

The 10 Most Wanted Enemies of American Public Education's School Leadership

Fenwick W. English

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

It should come as no surprise to anyone close to the discourse concerning public education in the United States today that educational leadership is under attack from a variety of internal and external critics and agencies, not the least of which is the U.S. government under new Secretary of Education Arne Duncan. This paper is a response to begin to identify those enemies of educational leadership programs, their ideological agendas, and their allies. The network involves outspoken individuals with elitist credentials, long time neo-liberals, right-wing think tank pundits and their conservative foundation sponsors, and other foundations such as the Broad Foundation. It is not an exaggeration to say as Kowalski did in 2004 that we are in a "war for the soul of school administration" (p. 92). Of prime importance in understanding our enemies is that we find our collective voice in a response to their agenda, because as Giroux (2004) has remarked, "There is no language here for recognizing anti-democratic forms of power, developing nonmarket values, or fighting against substantive injustices in a society founded on deep inequalities, particularly those based on race and class" (p. 61).

It is somewhat of an irony that some of us who now find ourselves in a position of defending public education and its leadership have been long-time critics of it over many years (English, 1994, 1995, 1997, 1998, 2001, 2002, 2005, 2007, 2008a, 2008c; English & Papa, 2010). The great French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu (2003) also found himself saying,

This situation is all the more paradoxical in that one is led to defend programs or institutions that one wishes in any case to change, such as public services and the nation state, which no one could rightly want to preserve as is, or unions or even public schooling, which must be continually subjected to the most merciless critique. Thus I am sometimes suspected of conversion or accused of contradiction when I defend a public school system of which I have shown time and again that it fulfills a function of social conservatism. (p. 23)

The similarity between Bourdieu's view and my own is that the enemies cited in this paper want to take public education down a road where it will not perform any better, or even possibly worse, than it does today, and in the process substantially degrade or destroy what Bourdieu (1998) called "civic virtue" and Houston (2006) reminisced as "the spirit of the commonwealth that has always been the central expectation of public education" (p. 5). It is this greater threat to the destruction of the fabric of civic humanism that Emery and Ohanian (2004) warned is "the hijacking of American Education" (p. 1) that prompts me and many others (Lugg, 2000, 2001; deMarrais, 2006; Kumashiro, 2008) to expose their ideas and their agendas to greater public scrutiny.

A Preliminary Classification of the Enemies

Any sort of classification becomes difficult because our critics often have ideological footings in many camps and draw support from a

wide variety of sponsors. Whereas most emanate from the Republican right, a few are Democrats. Kumashiro (2008) delineated three forces of the political right in the United States as (a) "secular," whose agenda is to "preserve economic privilege"; (b) Christian, which is to "uphold traditional notions of gender and sexuality"; and (c) xenophobic, which is aimed at protecting "the privileges of certain racial groups and nations" (p. 10). I shall attempt to make these clearer in this descriptive section. My 10 most wanted enemies of public education leadership are located in four categories:

- elitist conservatives such as Charles Murray, Ed Hirsch, Jr., and William J. Bennett;
- neoliberals, free marketers, and new public management gurus such as Chester Finn, Fred Hess, Eli Broad, Arne Duncan, and Lou Gerstner;
- goo goos such as Arthur Levine; and
- cranks, crackpots, and commie hunters such as David Horowitz.

These are my current 10 most wanted enemies of public education leadership. There are, of course, many others, such as Jack Welch, Chris Whittle, Dinesh D'Souza, Newt Gingrich, Lynne Chaney, and Stephen and Abigail Thernstrom, to cite a few. But these names keep resurfacing again and again. Although most are Republicans or fellow right-wing bon vivants, a few Democrats are among them.

The Elitist Conservatives

The elitist conservatives fancy themselves as holding onto the cultural icons and heritage that they believe everyone should know and that constituted some cultural apogee or "golden days." Eatwell (1989) has called this group of individuals "the reactionary right," though the persons I placed in this group also overlap into Eatwell's "moderate right" category. The positions adopted by persons in the "elitist conservative" group espouse a return to some "idealized past." They are "aristocratic, religious and authoritarian" (Eatwell, 1989, p. 63). Those in the "moderate right" tend to reject four tenets of liberal philosophy: "liberalism's individualism, its universalism, its rationalism, and its contractual and utilitarian principles" (Eatwell, 1989, p. 67). The three most wanted enemies of public education school leadership in this category are Charles Murray, Ed Hirsch, Jr., and William J. Bennett.

Charles Murray

Murray is perhaps best known for his coauthored book with Richard Herrnstein in 1994, *The Bell Curve*. In this book he argued that welfare and early-childhood education programs were largely a waste of time for poor and minority children because these children were genetically inferior and could not profit from such programs. According to Brock (2004), the misuse of statistics in this work got him "cut loose" from the conservative Manhattan Institute. He then retreated to the American Enterprise Institute, another right-wing think tank. Brock said, "The Right had spent more than \$1 million promoting Murray alone" (p. 47).

Ed Hirsch, Jr.

Ed Hirsch is a former English professor at the University of Virginia who published *Cultural Literacy: What Every American Needs to*

Know. In this book, Hirsch (1988) argued for a curriculum based on a common core, which included 5,000 items that he and two other male university professors identified that every American had to know to be “culturally literate.” Hirsch argued that this amounted to “freezing a culture” in the same way a language is frozen at some state of development in order to become standardized. Cultural literacy works when the society in which it derives its privileged hierarchical status also remains frozen.

William J. Bennett

William J. Bennett was the third U.S. Secretary of Education under Ronald Reagan. He is a fellow with the conservative Heritage Foundation. He long has espoused competency testing for teachers, merit pay, opening the teaching profession to persons not prepared in colleges of education, a national examination of all students, parental choice of schools, and administrative accountability. He is an opponent of same-sex marriage and long-time member of the Republican Party. He has benefited from financial support from Empower America and the John Olin Foundation (Turchiano, 2004, p. 29), one of the hard-right conservative foundations. These three personages are the epitome of the issue of social justice in America, as captured by Barry (2005):

In every society, the prevailing belief system has been largely created by those with the most power—typically, elderly males belonging to the majority ethnic and religious group, who also run the dominant institutions of the society. It is notable, for example, that almost all religions rationalize a subordinate position for women and explain that inequalities of fortune are to be accepted as part of God’s great (if mysterious) plan. (p. 27)

The view of these White males is that of preserving the status quo, even as American society is undergoing profound changes in racial and ethnic composition. Dougherty (2010) reported U.S. Census data showing 48.6% of the children born in the United States between July 2008 and July 2009 were to non-White minorities. Ten states now show minority majorities in resident populations—not simply California, Arizona, and New Mexico, but also Maryland, Georgia, and Washington, DC. Some experts estimate that the nation could become White minority as early as 2011.

Neo-Liberals, Free Marketeers, and New Public Management Gurus

Harvey (2009) stated that neo-liberalism

is in the first instance a theory of political economic practices that proposes that human well-being can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets, and free trade. The role of the state is to create and preserve an institutional framework appropriate to such practices. ... Furthermore, if markets do not exist (in areas such as land, water, education, health care, social security, or environmental pollution) then they must be created by state action if necessary. (p. 2)

The five most wanted enemies of public education in this camp are Chester “Checker” Finn, Frederick Hess, Eli Broad, Louis Gerstner, and Arne Duncan.

Chester E. Finn, Jr.

Chester E. Finn, Jr. is a long-time conservative critic of public education, schools of education, educational leadership programs, and teacher unions. His books and perspectives embrace the main tenets of neo-liberalism applied to education, including vouchers and charter schools. He has been a fellow at the Hoover Institution and an Olin Fellow at the Manhattan Institute as well as an adjunct fellow at the conservative Hudson Institute. Finn is the president of the Broad-funded Thomas B. Fordham Institute, where he continues to be an advocate for the neo-liberal agenda in education (see also Finn, 1991).

Frederick M. Hess

Frederick M. Hess is director of Education Policy Studies at the American Enterprise Institute. Prior to assuming this role at the American Enterprise Institute, he was an instructor at the University of Virginia and a senior fellow of the Progressive Policy Institute. Emery and Ohanian (2004) noted that the Progressive Policy Institute has received generous funding from the Bradley and Heritage Foundations (p. 70). The Bradley Foundation is one of the four “Big Sisters” previously noted. Its money comes from the sale of auto parts magnate Harry Bradley. The Bradley Foundation has a long history of sponsoring conservative ideologies in education and in the larger policy arena. Hess sits on the review board for the Broad Prize in Urban Education and on the boards of directors of the National Association of Charter School Authorizers. Hess (2003) is a frequent critic of school of education leadership programs for failing to teach candidates “proven” business management skills.

Eli Broad

Eli Broad made his fortune in real estate (KB Home) and was founder of SunAmerica, now a subsidiary of American International Group. He and his wife Edythe established the Broad Foundation “with the mission of advancing entrepreneurship for the public good in education, science and the arts” (“Eli Broad,” 2010, para. 4). The Broad Foundations have assets of \$2.1 billion. According to Wikipedia (“Eli Broad,” 2010), “The Eli and Edythe Broad Foundation’s education work is focused on dramatically improving urban K–12 education through better governance, management, labor relations and competition” (para. 5). The Broad Foundation has four national flagship initiatives: (a) the \$2 million Broad Prize for Urban Education; (b) the Broad Superintendents Academy, a 10-month executive management program to train working CEOs and other top executives from business, nonprofit, military, government, and education backgrounds to lead urban school systems; (c) the Broad Residency in Urban Education, a 2-year management development program that trains recent graduate students, primarily with business and law degrees, who have several years of work experience and places them immediately into managerial positions in the central operations of urban school districts; and (d) the Broad Institute for School Boards, a national training and support program for urban school district governance teams of school board members and superintendents (“Eli Broad,” 2010).

Business leaders such as Eli Broad and Lou Gerstner suffer from what Krugman (2009) called the “great man’s disease,” which “happens when a famous researcher in one field develops strong opinions about another field that he or she does not understand”

(p. 29). Krugman wrote this prescient passage (simply substitute the word *education* for *economics* in this quotation):

Imagine a person who has mastered the complexities of a huge industry, who has run a multibillion-dollar enterprise. Is such a person, whose advice on economic policy may well be sought, likely to respond by deciding to spend time reviewing the kind of material that is covered in freshman economics courses? Or is he or she more likely to assume that business experience is more than enough and that the unfamiliar words and concepts economists use are nothing but pretentious jargon? (pp. 31–32)

The Broad Foundation “was the eighth-largest U.S. family foundation by giving in 2008, the last year for which data is available, donating \$116.5 million to various causes, according to the nonprofit Foundation Center” (Lattman & Pilon, 2010, p. C1). Broad’s opinions about what is wrong and how to fix public education are enjoying bountiful funding, including \$10 million to the Washington, DC, public schools to install a form of merit pay for teachers (Martinez, 2010, p. A8), another key plank in the neo-liberal ideology to “reform” public education. Broad is optimistic that his agenda is ripe for implementation: “‘We’re at a golden moment now,’ with a president and an education secretary who, he says, agree with his reform agenda” (Riley, 2009, p. A11).

Louis V. Gerstner, Jr.

Louis Gerstner is the former business executive with RJR and American Express who became CEO of IBM in 1993. He is credited with saving IBM from going out of business, in part by laying off over 100,000 employees. After he left IBM he received a 10-year, \$2 million consultancy contract and is required to work only 1 month out of the year (“Louis V. Gerstner, Jr.,” 2010).

Gerstner, like Eli Broad, has strong opinions about public education. Like Broad, he has zeroed in on school boards and school districts as “the problem” and has recommended that all 15,000 school districts be abolished (Gerstner, 2008, p. A23.). He sees too many “profit centers” as decentralization of corporate control and trying to bring order to some national effort. Corporate control is authoritarian, not democratic. And whereas the corporatizers in education often promise more transparency and accountability, what they produce is less of both (see Anderson & Pini, 2005, p. 230).

Arne Duncan

Arne Duncan is the ninth U.S. Secretary of Education. A former professional basketball player with a graduate degree from Harvard, Duncan was deputy chief of staff for Chicago Public Schools for CEO Paul Vallas, another noneducator who headed that school system. Duncan was appointed CEO of the Chicago Public Schools in 2001 and nominated to be U.S. Secretary of Education in 2008. Billed as a reformer, he was endorsed by Washington, DC, schools Chancellor Michelle Rhee and former Bush U.S. Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings (Levy, 2008.) Like Spellings, Duncan had no outstanding education credentials and even after 7 years heading the Chicago Public Schools

doesn’t seem to have developed much wisdom from that experience. There is no indication of a broad or deep understanding, or at least an appreciation, of the complicated relationship between education and larger society forces. Nor was his tenure as Chicago’s schools chief an

unmitigated success in any of the popular ways politicians and presidents define success, such as increased test scores and lower dropout rates. (Chennault, 2010, p. 30)

Duncan has launched a \$4 billion executive agenda called Race to the Top with Troubled Asset Relief Program (TARP) funds (McNeil & Maxwell, 2010). It contains a huge amount of the neo-liberal education agenda: charter schools, blunting the role of teacher unions, pay for raising pupil performance on tests in the form of individual “merit,” and criticizing schools of education and educators for not promoting more “rigor” in their programs (Sawchuk, 2009), as well as working to create more alternative pathways to licensing (see also Hawley, 2010, p. 28). The fact that Duncan has won the support of long-time neo-liberal pundits such as Chester Finn, William Bennett, and Newt Gingrich is indicative of how deeply the neo-liberal agenda has penetrated the Democratic Party. When even the party in power has no solutions except those proposed by the opposing party, it matters little who is in office. Chennault (2010) similarly noted, “President Obama’s education agenda is, broadly speaking, indistinguishable from that of his predecessor” (p. 31).

The Goo Goos

Arthur Levine

The Goo Goos are the social do-gooders who want to do things right and improve things but make them worse. To this category of the 10 enemies of public education leadership I add Arthur Levine, formerly of Teachers College, Columbia University, and now the sixth president of the Woodrow Wilson Foundation. Levine authored a report in 2005 called *Educating School Leaders*, which not only indicted educational leadership programs in general but also failed to follow sound research-based practices in doing his national study. He subsequently ran into a buzz saw in Teachers College over it and left as dean. Levine’s study promised to let his “data speak for themselves,” but he provided no data. He claimed that no program he examined was “exemplary,” but he never disclosed his sample except by saying two of the programs were acceptable at Vanderbilt and University of Wisconsin at Madison. Levine recommended the abolition of the EdD but never examined the quality of EdD research directly, which was done recently by English and Papa (2010). His so-called “study” would fail to meet even the most minimal standard acceptable for the National Research Council’s *Scientific Research in Education* (Shavelson & Towne, 2002). Levine is enamored with the MBA and business schools (Maranto, Ritter, & Levine, 2010), despite the very loud criticisms of the inadequacies of the MBA and business schools in the literature (see Khurana, 2007), and especially with the large number of CEOs, COOs, and CFOs in jail, indicted, or on their way to jail for financial improprieties. Business school reputations have been severely tarnished, and a host of new deans is trying to change the “win at all costs culture” of them (Middleton, 2010).

Cranks, Crackpots, and Commie Hunters

David Horowitz

This category of public enemy is reserved for David Horowitz, a former leftist Vietnam War protestor; editor of *Ramparts*, a radical leftist newspaper; and member of the Black Panther Party who did a 180-degree turn and now, because he was wrong, believes he is permanently right. At some point Horowitz underwent a conver-

gence and wrote a book on his own generation and how they were to blame for the social ills of the day. He wrote speeches for Senator Bob Dole and finally, “by 2000, [was ushered] into the circle of Bush advisor Karl Rove” (Brock, 2004, p. 101). He established the Center for the Study of Popular Culture in Los Angeles with funds from the Bradley and Scaife Foundations, where he runs several right-wing web pages, among them *FrontPage*, an instrument “for smearing leading Democrats” (Brock, 2004, p. 102) and liberal professors whose views he finds anti-American or anti-George Bush.

But Horowitz’s attack on professors in higher education he finds too liberal or named Communists is part of his claims of a bias in higher education that can only be put right via state intervention. As a result he has sponsored an “Academic Bill of Rights” initiative that would guarantee that students with conservative views would not be discriminated against (Kronholz, 2005), despite no evidence that such is the case. Horowitz founded a website called RateMyProfessors.com where students can complain about professors who are too liberal. He also has been involved in creating such an outlet for students in elementary and secondary schools (Cavanagh, 2006). Horowitz had worked with the American Enterprise Institute to do a “study” of university faculty who were liberal; the study reported that “the Left dominated university faculties by a factor of eleven to one” (Brock, 2004, p. 370). What Horowitz neglected to say was that “the survey ... examined only social science faculties, leaving out more conservative schools of medicine, law, business, and engineering” (Brock, 2004, p. 370).

I analyzed Horowitz’s 2006 book, *The Professors: The 101 Most Dangerous Academics in America* (English, 2008b). Forty-five percent of the “dangerous” professors resided in the humanities; 33% in the social sciences; and 22% in other fields such as journalism, communication, music, law, education, criminal justice, and engineering (English, 2008b, p. 256). None was in the hard sciences. The views that Horowitz found “dangerous” were that 31% of his “dangerous” professors were anti-Iraq War; 28% were either Marxist in orientation or advocated or shared Marxist perspectives; 28% were anti-Israel or opposed to Israeli treatment of the Palestinians; 19% were anti-American or against American policies; 19% were anti-George Bush; 18% embraced feminist or lesbian programs, critical race theory, queer theory or homosexuality; 9% were anticapitalistic; 7% were generally against war; 5% were pro-Cuba; and another 5% were anti-Vietnam War (English, 2008b, p. 256).

Horowitz’s attacks are an example of what Eatwell (1989) called “the extreme right,” which “has tended more to produce propagandists, interested in telling people what to think rather than how to think, and lacking in originality” (p. 71). And within Horowitz’ “dangerous professors” one can clearly see the outline of conspiracy theory, a hallmark of the extreme right. Conspiracy theory, noted Eatwell, is a form of political myth and “in its extreme right-wing form involves a particular set of views: these center mainly around nationalism and racism, which can involve mobilizing, integrating and simpliste-explicatory myths” (p. 72).

The Final Ranking of the 10 Most Wanted Enemies of Public Education Leadership

Here is my final ranking and commentary on the top 10 enemies of public educational leaders and leadership programs in the United States. Whether they are Democrats or Republicans makes little difference, as they are all neo-liberal advocates or fellow travelers.

1. Eli Broad. Eli Broad’s millions are going towards a top-down corporate takeover of urban school systems. His promoted noneducators have no historical awareness of the field in which they work, are beholden to efficiency management tactics and simplistic economic models, and discourage innovation and privatize formerly noncommodified public spheres while failing to bring about the dramatic improvements they advertise. The Broad approach proffers nothing new on all fronts because it assumes that everything that is necessary to be known to improve schools is already known, if not in education than in business. Broad’s superintendent and school board academies have never released their curriculum and never indicated what in traditional preparation programs is not necessary to know or who their “experts” are. Whereas most public university curricula are in fact public, available on their web pages, in course syllabi, and on reading lists, the Broad approach eschews any such disclosures. Broad CEOs are called “gunslingers,” and their record of success is spotty at best in urban settings (see Eisinger & Hula, 2008).

2. Arne Duncan. Arne Duncan, the ninth U.S. Secretary of Education, has shown he is a captive of the neo-liberal “boxed” thinking about school improvement. He has proffered no new bold reforms. He is not an innovator but an orthodox administrator who has accepted the diagnosis and the solutions proffered by the Republican, right-wing think tank pundits. He is busily implementing their agenda in *Race to the Top*, which has found protests coming from the missing parent voice, “from the top down, often draconian policies put forward by U.S. Secretary of Education Arne Duncan” (Haimson & Woestehoff, 2010, p. 34). He has advocated more mayoral control of urban school systems, which means the loss of the elected or appointed school board, a long-time agenda of the neo-liberals (Hechinger & Sataline, 2009, p. A12).

3. Chester E. Finn, Jr. Chester “Checker” Finn continues to push his long-time neo-liberal ideology as president of the Thomas Fordham Institute supported by the Broad Foundation. He is fond of using corporate metaphors in his writing (Saltman, 2005, p. 37). He has been a leading advocate of the privatization of education and was “co-founder of the education management organization Edison Project” (Kumashiro, 2008, p. 21).

4. William J. Bennett. Bill Bennett is a Republican Party stalwart with very deep ties to the neo-liberal education agenda. Bennett is a former board member of the Bradley Foundation, which has been a long-time opponent of affirmative action and welfare (Kumashiro, 2008, p. 12). He has been supported by the Heritage Foundation, the “mother” of all right-wing think tanks. He also co-owns a private company, K12, Inc. which, “according to the federal Government Accountability Office, has improperly received millions of federal grant dollars from the U.S. Department of Education” (Kumashiro, 2008, p. 18).

5. Frederick M. Hess. Currently the director of policy studies at the American Enterprise Institute, Hess proffers the tried and true neo-liberal ideology in education: privatization, vouchers, non-educators in leadership roles; run schools like business or the military; alternative certification; and anti-teacher unions and schools of education. He is one of the reputed anonymous authors of the Thomas B. Fordham Institute and Broad Foundation’s (2003) political broadside against educational leadership programs, *Better Leaders for America’s Schools: A Manifesto*.

6. Louis V. Gerstner, Jr. Lou Gerstner believes public education can be improved by the way he ran IBM. Gerstner wants to

abolish all of the school districts in the nation, which remain one of the few arenas where Americans exercise local control of anything. The abolition or marginalization of local school boards also has been advocated by Eli Broad and Chester Finn.

7. Charles Murray. A eugenics elitist, Murray has helped propagate the dogma of racial superiority in education and to weaken the commitment of public opinion for the advancement of the poor and most vulnerable classes in the larger society. As Conason (2003) noted,

Speaking from the commanding heights of the American right, they informed the nation that blacks are destined to fail, that racial discrimination is logically and morally defensible as well as natural, and that the government should stop trying to enforce civil rights and help the black underclass. (p. 138).

Murray's work is an example "the new racism" within what Ansell (1997) has termed "the New Right worldview," where "the disproportionate failure of people of color to achieve social mobility speaks nothing of the justice of present social arrangements . . . but rather reflects the lack of merit or ability of people of color themselves" (p. 111). Murray's work is the epitome of the New Right worldview.

8. David Horowitz. Horowitz is the only one on my list of the top 10 enemies whom I would call a member of the extreme right. He is a populist demagogue.

9. Arthur Levine. Arthur Levine portrays himself as a reformer but his "reforms" proffer nothing new and are a rehash of much of the internal change agenda within educational leadership that was already in the literature.

10. Ed Hirsch, Jr. Hirsch is a linguist whose efforts to capture the "core curriculum" are futile efforts to preserve White privilege in a burgeoning multiracial and multicultural society. Hirsch's "core curriculum" is a prime example of Bourdieu and Passeron's (2000) "cultural arbitrary" being imposed by political power on the rest of a specific society. The school serves as the legitimizing agent of this form of "symbolic violence."

In summarizing the agendas of the political right and left in America, Barry (2005) saw tremendous success of the right due to "a network of lavishly financed foundations, and the books and journals that they promote at enormous expense, have rationalized all the most mean-spirited impulses of affluent American whites" (p. 233). Further, Barry added, "The only honest case that can be made for the agenda of the right is that it suits the people who benefit from it nicely" (p. 234). The purpose of this paper was to identify the most significant figures and forces that are involved in that assault.

Note: For a complete version of this article see the *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation* at the NCPEA/Rice University Connexions Project: <http://ijelp.expressacademic.org/>

References

- Anderson, G., & Pini, M. (2005). Educational leadership and the new economy: Keeping the "public" in the public schools. In F. English (Ed.), *The Sage handbook of educational leadership* (pp. 216-236). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ansell, A. (1997). *New right, new racism: Race and reaction in the United States and Britain*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Barry, B. (2005). *Why social justice matters*. Cambridge, England: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1998). *Acts of resistance: Against the tyranny of the market*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (2003). *Firing back: Against the tyranny of the market 2*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J.-C. (2000). *Reproduction in education, society and culture* (2nd ed.). London, England: Sage.
- Brock, D. (2004). *The Republican noise machine: Right-wing media and how it corrupts democracy*. New York, NY: Three Rivers Press.
- Cavanagh, S. (2006, April 19). Campaign targets perceived liberal bias in schools. *Education Week*, 25, 18.
- Chennault, R. (2010, May 19). Obama-era education policy. *Education Week*, 29, 30-31.
- Conason, J. (2003). *Big lies: The right-wing propaganda machine and how it distorts the truth*. New York, NY: Thomas Dunne Books.
- deMarrais, K. (2006). "The haves and the have mores": Fueling a conservative ideological war on public education (or tracking the money). *Educational Studies*, 39, 201-240.
- Dougherty, C. (2010, June 11). U.S. nears racial milestone. *The Wall Street Journal*, p. A3.
- Eatwell, R. (1989). The nature of the right, 2: The right as a variety of "styles of thought." In R. Eatwell & N. O'Sullivan (Eds.), *The nature of the right: American and European politics and political thought since 1789* (pp. 62-76). Boston, MA: Twayne.
- Eisinger, P., & Hula, R. (2008). Gunslinger school administrators: Nontraditional leadership in urban school systems in the United States. In J. Munro (Ed.), *Educational leadership* (pp. 111-126). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.
- Eli Broad. (2010). Retrieved June 14, 2010, from Wikipedia: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Eli_Broad
- Emery, K., & Ohanian, S. (2004). *Why is corporate America bashing our public schools?* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- English, F. (1994). *Theory in educational administration*. New York, NY: Harper Collins.
- English, F. (1995). Toward a reconsideration of biography and other forms of life writing as a focus for teaching educational administration. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 31, 203-223.
- English, F. (1997). The cupboard is bare: The postmodern critique of educational administration. *Journal of School Leadership*, 7(1), 4-26.
- English, F. (1998). The postmodern turn in educational administration: Apostrophic or catastrophic development? *Journal of School Leadership*, 8(5), 426-447.
- English, F. (2001). What paradigm shift? An interrogation of Kuhn's idea of normalcy in the research practice of educational administration. *International Journal of Leadership in Education Theory and Practice*, 4(1), 13-28.
- English, F. (2002). The point of scientificity, the fall of the epistemological dominos, and the end of the field of educational administration. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 21(2), 109-136.
- English, F. (Ed.). (2005). *The Sage handbook of educational leadership: Advances in theory, research, and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- English, F. (2007). The NRC's scientific research in education: It isn't even wrong. In F. English & G. Furman (Eds.), *Research and educational leadership: Navigating the new National Research*

- Council guidelines* (pp. 1-38). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.
- English, F. (2008a). *Anatomy of professional practice: Promising research perspectives on educational leadership*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.
- English, F. (2008b). The new McCarthyism: The right wing's assault on American academic thought. In E. Samier & A. Stanely (Eds.), *Political approaches to educational administration and leadership* (pp. 252-268). New York, NY: Routledge.
- English, F. (2008c). Towards a theory of social justice/injustice. In T. Townsend & I. Bogotch (Eds.), *Radicalizing educational leadership: Dimensions of social justice* (pp. 113-146). Rotterdam, the Netherlands: Sense.
- English, F., & Papa, R. (2010). *Restoring human agency to educational administration: Status and strategies*. Lancaster, PA: ProActive.
- Finn, C. (1991). *We must take charge: Our schools and our future*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Gerstner, L. (2008, December 1). Lessons from 40 years of education reform. *The Wall Street Journal*, p. A23.
- Giroux, H. (2004). *The terror of neoliberalism: Authoritarianism and the eclipse of democracy*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm.
- Haimson, L., & Woestehoff, J. (2010, June 16). Shutting out parents: Obama's disappointing blueprint for reform. *Education Week*, 29, 34-35.
- Harvey, D. (2009). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Hawley, W. (2010, June 9). The 2015 report on colleges of education. *Education Week*, 29, 28.
- Hechinger, J., & Sataline, S. (2009, March 12). For more mayors, school takeovers are a no-brainer. *The Wall Street Journal*, p. A12.
- Hernstein, R., & Murray, C. (1994). *The bell curve: Intelligence and class structure in American life*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Hess, F. (2003). *A license to lead? A new leadership agenda for America's schools*. Washington, DC: Progressive Policy Institute.
- Hirsch, E. (1988). *Cultural literacy: What every American needs to know*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Horowitz, D. (2006). *The professors: The 101 most dangerous academics in America*. Washington, DC: Regnery.
- Houston, P. (2006). The superintendent: Championing the deepest purposes of education. In P. Kelleher & R. Van Der Bogert (Eds.), *Voices for democracy: Struggles and celebrations of transforming leaders: Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* (pp. 105-109). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Khurana, R. (2007). *From higher aims to hired hands: The social transformation of American business schools and the unfulfilled promise of management as a profession*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Kowalski, T. (2004). The ongoing war for the soul of school administration. In T. J. Lasley (Ed.), *Better leaders for America's schools: Perspectives on the manifesto* (pp. 92-114). Columbia, MO: UCEA.
- Kronholz, J. (2005, October 4). Congress wades into campus politics. *The Wall Street Journal*, p. A4.
- Krugman, P. (2009). *A country is not a company*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Review.
- Kumashiro, K. (2008). *The seduction of common sense: How the right has framed the debate on America's schools*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Lattman, P., & Pilon, M. (2010, May 19). Winfrey hires a star manager. *The Wall Street Journal*, pp. C1-C3.
- Levine, A. (2005). *Educating America's leaders*. Washington, DC: The Education Schools Project.
- Levy, C. (2008, December 26). Obama picks a moderate on education. *The Wall Street Journal*, p. A11.
- Louis V. Gerstner, Jr. (2010). Retrieved June 14, 2010, from Wikipedia: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Louis_V._Gerstner,_Jr.
- Lugg, C. (2000). Reading, writing and reconstruction: The Christian Right and the politics of public education. *Educational Policy*, 14(5), 622-637.
- Lugg, C. (2001). The Christian Right: A cultivated collection of interest groups. *Educational Policy*, 15(1), 41-57.
- Maranto, R., Ritter, G., & Levine, A. (2010, January 6). The future of ed. schools: Five lessons from business schools. *Education Week*, 29, 36.
- Martinez, B. (2010, April 8). D.C. deal puts merit pay for teachers on the syllabus. *The Wall Street Journal*, p. A8.
- McNeil, M., & Maxwell, L. (2010, June 9). States up ante on applications for Race to Top. *Education Week*, 29, 1, 27.
- Middleton, D. (2010, May 6). B-schools try makeover. *The Wall Street Journal*, p. B5.
- Riley, N. (2009, August 29). "We're in the venture philanthropy business." *The Wall Street Journal*, p. A11.
- Saltman, K. (2005). *The Edison schools: Corporate schooling and the assault on public education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Sawchuk, S. (2009, October 28). Duncan shares concerns over teacher prep. *Education Week*, 29, 1-12.
- Shavelson, R., & Towne, L. (Eds.). (2002). *Scientific research in education*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.
- Thomas B. Fordham Institute and Broad Foundation (2003). *Better leaders for America's schools: A manifesto*. Retrieved from <http://www.edexcellence.net/doc/Manifesto.pdf>
- Turchiano, J. (2004). William J. Bennett. In J. Newfield & M. Jacobson (Eds.), *American monsters: 44 rats, blackbats, and plutocrats* (pp. 23-32). New York, NY: Thunder's Mouth Press.

Contributing to the UCEA Review

If you have ideas concerning substantive feature articles, interviews, point/counterpoints, or innovative programs, *UCEA Review* editors would be happy to hear from you. Additionally, Andrea Rorrer, University of Utah, has reached the end of her term as *UCEA Review* Features Editor. We thank her for her invaluable contribution to the *Review* and the UCEA community. If you have an interest in serving as a *UCEA Review* Features Editor, please contact Michelle Young at UCEA Headquarters. The Editorial Team (see back page of the *Review*) meets twice a year. One to two features appear in each issue of the *Review*, which is published three times a year.

General Editors:

Michelle D. Young: michellyoung@austin.utexas.edu
Gerardo Lopez: lopezg@indiana.edu



UCEA REVIEW

University Council for Educational Administration
Headquartered at The University of Texas, College of Education

Fall 2010

Arizona State University
Auburn University
Bank Street College
Bowling Green State University
Brigham Young University
Cardinal Stritch University
Chinese University of Hong Kong
Clemson University
College of William and Mary
Duchesne University
Florida Atlantic University
Florida State University
Fordham University
Georgia State University
Hofstra University
Illinois State University
Indiana University
Iowa State University
Kansas State University
Kent State University
Lehigh University
Louisiana State University
Miami University
Michigan State University
New Mexico State University
New York University
Nipissing University
North Carolina State University
Northern Illinois University
Northside ISD (TX)
Ohio State University
Oklahoma State University
Pennsylvania State University
Portland State University
Rutgers University
St. Johns University
St. Louis University
Sam Houston State University
San Antonio ISD (TX)
Stephen F. Austin State University
Temple University
Tennessee State University
Texas A & M University
Texas State University—San Marcos
Texas Woman's University
University at Buffalo/SUNY
University of Alabama

Diversity-Responsive School Leadership

Willis Hawley and Rebecca James
University of Maryland

The Challenge

It is ironic, given the gap between the achievement of students of different races and ethnicities, that school leaders and advocates for school improvement rarely look at explanations for the gap that might be related to race and ethnicity. It seems absolutely sensible, for example, to conclude that the achievement gap cannot be substantially narrowed unless we eliminate gaps in opportunities to learn. Opportunities to learn will not become more equitable until school leaders prioritize this need. It follows that ensuring that school leaders have the capacity to meet the learning needs of students of color, students from low-income families, students who are English language learners, and students with disabilities should be a fundamental priority of colleges of education.

While we all raise our hands when asked if diversity-responsive leadership is important, there is reason to believe that colleges of education are not walking the talk. One obvious piece of evidence is that the nation's schools, most of whose leaders were prepared in schools of education, are not very effective in ensuring that the needs of diverse students are met. More to the point of this essay, one need only look at the curricula of schools of education to conclude that we are, collectively, a long way from developing coherent and rich approaches to preparing leaders to enhance the learning of diverse students. We make this assertion and offer suggestions for enhancing leadership preparation programs focusing on what needs to be done to strengthen leadership that is responsive to the needs of racially and ethnically diverse students. (Of course, race is a social construction rather than a biological reality. But this fact is a reason to take attributions of race seriously.) Although we recognize that other aspects of student diversity are also important, we believe that examining how leaders influence the learning of students from racially and ethnically diverse backgrounds is a good place to start.

What Colleges of Education Do Now to Prepare Leaders to Enhance the Learning Opportunities of Racially and Ethnically Diverse Students

We surveyed 62 universities affiliated with UCEA. The survey contained open-ended questions and asked universities to list the courses, resources, and strategies they use to enable educational leaders to ensure that students of diverse races and ethnicities learn at high levels. With two e-mail reminders from UCEA, we received responses from only 18 universities. With a 30% response rate, the results of our survey might not accurately represent all leadership programs. However, these survey results are the best evidence we have at this point of how universities attempt to prepare school leaders to address the needs of diverse learners. Further, it

Volume 51 Number 3

University of Arizona
University of Arkansas
University of Central Arkansas
University of Cincinnati
University of Connecticut
University of Dayton
University of Florida
University of Georgia
University of Houston
University of Illinois
University of Iowa
University of Kansas
University of Kentucky
University of Lincoln
University of Louisville
University of Maryland
University of Minnesota
University of Missouri—Columbia
University of Nebraska—Lincoln
University of Nevada—Las Vegas
University of New Mexico
University of North Carolina—Chapel Hill
University of North Carolina—Greensboro
University of Northern Colorado
University of Oklahoma
University of Oregon
University of Pittsburgh
University of Southampton
University of Tennessee—Knoxville
The University of Texas—Austin
The University of Texas—Pan American
The University of Texas—San Antonio
University of Toledo
University of Utah
University of Virginia
University of Washington
University of Wisconsin—Madison
University of Wisconsin—Milwaukee
Vanderbilt University
Virginia Commonwealth University
Washington State University
Wayne State University