quality assurance and the national and international recognition of providers, programs, credits, and qualifications warrant close attention. Quality assurance starts with the program deliverer—domestic or international. Many higher education institutions have adequate quality-assurance processes for domestic delivery. But these processes do not cover the challenges inherent in working cross-culturally, in a foreign regulatory environment and with a foreign partner. In order to establish and maintain credibility, priority needs to be given to define roles and responsibilities of all players involved in quality assurance. These include individual institutions and providers, national quality assurance systems, nongovernmental and independent accreditation bodies, professional organizations, and regional or international organizations. Once roles are defined, individual players must collaborate to build a quality system that ensures cross-border education.

At the point when prospective students apply, Altbach and Knight (2007) identify issues to resolve including academic entry requirements. These include, proficiency, entrance assessment processes, faculty workload, delivery modes, curricular adaptations, instructional quality assurance, and academic and sociocultural student support. Higher education providers should consider intellectual property ownership, choice of partners, division of responsibilities, academic and business risk assessments, and internal/external approval processes. In most cases, already established university approval processes for program, course, and certificate deliveries will address these issues.

After or more likely while all the aforementioned issues are determined, program design will require significant consideration given to learning needs of potential students, the development of global competencies, and course delivery options. The greatest challenge will involve culture. Lumby & Foskeet, 2010 lay out the challenge this way. “The implication that if leadership preparation and development is to aspire to cultural fit, a high degree of sophistication is required” (p. 50). “Culture at the macro and micro levels is a foundational skill, which positions educational leadership as critical contributors to shaping society and not just the school” (p. 44). Even within the United States, the predominant cultural conceptions of leadership are flawed for Native American populations or to some religious groups. Leadership preparation programs face a twofold challenge by deciding which cultural assumptions to embed in the design and delivery of a course or program and deciding how to best equip leaders with intercultural competence so they can in turn determine which cultural assumptions to embed in their own school leadership.

Every program that seeks to offer knowledge to international school or other NGO leaders will take a different path depending upon existing positions on internationalization at the university level, other institutional conditions and

opportunities, international connections, technology support, and many other factors. As experts in the fields relevant to these programs, educational leadership professors can play a critical role to develop curriculum and course delivery methods that prepare the kinds of leaders that schools and other NGOs need worldwide.

Conclusions

American universities have several advantages in the internationalization process. They include the convergence of formerly diverse systems internationally towards the American education model and the rapid spread of English as the language of instruction and publication worldwide (Edwards, 2007). American school leadership professors have a knowledge base that can contribute to resolution in solving some of the most critical issues of globalization.

Professors who have considered the problems of globalization even lightly may understand that challenges of the American educational system that require inordinate energy on the part of all educators to simply keep up with the next new plan devised by policymakers whose primary qualification regarding education may be that they went to school at some point. That does not stop our system from churning out yet more initiatives that will require driving around to listen to scripted power point presentations that insist American schools are doing it all wrong, this new initiative will solve all that. Other educators may also have noticed that just about the time all the standards, assessments, and delivery issues of one initiative are neatly aligned and sensible implementation seems nearly possible sometime soon, then it's time to drive around to learn about the next one. Such is the reality of American education.

The larger international world desperately needs the knowledge and skills about effective school leadership possessed by American educational leadership professors. We need to better understand what we know by examining American school practices through the lenses of other cultures. We know much more about school leadership than our system acknowledges and we have the opportunity to share what we know with others around the world and in the process learn so much.

The choice is before American educational administration faculty. We can remain in our provinces, so to speak, waiting for the requirements of the next reform to come in the e-mail or we can intentionally seek to learn more about globalization, the role of educational leaders in globalization, and determine a course of action. Returning to Admiral Carlisle Trost's observations about leadership cited earlier, the first task of a leader is to figure out what's going on. Globalization is going on, now, worldwide. American educational leadership scholars are highly qualified to engage with educators throughout the world to respond to Gardner's query about the kinds of school leaders school throughout the world need. Educational leadership faculty has opportunities at multiple levels to engage proactively. The challenge is not simple, but for those who see the potential to learn more deeply about school leadership and contribute to globalization, it is worth doing. The choice is clear, do you seek to be a provincial or global scholar?

References

- Altbach, P. & Knight, J. (2007). The internationalization of higher education: motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education*. p. 290-305.
- Apple, M. (2011). Global crisis, social justice, and teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*. Retrieved from <http://jte.sagepub.com/content/62/2/22210>
- Begalla, R. (2013). The Bologna Process and Internationalization for Higher Education in the US. *Journal of Teaching in International Business*, 24(2), 65-80.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2013) *Reframing organizations*, 5th Ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Brustein, W. I. (2007). The global campus: Challenges and opportunities for higher education in North America. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(3-4), 382-391.
- Crow, G., Lumby, J., & Pashiardis, P. (2008). *Introduction: Why an international handbook on the preparation and development of school leaders?* In Lumby, Crow, & Pashiardis (Ed). *International Handbook on the Preparation and Development of School Leaders* pp. 1-20.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). *The flat world and education: How America's commitment to equity will determine our future*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Edwards, J. (2007). Challenges and opportunities for the internationalization of higher education in the coming decade: planned and opportunistic initiatives in American institutions. *Journal of Studies in International Education* 11(2). Pp. 373-381.
- English, F., Papa, R., Mullen, C., & Creighton, T. (2012). *Educational leadership at 2050: Conjectures, challenges, and promises*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Education.
- Friedman, T. & Mandelbaum, M. (2012). *That Used to Be Us*. New York, NY: Picador/Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Gardner, H. (2008). *Five Minds for the Future*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press.
- Hackmann, D. McCarthy, M. (2011). *At a crossroads: the educational leadership professoriate in the 21st century*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, Inc.
- Hunter, B., White, G. P., & Godbey, G. C. (2006). What does it mean to be globally competent?. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 10(3), 267-285.
- Huber, S. (2008). School development and school leader development. In Lumby, Crow, & Pashiardis (Ed). *International Handbook on the Preparation and Development of School Leaders* pp. 163-175.
- Leithwood, K., Day, C., Sammons, P., Harris, A., and Hopkins, D. (2006). *Successful school leadership what it is and how it influences pupil learning*. National College for School Leadership, Report RR800.
- Leithwood, K. & Levin, B. (2008). Understanding and assessing the impact of leadership development in Lumby, Crow, & Pashiardis (Ed). *International Handbook on the Preparation and Development of School Leaders* pp. 280-300.
- Linde (2015)n, R. (2010). *Leading across boundaries: creating collaborative agencies in a networked world*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- LinkedIn downloaded at <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/LinkedIn>
- Lumby, J. & Foskett, N. (2008). Leadership and culture. Lumby, J., Crow, G. M., & Pashiardis, P. (Eds.). (2008). *International handbook on the preparation and development of school leaders*. New York, NY: Routledge. pp.43-60.

- Mansilla, V. & Jackson, A. (2011). Educating for global competence: preparing our youth to engage the world. Council of Chief State School Officers' EdSteps Initiative & Asia Society Partnership for Global Learning.
- McIntosh, P. (2005). Gender perspectives on educating for global citizenship. In N. Noddings (Ed.), *Educating Citizens for Global Awareness*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press, pp. 22-39.
- NCPEA Educational Leaders without Borders, downloaded from <http://www.educationalleaderswithoutborders.com/who-we-are.html>
- NCPEA News (Feb. 19, 2014). International guidelines for working with educational leadership programs. Vol 2 (4). Downloaded from <http://ncpeaprofessor.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/February-2014-NCPEA-News-.pdf>
- Noddings, N. (2005). Conclusion: what have we learned? In N. Noddings (Ed.) *Educating citizens for global awareness*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press. Pp. 122-136.
- Noddings, N. (2005). Global citizenship: promises and problems. In N. Noddings (Ed.) *Educating citizens for global awareness*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press. Pp. 1-21.
- Stearns, P. (2009). *Educating global citizens in colleges and universities*. New York, NY: Routledge, Taylor & Francis.
- UCEA Center for the International Study of School Leadership downloaded at <http://www.ucea.org/ucea-center-international-study-school-leadership/>