

Special Issue

Resisting Social Justice in Leadership Preparation Programs: Mechanisms that Subvert

Frank Hernandez
Hamline University

Kathryn Bell McKenzie
Texas A&M University

It is well documented that the achievement gap between affluent students and economically disadvantaged students and between White students and students of color continues to widen. In addition to these achievement gaps, marginalizing practices are often imbedded in the structures of schooling. These challenges require educational leadership programs that effectively prepare school principals who can meet our most pressing school challenges and who, in particular, strive for social justice ends; however, the literature on leadership for social justice provides no clear consensus on what an entire educational leadership program oriented toward social justice would include. This study attempts to fill the gap in the literature by critically examining a curriculum and instruction leadership program that has social justice embedded into the program's core practices. Specifically we ask the following questions:

- 1. What critical elements underlie programs that prepare professionals for social justice in fields outside of educational leadership?*
- 2. What can we learn from these programs in support of educational leadership programs whose aim is to prepare leaders for social justice?*
- 3. What possible resistance was faced by these programs, and what can we learn from these experiences that can inform our practice of preparing educational leaders for social justice?*

There were several key findings that range from how students were selected into the program to the way in which faculty worked with each other in their teaching responsibility. The paper concludes with implications and recommendations for principal-preparation programs.

It is well documented that the achievement gap between affluent students and economically disadvantaged students and between White students and students of color

continues to widen. In addition to these achievement gaps, marginalizing practices are often imbedded in the structures of schooling; for example, culturally and linguistically diverse

students are both segregated from their school peers throughout the school day and overrepresented in special education and other remedial education programs (Capper, Frattura, & Keyes, 2000; Farkas, Duffett, Johnson, Moye, & Vine, 2003; Ladson-Billings, 1994). These challenges require educational leadership programs that effectively prepare school principals who can meet our most pressing school challenges and who, in particular, strive for social justice ends; however, the literature on leadership for social justice provides no clear consensus on what an entire educational leadership program oriented toward social justice would include.

Recently nonetheless, McKenzie, Christman, Hernandez, Capper, Dantley, Gonzales, Cambron-McCabe, and Scheurich (2008) have suggested that to address the inequities that exist in today's schools, educational leadership programs must feature elements that explicitly prepare leaders to lead for social justice. Referring to these elements as *the framework*, the current paper examines the framework that was created and compares the framework to what is being learned from programs, other than educational leadership, where social justice is embedded. To meet these goals, we ask the following questions:

1. What critical elements underlie programs that prepare professionals for social justice in fields outside of educational leadership?
2. What can we learn from these programs in support of

educational leadership programs whose aim is to prepare leaders for social justice?

3. What possible resistance was faced by these programs, and what can we learn from these experiences that can inform our practice of preparing educational leaders for social justice?

Research on Educational Leadership for Social Justice

The overall research on leaders who strive for social justice has gained unprecedented momentum in the last five years; for example, scholars in the field of leadership research have well documented the role that school leaders for social justice play in creating equitable schools for children, particularly for students living in poverty, students of color, English-language learners, and students with disabilities (Bogotch, 2002; Lyman & Villani, 2002; Maynes & Sarbit, 2000; Riester, Pursch, & Skrla, 2002; Scheurich, 1998; Scheurich & Skrla, 2003; Touchton & Acker-Hocevar, 2001; Vibert & Portelli, 2000). One element in this growing body of literature on leadership for social justice has been the demand that principal preparation programs teach future school principals to lead for social justice ends (see Brown, 2004; Dantley & Tillman, 2006; Hafner, 2006; Lyman & Villani, 2002; Marshall, 2004; Marshall & Oliva, 2006; Nieto, 2000; Pounder, Reitzug, & Young, 2002). While the focus of this literature is on teaching school leaders how to

lead for social justice, little has been published on what a comprehensive principal preparation program for social justice would include.

In an effort to begin the discussion concerning what a comprehensive educational leadership program for social justice would entail, McKenzie et al. (2008) drew from the literature outside the discipline of educational leadership that emphasized social justice, equity, and diversity. First, we looked at teacher education for social justice (Adams, Bell, & Griffin, 1997; Ayers, Hunt, & Quinn, 1998; Cochran-Smith, 1995, 2003; Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999; Darling-Hammond, French, & Garcia-Lopez, 2002; Nieto, 2000). We considered specific scholarship that addressed how practicing K-12 teachers enacted social justice in their classrooms (Allen, 1997; French, 2002; Gaudelli, 2001; Traudt, 2002). Next, we considered the equally important literature on counselor education for social justice (Bemak & Chung, 2005; Constantine, 2001; Gates, Ringel, Santibañez, Chung, & Ross, 2003; Lee, 2001), which states that social justice issues can and should be addressed in counselors' and counseling psychologists' work with clients from diverse cultural backgrounds.

Finally, there is an established research agenda whose focus is on practicing teachers who, by striving to understand cultural and racial differences among students, intend to contribute to those students' greater academic and socioemotional success (Anderson, 1990; Banks, 1999; Capper, 1993; Cochran-Smith, 2003; Dantley, 2002; Delpit, 1988; Gay, 2002; Ladson-

Billings, 1995; Milner, 2005; Sleeter, 2001; Sleeter & McLaren, 1995; Trumbull, Rothstein-Fisch, Greenfield, & Quiroz, 2001; Young & Laible, 2000). Yet, in this literature, very little has been written about specific program elements found in the training programs whose goal is to train leaders for social justice.

Having drawn on the research outside our discipline, we wanted to further pursue what educational leadership programs can learn from other programs that train leaders for social justice. Therefore, the current study looked at an interdisciplinary doctoral degree program in curriculum and instruction that focused on social justice. The theoretical frame used in studying this program was our original framework; therefore, first, we begin by briefly highlighting the components that were advanced in the original framework. Second, we discuss the methods and the context of our study, including the elements found in the particular program we studied. Then, we rigorously examine the elements that we found in the program and compare them to the framework. The paper concludes by looking specifically at the resistance this program faced and at implications and recommendations that the current study has for educational leadership programs striving to develop leaders for social justice.

The Framework

The original framework advanced by McKenzie et al. (2008) comprised four categories of elements: (a) selection of students; (b) knowledge and content: critical consciousness and

teaching and learning (c) proactive systems of support and inclusive structures; and (d) induction/praxis. Rather than go into great detail about each of these elements, this paper will highlight the main recommendations in the framework. The following is a brief description of the framework.

Selection of Students

Regarding the framework, McKenzie et al., (2008) argued that principal preparation program selection of students is critical to the development of social justice leaders. Because, in general, students complete principal preparation programs quickly (an average of two years), students should quickly acquire an understanding of—or quickly enhance their existing understanding of—social justice work. The framework recommended that programs prohibit students from self-selecting into leadership programs and that a rigorously structured selection committee conduct the selections on the basis of a student's commitment to social justice. Equally important in the selection process for aspiring principals would be whether they have (a) an awareness of their own social beliefs, (b) a strong teaching background, and (c) a record of teacher leadership within their own school. To ascertain the information listed above, McKenzie et al. (2008) suggested that the selection process placing students into leadership programs should rest, in part, on (a) criteria-related documentation and a social-identity paper written by aspiring principals about experiences that have affected their personal and professional lives and (b) an assessment instrument

that selection committees use to gauge students' understanding of and competence with difference. The selection process can also include simulation activities that center on issues of social justice and pinpoint an individual's attitudes or interaction skills regarding equity-related problem solving. Also in line with the selection criteria, selection committees could observe candidates in their work setting, focusing particularly on the quality of the candidate's skills in teaching all students well.

Knowledge and Content: Critical Consciousness and Teaching and Learning

The second element of the framework comprised critical consciousness and teaching and learning. The authors of the framework suggested that critical consciousness and teaching and learning, despite having long been features of leadership programs, in many cases operate only in isolated courses and fail to evolve. The authors of the framework proposed that leadership programs embed the continuous development of critical consciousness in all levels of curriculum. Embedding critical consciousness in the curriculum helps future school leaders interrogate school-wide practices regarding who benefits from them and who does not. This type of curriculum should include assignments that require aspiring school leaders to participate in and to conduct research with organizations that have social justice as their core. In the framework, McKenzie et al. suggested that traditional instructional leadership,

which is often focused on supervision, staff development, and curriculum and instruction, should also include effective teaching instruction that results in high learning for all students all of the time.

To support this type of teaching, educational leadership programs must help their future principals in identifying socially-just teaching practices and in supporting the development of socially-just teachers. This new teaching and learning also requires that leadership programs revise their approach to teaching aspiring school leaders on the subject of effective instruction for all students. The new teaching and learning requires faculty in leadership programs to provide future leaders with genuine—not staged—opportunities to learn about effective teaching. That is, leadership program faculty should allow their students to observe teaching and learning at school sites and to courageously participate in difficult conversations about identifying socially just teaching practices.

Proactive systems of support and inclusive structures

The third element found in the framework for designing a social justice leadership program is the future principal's ability to develop inclusive practices where aspiring school leaders can "recognize structures that pose barriers to students' progress and create proactive structures and systems of support for all students at the macro and micro levels" (McKenzie et al., 2008, p. 126). The authors suggested that at the macro level leadership programs must prepare principals in the belief that their students, who will likely be at

different learning levels, should learn in integrated heterogeneous learning environments. The framework requires that leadership programs address school structures that segregate and isolate students from each other and that include pull-out programs for particular school groups (Frattura & Capper, 2007); furthermore, a proactive system of support requires school leaders to reallocate resources so that integrated learning environments can exist for students. At the micro level, the authors of the framework suggested the importance of developing a comprehensive professional development program focused on high learning for every student—a program that provides real-time feedback to teachers about their own practice of teaching.

Induction/Praxis

The fourth element that the authors of the framework proposed concerns educational leadership programs' organization of induction/praxis for aspiring principals. Traditionally, principal preparation programs have provided future school leaders with insufficient training in the process of becoming socially just leaders. Oftentimes, the principals' induction period features no on-going feedback; consequently, the framework for a social justice leadership program suggested an induction period that lasts between two and five years and that includes additional coursework, on-going support, and a network of school leaders, all for the enhancement of social justice.

Methods and the University Context

To address our research questions, we needed a qualitative design and, more specifically, a case-study design (Yin, 1994). Using purposeful sampling, we identified programs that (a) were outside of educational leadership and administration, (b) had social justice or elements of social justice at the core of their work, (c) and were exemplary programs that prepared professionals for social justice.

The program the authors of this manuscript chose to study was the Social Justice Program (SJP), an interdisciplinary degree in curriculum and instruction, at the University of Riverside (both pseudonyms) in an upper Midwestern state. In studying this program we, first, conducted an in-depth, in-person interview with the founding director of the program. She provided us a historical perspective of the genesis of the program, as well as her interpretations of the successes and challenges of the implementation, practice, and finally dissolution of the program; moreover, she referred us to a consultant who participated in the development of the program and a student who participated in the program as a cohort member. We conducted in-depth interviews with these individuals as well. Each of the semi-structured interviews was guided by questions focused on the elements found in the suggested framework by McKenzie et al. (2008), with specific interest in student selection, knowledge and content, critical consciousness,

teaching and learning, induction/praxis, and faculty development.

We were interested, also, in understanding both how the Social Justice Program had become oriented toward social justice and the challenges the program faced during its development. The interviews were tape-recorded and transcribed. In addition, documents related to the program were analyzed, such as marketing materials, admissions applications, program overviews, student testimonials, and program information on the university website. The documents were helpful in that they provided information about course sequence, mission and vision of the program, faculty teaching teams, selection process, and how the SJP had changed over time.

The university setting for the SJP takes place at an upper Midwestern, Catholic, liberal arts institution. The University of Riverview is the largest independent college or university in this upper Midwestern state. It enrolls approximately 11,000 students. Slightly more than half of the students are undergraduates; the remaining students are in graduate programs. In 1977, the university (then known as the College of Riverview) became co-educational, and as of 2008, 51% of undergraduate and 52% of graduate students are female. Overall, 10% of all the students are students of color. Furthermore, from the mid-1970s to the early 1990s, the university experienced unprecedented growth. Enrollment grew from 2,500 male students to over 10,000 male and female students. The first graduate program in education began in 1950, and over the past two decades, the

University of Riverview has opened three new campuses, two in this upper Midwestern state and one in a large European city.

It was in 1990 that the academic institution established a new academic structure featuring an undergraduate college and graduate schools; in other words, the institution evolved from a college into a university. The academic structure was redefined once again when in 2001 the university assembled related graduate and undergraduate programs into common schools and colleges. During this time of great growth and in this entrepreneurial atmosphere, the university decided to offer a doctorate degree in social justice. At the time, only one graduate program existed in the School of Education: educational leadership. However, the SJP, which is the focus of this study, would be the university's first attempt at a doctoral program whose participants would examine the impact of race, class, gender, ableism, and heterosexism on the community, including the lives of students who attended the program.

Findings

In this study, we found elements in the SJP that aligned with the framework. We also found elements in the SJP that the framework did not include nor consider. The SJP, which came out of the Curriculum and Instruction Department at the University of Riverview, has as its core a commitment to one's empowering of oneself to change the world. The

pertinent marketing materials describe the doctorate in social justice thus:

Social Justice is an interdisciplinary field committed to justice, equality, and freedom. Its function is to enhance our understanding of education through a critical examination of the unequal power dynamics in society and offers alternatives to the status quo. Social Justice includes and goes beyond classroom teaching and learning. It addresses educational issues in multiple contexts. Social Justice prepares you to be a successful change agent in the struggle for justice and liberation in the classroom and beyond.

The founding director of the program suggests that there were three clear purposes for the SJP. First, the program wanted its graduates to understand that their service to their community was important to their becoming effective change agents. Second, the program served to train teachers and other leaders according to methods that differed from the methods typical of other higher-education programs. Third, the program wanted to impress on their graduates the difference that they could make in their own communities. It is important to note that this program's goal was to prepare leaders in an array of fields not just K-12 teachers and leaders; for example, it included individuals in higher education, health-related, and non-profit fields. The following items are elements from the framework that were and were not

found in the SJP at the University of Riverview.

Selection of Students at the University of Riverview

The selection process for the SJP involved elements that were found in the framework and focused on determining the students' understanding of and commitment to social justice. These included an autobiographical statement, a writing assignment, and a personal interview; however, contrary to the selection process proposed in the framework, students were not selected to apply to the program, but rather self-selected into the program. That is, students decided on their own whether they would apply or not to the SJP. The SJP selection process included three distinct stages. The first stage involved the initial application, which is generally found in most programs. In this stage, students were required to submit an application, which included transcripts, two letters of recommendation, a professional resume, one example of academic work, and an autobiographical statement addressing three points (who the student was, the perception that students had regarding their own performance of social justice work, and specific factors that had helped lead the students to this type of program). After the first stage, students who made the initial cut were asked to complete a writing assignment. The founding director explained this process:

Part of their work [admissions], if they made the first cut, was to

respond to a piece of writing that we sent them. The writing changed from year to year. The first two years it was Ira Shor's "Empowering Education." We took out either chapter one or chapter two and sent it to them [students] and gave them questions and they had to respond to and unpack his work; [for example], they had to show how his philosophy and the practices he spoke about "fit or did not resonate with you and how, in turn, you did this in your work."

The third stage of the admissions procedure included a personal interview with program faculty. The program director was most interested in finding out how prospective students viewed themselves as critical thinkers, and more specifically, what social justice meant to them personally. The founding director of the SJP stated that, initially, the selection committee had been very "lenient" with the first-year applicants. This leniency was due to the University of Riverview's desire to get their program up and running and immediately enroll students since new doctoral programs were starting simultaneously at two other local universities. Most of the applicants were previous students that had attended, and received advanced degrees from, the University of Riverview. The founding director states:

There were a lot of people who applied to the program because they had earned their masters at

the University of Riverview and thought it was a comfortable place and wanted to come back. And that was part of the challenge we had in every single cohort. People didn't really understand social justice and making change, but they wanted to come back to the University of Riverview. They also felt that they would never get into the [major research university in town]. I'm being honest with you; it wasn't because there was this love that they [students] were going to make social change. There were pockets of people in every cohort who strongly felt that way or who believed in aspects of social justice and who believed in critical reflection. But grasping the whole piece of personal assumptions and stuff like that—do you need to get it? No.

The readings and the approach to assigning the writing projects also changed over time. Soon after accepting their first cohort, the SJP learned that the students' writing-response requirement for acceptance into the program was different in quality from what the students were submitting in their work for classes. As a result of this gap in the students' writing, students were required to do the writing portion of the application on campus, so that faculty had a more accurate understanding of the students' writing skills.

In line with what McKenzie et al. (2008) suggested in the framework, the SJP used a writing response and a

personal interview to understand both students' perceptions of themselves as change agents and students' beliefs about social justice and critical thinking; however, most students self-selected into this social justice program. The selection process did not require that selection committees observe prospective students in their work settings or that students have an established leadership record—only a current résumé was required.

The SJP also used no simulation activities where one's values and decision-making could be observed, assessed, and reviewed as part of the selection process. Indeed, as the founding director stated above, this selection process resulted in having students apply who wanted to return to the familiarity of the university but who did not try to become agents of change; however, it is important to note that the selection process for the SJP evolved and came to include selection elements that were not addressed in the original framework; for example, the goal for the SJP was to diversify each cohort of students. In fact, this commitment to having culturally diverse students was part of the mission of the SJP. Out of the 17 students in cohort two, for example, five were gay or lesbian, which changed much of the content that was discussed in class. Over time, the program averaged 3-4 people of color in each cohort, despite the goal of having one-third of the students be of color; however, the program director asserted that "the problem was money, \$45,000; people were taking out big loans and we had no scholarships here. It was a big stumbling block [for the program]."

Knowledge and Content: Critical Consciousness and Teaching and Learning

In regards to the knowledge and content included in the SJP, critical consciousness was a cornerstone of the program, which is consistent with the recommendations of the framework. Teaching and learning as articulated in the framework, however, was not the core of the SJP in that this program was not specifically designed to develop only school teacher leaders but community leaders as well; however, the SJP went beyond the suggestions of the framework in regards to developing knowledge and content with the inclusion of a summer residency and a service delivery component.

Furthermore and specific to the program design, the SJP consisted of 49 core credits, 9 elective credits, and 9 dissertation credits. The first two years of the four-year program were designed to provide students a foundation in theory, research, and the practice of Social Justice. According to the documents that were reviewed, the students' entire course work was guided by questions that were answered in each class:

1. What are the practices central to effective social justice?
2. How can the theory and practice of social justice address inequities of race, class, and gender?
3. What are the contradictions and inconsistencies in social justice?
4. What are the major ethical issues and dilemmas raised

by the practice of social justice?

5. How do we as educators learn to investigate and change practice to make it consistent with the principles of social justice?

Moreover, the SJP was designed to include a close cohort model. That is, each cohort could admit up to twenty-six students, and once the program began, other students could not enter the cohort. Within the cohort model and over time, students developed strong, trustful relationships with each other. This characteristic also allowed faculty to devote a significant amount of time to preparing for each cohort meeting. The program's first cohort started in June 1998 and every two years, a new cohort began.

When asked about how the program addressed critical consciousness, the founding director suggested that critical consciousness was embedded in every course. And, as part of their completion of each course, students were to self-assess, utilizing reflective journals, their critical consciousness, whether their consciousness had shifted, and the possible impact the program, cohort, or course had on any change that occurred in their critical consciousness; moreover, each course had a reflective component that asked students to address their own assumptions and the evolution of their own thinking related to the readings and dialogues with cohort and community members. In other words, social justice leadership was implied in students' work but the program

struggled at times in pushing students to become more critically conscious. The director states:

For each cohort, we were getting our feet wet and then they [students] were getting ready to graduate. But the mission of the program was supposed to be that you left here not only as a critical thinker in terms of how you taught, but your educational community was broadened and that you were a leader, whether it was a teacher leader or a community leader. But I think we could have emphasized that more, but we didn't. Just the way we didn't emphasize spirituality.

The SJP was, however, designed to emphasize elements of racism, classism, sexism, ableism, and heterosexism in every course that was offered; however, because each course was developed in a way that allowed student and faculty to co-create portions of the content, some -isms surfaced in cohorts whereas other -isms did not; for example, the SJP was conceived in a way that allowed the professors to create one-third of the content, students to create another one-third, and a combination of students and faculty to create the final one-third. The second cohort had a number of gays and lesbians, who consequently co-created experiences that related to issues of heterosexism. In fact, these students chose particular readings and experiences that the entire cohort had to follow.

In contrast, dialogues about

disabilities did not occur in the SJP until the fourth cohort, and this arose only because a student in that cohort spoke about her own disability. This pattern was also true for English-language learners. Though there were non-native English speakers who participated in the program, there was little support at the university for these individuals. Regarding this topic, the founding director stated,

Many of our students from other countries, who were having difficulties and challenges both in oral and written communication, [received] no help... It [ELL: English language learning] really was never addressed—not only to those students in class but also [to knowing] how do you help students you teach? That was an area that was also neglected. I have to say in all fairness it takes a lot of work to begin to judge when something gets deleted and when something gets embellished in a program.

The SJP's decision to have students and faculty co-create one-third of the content of each course allowed students to take a substantive role in their own learning and acknowledged the perspectives and the personal stories that often guide an individual's work; however, programs like the SJP that allow for this co-creating of content also run the risk of not addressing the full continuum of -isms; for example, the SJP neglected disabilities-related issues until the final cohort powerfully exemplified how this approach can negatively affect content.

In contrast to what is proposed in the framework, students in the SJP participated in a two-week summertime residency before they began the actual course work in the program. The summer residency was instrumental in bringing together each cohort to dialogue about the process of social justice and to prepare students for their course work and other experiences in the SJP. In addition, students used the summer residency to examine what critical dialog was and how this dialog would be used within the cohort. The final element in the summer-residency program was to determine how each learning community would be managed; for example, this was the time when the learning community determined its norms, including how to resolve conflict and how each individual would work together with others to meet the goals of the program.

Outside of the summer-residency program, and not addressed in the framework, was the service delivery model for the SJP. In this program, each cohort met one weekend a month, and this scheduling included an evening session on Fridays, all-day meetings on Saturdays, and half-day meetings on Sundays. Over time, the SJP, because of the need to increase hours and to fill the large gaps in between sessions, began implementing on-line learning. Each cohort was required to interact over a one-week period before returning for their cohort meeting. The SJP also included an internship; however, rather than be a required element of the program, the internship remained simply an option for students. Out of four cohorts, comprising about 75

students, only one student took advantage of the internship experience.

Proactive Systems of Support and Inclusive Structures

Within the framework proposed by McKenzie et al. (2008), proactive systems of support and inclusive structures addressed the future principals' ability to develop structures in schools where students are integrated in the learning process and to provide teachers with professional development that supports inclusive practices. Because the SJP at the University of Riverview did not specifically work with future principals, this section focuses on the proactive systems of support and inclusive structures of the university program rather than what was taught to the students regarding putting these structures into place at their respective professional positions. Specifically, we address the development that was provided to faculty and the structures that were set in place in order for the program to meet its mission.

First, the university provided professional development for faculty for four years before the establishment of the first cohort. From 1994 to 1998, there were numerous workshops and seminars that provided space for faculty to review their roles in the new SJP; furthermore, nationally known consultants whose expertise was in the field of multicultural education, social justice, and democratic education worked with faculty over the four-year period; for example, one consultant worked with the University of Riverview for the first two years and

supported the beginnings of the initial program. This consultant in particular indicated that he focused mostly on philosophy of methods, but argued that in order for a program like the Social Justice Program at the University of Riverview to thrive, “faculty development has to be structured as a regular frequent occurrence,” and suggested that faculty must also get release time and be paid for this work. All of the consultants and the founding director of the SJP worked to identify elements that would be included in such a program. In fact, they created a think tank to develop what these components might be relative to the think-tank members’ own experiences working in the area of multicultural education and social justice.

This element of professional development as a structural support for university faculty engaging in teaching for social justice differs greatly from the framework. The framework, despite emphasizing the importance of university faculty development, falls short of highlighting the type of training that is required of faculty in order for these types of programs to succeed. The faculty of the SJP, however, engaged in four years of professional development before the program began; this constitutes significant preparation. In fact, one of the national consultants whom was hired to help start the SJP suggested that extensive professional development prior to the initiation of the program would be a challenge but was needed to well-prepare professors for the changes they would be required to make in their thinking and teaching. This consultant stated:

Professional socialization [of professors] into any field does not include change agency as a feature about development. Professors become knowledge-based experts in a specific subject matter, and then our expertise is our credibility, our legitimacy to be part of a disciplinary field. But we are not orientated to be change agents in a specific practice like the field of sociology or in the field of nursing. All of these are specific practices of what are sometimes called professional activity systems. [But we must ask...] What are the power relations? What is sensible to do if you want to change them? All these questions are very valuable but they are considered outside of graduate training, which is only discipline based.

Although not specifically addressing macro- and micro-level aspects of support systems for students, the SJP did advocate the position that faculty should support graduate students’ efforts to become change agents in their work places so that students, and individuals with whom these students would work, would become more productive citizens. As a part of preparing student to be change agents, the SJP organized faculty-teaching assignments as a model to show students ways of engaging in critical dialogue with others. Such as, each course early in the program was team-taught by two professors. The purpose of team-teaching was to create a model

of cross dialogue that students could observe first hand in their courses. An interviewed graduate student remembered the team-teaching component and had mixed reviews about its effectiveness:

I enjoyed the team teaching. You got an opportunity to have a variety of perspectives. I don't think that the university found it to be cost effective. I think that problems arose when the instructors were not in agreements regarding their own pedagogy.

Whereas the framework centered on the content and the knowledge skills that aspiring principals should have, the structure in which these skills should be taught was treated as a peripheral component. Unlike the framework, the SJP considered how teaching methods and teaching assignments could influence a program that focuses on issues of equity.

Clearly, the SJP understood the importance of professional development for its faculty and designed the teaching around learning opportunities for faculty to grow in their pedagogical practices. The SJP, in contrast to the framework, addressed the professional socialization of faculty as content expert and pushed the faculty to better understand their role as change agents in the learning environment.

Resistance

In the original framework we used to compare the elements of the SJP program, McKenzie et. al., (2008) did not discuss the possible internal

resistance within programs that address issues of social justice. We found, however, that possible resistance must be explicitly addressed. In regards to the SJP, this resistance proved fatal and resulted in the merging of the SJP into another doctoral program at the University of Riverview. The resistance to the SJP came from both faculty and students. As a result, the university administration used its authority to make drastic changes to the SJP.

Faculty Resistance

Early in the program's development, faculty raised concerns about SJP. The founding director and the consultants that worked on the inception of the SJP understood the importance of having faculty on board; hence the commitment to extensive faculty professional development. Yet, even with this substantive amount of professional development targeting social justice and teaching, faculty tended to think about (a) how this program was going to influence their teaching loads, (b) which classes they would teach, and (c) what content they would be required to cover in these new courses. The founding director commented on this matter:

[The resistance] had a lot [to do] with, I think, the traditional notion: "here's my class, oh my God, what do I know about social justice? And who's teaching what? I teach Social Foundations, so what does that mean for my job?" Some of them [faculty] didn't even know who [leading consultant for the SJP] was. And

that's fine. I don't know some of the people [scholars] in some of the other areas [fields] from my colleagues as well. So we started to have seminars [about social justice]. When I look back, I think part of the demise of the program was that we did not have buy-in from the entire faculty. We had to get people on board because we had to write the SJP from scratch.

Although faculty professional development continued after the start of the program, this initial lack of faculty buy-in proved problematic for the SJP. Faculty continued to resist the program, not so much because of its required content (although that was still a concern) as because of the personal reflection and the extra time that the SJP required of faculty in the areas of race, class, gender, and other -isms. In fact, part of the professional development that consultants provided to the faculty members challenged them to consider their professional and personal assumptions about issues such as race, class, and gender before they started teaching about these issues.

Furthermore, faculty members were encouraged to rethink, in a novel way, their approach to teaching and learning. That is, faculty had to consider pedagogical approaches that promote students' and faculties' co-creation of content, and faculty had to consider the question, "How do I facilitate difficult discussions about race and class, among other issues?" In this regard, the founding director voiced some thoughts:

I think he [the leading consultant on the project] once said this, and I just truly believe him: "If you don't have the team, its not going to work." I mean, we brought him in to do faculty development *after* the program was up, too; we had faculty up from all over [different departments and programs] coming to sit at seminars with him, but it really takes extra time to do social justice. You can't type out a syllabus and say this is the way it stays. How do you co-create? How do you [faculty] learn to deal with issues of race on a very deep-rooted level, like when someone stands up in class and says "my new mantra is "get whitey." I've come to my new identity as a Black person and this is how I feel right now and I'm very angry." So how do you [faculty] facilitate that [dialogue]? And how do we help each other facilitate that? They [some faculty] felt that the program was too radical.

Additionally, the lead consultant that worked with the SJP also was aware that not all of the faculty supported the program. It was evident to him that the commitment among faculty varied.

I think that they [faculty] responded unevenly. Some were very enthusiastic and some were not, and some were just there. That's very risky for this kind of program, which requires a very high level of commitment and

training amongst the faculty.... It's not just enough to read Freire and deliver a lecture on Freire. It's more of a grasp of the questions that such a project raises for teacherly practice, for student behaviors, for institutional organization, and so on as a community. I think some of the folks understood that. I think there were a variety of responses, and I think this is a crucial issue because none of us are trained to see ourselves as institutional change agents as we get B.A.s, M.A.s, and Ph.D.s and Ed.D.s and J.D.s. So we get all these advanced degrees, but those advanced degrees, as I said before, are always to take our place as subject-matter experts in a discipline or a field. Structured into that training is not the idea of social justice or change agency, so that notion has been so driven out of our professional preparation that to locate it inside takes a very determined, explicit, conscious effort.

This lack of training in and experience with social justice was identified as a concern by one of the students in the program. She expressed concerns that the faculty did not really know how to model or teach social justice:

There were some classes which in some respects were somewhat disappointing. And it wasn't so much the material as it was the facilitation. Remember too, we

were at the University of Riverview, and Riverview is not known for its diversity, and this was also conceptualized as a different class—well, a different type of program where instructors were not necessarily to lecture but to facilitate instructions and facilitate the process. I think that some people [faculty] were more comfortable being in a diverse setting and playing that role than others.

As a result of both faculty resistance to the SJP and the faculty's inability to change their pedagogical approaches, the SJP started to lose its rigor. That is, the work that students were submitting, including their dissertations, were not at the level that the program had originally hoped for. The founding director suggested that when faculty had to work with students across cultural boundaries, they may have lowered their expectations:

I don't know if I can express this correctly, but many times, White faculty were working with Africans, African Americans, Latinos and Latinas, and did not have the courage to say "You need to go and take a writing course; this is not going to work." What we did have was faculty letting people go [slide through]. And then [the faculty] ended up...themselves writing a good part of the dissertation. And when that person [a student] needed to speak [about his or her study], they couldn't! What an

embarrassment for them. What could we do to support their development? Especially if we are a social justice program. That sort of paternalistic attitude, condescending attitude: "Oh, I know you can't do it; let me do it for you."

Furthermore, the way in which faculty started teaching also influenced the program's rigor. The faculty were well aware that the traditional notion of lecturing was not a core element of the SJP. Yet, they struggled with co-creating the courses with students. One faculty member who observed a weekend course said that working "in different small groups became the menu of the day. 'Here's your assignment. Go in small groups for a while and come back in an hour and then everyone report.'" The lead consultant, who also had opportunities to speak with faculty about teaching, indicated that he "picked up generically and abstractly that people were not enthusiastically a part of the social-justice direction or the dialogic formats for the democratic practices of teacher-student co-development of the program and the courses."

The resistance went as far as the development of alliances among teaching teams. This new alliance among teaching teams, as the founding director would suggest, was "ganging up" on supportive faculty and the administration of the program and was commenting on the SJP in a much louder voice than the supportive individuals. Two instrumental changes occurred as a result of these alliances.

First, some instructors returned to the familiar pedagogical approach of deciding what content would be covered in each class rather than teach the courses according to their original design; for example, most faculty saw no benefits in taking their cohorts to Homeroom 100, a before- and after-school program for gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgendered high school students. Whereas, some faculty had used field trips to Homeroom 100 as a way to provide experiences for and highlight potential research issues that students might address or to interact with community organizations in examining how other groups were making a difference for kids and their communities. The second major change was that the four-year program, which included two years of course work and two years to work on a substantive research project, eliminated one year of the research project and replaced it with a third year of course work. This was counter to the recommendations of both the founding director and the lead consultant who felt that "if we're truly steeped in social change," students will need two years to conduct a well-developed dissertation.

Institutional Interventions

In addition to the faculty and student resistance, the institution itself made decisions about the SJP early in its inception and later intervened in the program design. For instance, it was suggested by the team of consultants and the founding director in the development phase of the doctoral program in social justice that the University of Riverview should invest,

also, in a Center for Social Justice. The lead consultant suggested that this center would be responsible for “reaching out to other departments and programs within the university so that we would have a cross-campus dialog started.” The center would be responsible for producing publications and, through its outreach, would provide an added value across the university; however, the university decided not to invest in a center.

Furthermore, as elements in the original design began to change, enrollment in the program began to diminish. It was during this time that the dean of the school of education concluded that the school not only was losing money on the SJP but indeed could no longer afford to have team-taught courses. It was also at this time that the founding director stepped down. After the completion of the fourth cohort, which started in 2004, the SJP no longer accept students and merged with another doctoral program at the University of Riverview.

Implications and Recommendations for Educational Leadership Programs

The McKenzie et al. (2008) framework suggested that to address the inequities that exist in today’s schools educational leadership programs must feature elements that explicitly prepare leaders to lead for social justice. Comparing the elements advanced in this framework to the SJP allowed us to consider the strengths of the original framework and to reconsider and add to the framework to better inform education leadership

programs. Specifically, the SJP at the University of Riverview presents several program elements that educational leadership programs should consider as they move toward educating leaders for social justice ends. First, there must be a commitment from the leaders and the faculty in principal preparation programs to enroll a diverse group of students. The authors are not suggesting some type of quota, but rather a commitment from selection committees to a student selection process that recognizes and values the assets of a diverse student population. This, then, would create classes with students representing multiple perspectives.

Second, the summer-residency program is an element that would provide aspiring principals an opportunity to build community and trust and that could set the stage for difficult conversations centering on issues of equity and social justice; furthermore, this summer residency component could assist in the development of individual and cohort goals. Finally, the summer residency element could provide students with an understanding of what leadership for social justice means; in turn, the students could examine the ways in which social justice will inform future courses and the students’ future leadership work.

In addition to the summer-residency program, the element of co-creating course content and of allowing students to create content could serve educational leadership programs well. The SJP allowed faculty and students together to co-create one-third of the content of courses and allowed students

to create another one-third. This element would allow students in leadership programs to integrate real life dilemmas of practice into the course and to address issues that are personal and, in some cases, difficult to discuss. This element of creating content for the principal preparation programs would require a safety net so that students would address otherwise-overlooked issues related to equity and social justice. Finally, we are aware that principal preparation programs are guided by state standards that must be embedded into course work; however, we believe that allowing students to co-create course content would meet standards concerning judgment, communication, and facilitation, among other categories. There is also value in the element of team taught courses that prepare leaders for social-justice work. Faculty could model how to exchange and debate ideas, how to work collaboratively toward a common goal, and how to cultivate leadership in others.

Finally, programs whose goals are to prepare leaders for social justice should be open to multiple course-delivery models, including on-line learning. These programs should consider how the goals of the programs align with the delivery of the course work and with students' experiences; for example, the framework suggested that aspiring principals spend time in schools observing teaching practices as one way of learning to identify effective teaching practices that result in high learning for all students. This experience could be part of a supervision course that teaches students to conduct (a)

teaching and learning tours for identifying elements of cultural competence, (b) classroom-equity audits, and (c) real-time feedback for teachers (Skrla, McKenzie, & Scheurich, 2009).

An additional element that educational leadership programs should consider as they move to educate aspiring principals to be social-justice leaders is the professional development of such programs' faculty. The Social Justice Program at the University of Riverview provided four years of professional development to faculty before their program began, and they provided additional professional development once the program started. In the end, this was not enough and the program faded. On the basis of the SJP's experiences, faculty should have on going professional development that provides them real-time feedback about their teaching and about their assumptions related to -isms. An element of this professional development should include a process that helps faculty view themselves as change agents and not just as content experts. Programs can meet this end by creating settings in which faculty can safely consider the effects of race, class, gender, and other -isms on faculty members' own lives; moreover and equally important is the influence that those experiences with -isms can have on faculties' teaching practices. Educational leadership programs can take note of the fact that faculty buy-in is imperative to any successful program that has social justice in its mission. Clearly, the SJP did not acquire from its faculty a sufficiently complete buy-in,

which may be the most important element that one would find in a successful social justice program.

As faculty in principal preparation programs engage in discussions about training leaders to lead for social justice, there are four additional lessons that the SJP's founding director, the SJP's lead consultant, and a graduate of the program suggested. First, the lead consultant suggested that programs involved in developing social justice leaders should have a community service component to their training. Similar to the induction that was originally suggested in the framework, this community service would be a year-long experience where the principal candidate would work in a community service agency. For aspiring principals, this effort could involve working in a community center implementing a year-long tutoring program. Or it could involve work with immigrant youth who are working their way through the public school system. These experiences would give the future principal first-hand knowledge of both what it means to be a change agent and the importance of the groundwork in programs like the ones that have been mentioned. We acknowledge that these types of year-long experiences can be expensive and would have to be funded with state and federal grants.

Second, programs transitioning to a social-justice focus must ask themselves critical questions before they embark on the journey of developing leaders for social justice. The following are examples of such questions:

1. Is there a high level of commitment from faculty and support from administration to begin a program focused on social justice?
2. What kind of program is possible given our setting, limits, and resources?
3. Who are likely to be allies for such a program?
4. Who is likely to be hostile toward it?
5. Whom should we first approach to discuss our interest in developing a "social justice"-focused program?
6. What does a credible "social justice"-focused program look like?
7. As we develop a program, how should we keep from being isolated from the greater department and the university?

Finally, the student who we interviewed suggested that each course must have a common thread that runs throughout the entire program like "equity" and that there must be more opportunities for students, staff, and faculty to "continuously look at their practice" and that "notions of race class and gender" must be at the core of what faculty and students are learning.

The final recommendation that was offered from the informants concerns the importance of considering how a social justice-focused program can practice shared leadership. The lead consultant for the SJP suggests that

leaders or directors of such programs “should immediately begin developing their replacements.” To avoid exhaustion and burnout, these programs must have strong levels of leadership. In the initiation of a social-justice leadership program, there must also be an initiation of leadership development so that shared leadership is practiced throughout the program.

There is so much to learn about what makes an effective social justice-focused program. Although very little is known about what an entire educational

leadership program would include if it were focused on developing leaders for social justice, we know more now about what has worked and what has not from other programs. In an effort to design leadership programs that make a difference in the achievements of children and in their ability to think critically about their communities and their world, leadership programs would benefit significantly from their continued effort to learn from the work of others.

References

- Adams, M., Bell, L. A., & Griffin, P. (1997). *Teaching for diversity and social justice : A sourcebook*. New York: Routledge.
- Allen, A. (1997). Creating space for discussion about justice and equity in an elementary classroom. *Language Arts, 74*(7), 518-524.
- Anderson, G. (1990). Toward a critical constructivist approach to school administration: Invisibility, legitimation, and the study of non-events. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 26*, 38-59.
- Ayers, W., Hunt, J. A., & Quinn, T. (Eds.). (1998). *Teaching for Social Justice*. New York: The New Press and Teachers College Press.
- Banks, J. A. (1999). *An introduction to multicultural education* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Bemak, F., & Chung, R. C. (2005). Advocacy as a critical role for urban school counselors: Working toward equity and social justice. *Professional School Counseling, 8*(3), 196-202.
- Bogotch, I. E. (2002). Educational Leadership and Social Justice: Practice into Theory. *Journal of School Leadership, 12*(2), 138-156.
- Brown, K. M. (2004). Leadership for Social Justice and Equity: Weaving a Transformative Framework and Pedagogy. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 40*(1), 77-108.
- Capper, C. A. (1993). *Educational Administration in a Pluralistic Society*. Albany, NY: State University of New York.

- Capper, C. A., Frattura, E., & Keyes, M. (2000). *Meeting the needs of students of all abilities: How leaders go beyond inclusion*. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (1995). Color blindness and basket making are not the answers: Confronting the dilemmas of race, culture, and language diversity in teacher education. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32(3), 493-522.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2003). The unforgiving complexity of teaching: Avoiding simplicity in the age of accountability. (Editorial). *Journal of Teacher Education*, 54(1), 3-5.
- Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. (1999). Relationships of knowledge and practice: Teacher learning in communities. *Review of Research in Education*, 24, 249-305.
- Constantine, M. G. (2001). Multicultural training, self-construals, and multicultural competence of school counselors. *Professional School Counseling*, 4(3), 202-207.
- Dantley, M. E. (2002). Uprooting and replacing positivism, the melting pot, multiculturalism, and other impotent notions in educational leadership through an African American perspective. *Education and Urban Society*, 34(3), 334-352.
- Dantley, M. E., & Tillman, L. C. (2006). Social justice and moral transformative leadership. In C. Marshall & M. Oliva (Eds.), *Leadership for Social Justice: Making Revolutions in Education* (pp. 16-30). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Darling-Hammond, L., French, J., & Garcia-Lopez, S. P. (2002). *Learning to teach for social justice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Delpit, L. D. (1988). The silenced dialogue: Power and pedagogy in educating other people's children. *Harvard Educational Review*, 58(3), 280-298.
- Farkas, S., Duffett, A., Johnson, J., Moye, L., & Vine, J. (2003). *Now that I'm here: What America's immigrants have to say about life in the U.S. today*. New York: Public Agenda. Document Number
- Frattura, E., & Capper, C. A. (2007). *Leading for social justice: Transforming school for all learners*. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.
- French, J. (2002). Idealism meets reality. In L. Darling-Hammond & S. P. Garcia-Lopez (Eds.), *Learning to teach for social justice* (pp. 59-65). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gates, S. M., Ringel, J. S., Santibañez, L., Chung, C. H., & Ross, K. (2003). *Who is leading our schools? An overview of school administrators*

- and their careers. Santa Monica, CA: RANDo. Document Number)
- Gaudelli, W. (2001). Reflection on multicultural education: A teacher's experience. *Multicultural Education*, 84(4), 35-37.
- Gay, G. (2002). Preparing for culturally responsive teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53(2), 106-116.
- Hafner, M. M. (2006). Teaching strategies for developing leaders for social justice. In C. Marshall & M. Oliva (Eds.), *Leadership for Social Justice: Making revolutions in education* (pp. 167-193). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). The dreamkeepers successful teachers of African American children. 187.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). But that's just good teaching! The case for culturally relevant pedagogy. *Theory into Practice*, 34(3), 159.
- Lee, C. (2001). Culturally responsive school counselors and programs: Addressing the needs of all students. *Professional School Counseling*, 4(4), 257-261.
- Lyman, L., & Villani, C. (2002). The complexity of poverty: A missing component of educational leadership programs. *Journal of School Leadership*, 12(May), 246-280.
- Marshall, C. (2004). Social justice challenges to educational administration: Introduction to a special issue. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 40(1), 3-13.
- Marshall, C., & Oliva, M. (Eds.). (2006). *Leadership for Social Justice: Making revolutions in education*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Maynes, B., & Sarbit, B. (2000). Schooling children living in poverty: Perspectives on social justice. *Exceptionality Education Canada*, 10(1-2), 37-61.
- McKenzie, K. B., Christman, D. E., Hernandez, F., Fierro, E., Capper, C. A., Dantley, M., et al. (2008). From the field: A proposal for educating leaders for social justice. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44, 111-138.
- Milner, H. R. (2005). Developing a multicultural curriculum in a predominantly White teaching context: Lessons from an African American teacher in a suburban English classroom. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 35(4), 391-427.
- Nieto, S. (2000). Placing equity front and center: Some thoughts on transforming teacher education for a new century. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 51(3), 180(188).
- Pounder, D., Reitzug, U., & Young, M. D. (2002). Preparing school

- leaders for school improvement, social justice, and community. In J. Murphy (Ed.), *The educational leadership challenge: Redefining leadership for the 21st century* (pp. 261-288). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Riester, A. F., Pursch, V., & Skrla, L. (2002). Principals for social justice: Leaders of school success for children from low-income homes. *Journal of School Leadership, 12*, 281-304.
- Scheurich, J. J. (1998). Highly successful and loving, public elementary schools populated mainly by low-SES children of color: Core beliefs and cultural characteristics. *Urban Education, 33*(4), 451-491.
- Scheurich, J. J., & Skrla, L. (2003). *Leadership for equity and excellence: Creating high-achievement classrooms, schools, and districts*. Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin/Sage.
- Skrla, L., McKenzie, K. & Scheurich, J. (2009). *Using equity audits to create equitable and excellent schools*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin.
- Sleeter, C. E. (2001). Preparing teachers for culturally diverse schools: Research and the overwhelming presence of Whiteness. *Journal of Teacher Education, 52*(2), 94-106.
- Sleeter, C. E., & McLaren, P. (1995). *Multicultural education, social justice, and the politics of difference*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Touchton, D., & Acker-Hocevar, M. (2001). *Using a lens of social justice to reframe principals' interviews from high poverty, low performing schools*. Paper presented at the University Council for Educational Administration.
- Traudt, K. (2002). Survey says: Can a White teacher effectively teach students of color? In L. Darling-Hammond, J. French & S. P. Garcia-Lopez (Eds.), *Learning to Teach for Social Justice* (Vol. 43-51). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Trumbell, E., Rothstein-Fisch, C., Greenfield, P. M., & Quiroz, B. (2001). The bridging cultures framework. In *Bridging cultures between home and school: A guide for teachers: With a special focus on immigrant Latino families* (pp. 1-27). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Vibert, A., & Portelli, J. (2000). School leadership and critical practice in an elementary school. *Exceptionally Education Canada, 10*(1-2), 23-36.
- Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods* (2nd ed.). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publishing.

Young, M. D., & Laible, J. (2000). White racism, anti-racism, and school

leadership preparation. *Journal of School Leadership*, 10(5), 374-415.

¹ The authors of this paper were two of the authors that developed the framework in McKenzie et al. (2008), which is used as the theoretical frame for this work.

Frank Hernandez is an assistant professor and director of the Center for Excellence in Urban Teaching at Hamline University in St. Paul, Minnesota. During his 15 years in public education, Dr. Hernandez has served as a classroom teacher, an assistant principal, a principal, and a district coordinator of multicultural programming throughout several Midwestern urban school districts. His research interests include the intersection of identity and school leadership and teaching, equity and social justice, the principalship, and Latinos and K-12 schools.

Kathryn Bell McKenzie is an assistant professor in the Department of Educational Administration and Human Resources at Texas A&M University in College Station. Her research foci include equity and social justice in schools, school leadership, qualitative methodology, and critical white studies. During her over twenty years in public education, Dr. McKenzie was a classroom teacher, curriculum specialist, assistant principal, principal, and Deputy Director of the University of Texas/ Austin Independent School District Leadership Academy.