The New DEEL (Democratic Ethical Educational Leadership) and the Work of Reclaiming a Progressive Alternative in Educational Administration from PreK-20

Steven Jay Gross*
Temple University

Joan Poliner Shapiro**
Temple University

Abstract

Facing repressive accountability regimes and high-stakes testing in the US and beyond, university and practitioner educators around the world decided to take action. Inspired by the democratic administration movement of the 1930's and 1940's and current scholarship in ethics, we started a movement called the New DEEL (Democratic Ethical Educational Leadership). Our mission is to create an action-oriented partnership, dedicated to inquiry into the nature and practice of democratic, ethical educational leadership through sustained processes of open dialogue, right to voice, community inclusion, and responsible participation toward the common good. New DEEL leaders include faculty, students, staff, parents, administrators and community members. Since our inception in 2004, we have grown to include colleagues from over thirty universities as well as numerous school districts in the U.S., Canada, U.K., Hong Kong, Sweden, Australia, New Zealand, Taiwan and Jamaica. Results from our work include scholarship, new graduate programs, 6 successful international conferences, and support for emerging Progressive leaders in the K-12 system and in higher education. Our article will illustrate the difference our international movement is making in the lives of students, families, practitioners, and university faculty as we strive to reclaim a Progressive alternative in our field of educational administration. We are presenting a descriptive account of our recent history along with an agenda for future development. We think our example will be useful in an era when Progressive Education is under direct attack in most of the world's developed economies.

Keywords: Democracy, Ethics, Social Responsibility, Social Justice

* Steven Jay Gross is Professor of Educational Leadership and Founding Director of the New DEEL (Democratic Ethical Educational Leadership) Community Network at Temple University's College of Education. He also serves as a Director at the Center for the Study of Leadership and Ethics sponsored by the University Council for Educational Administration.

** Joan Poliner Shapiro is Professor of Educational Leadership at Temple University's College of Education, President of Temple University's Faculty Senate, and Co-Director of the New DEEL (Democratic Ethical Educational Leadership) Community Network.

Correspondence: sgross02@temple.edu

The New DEEL community has provided me … the opportunity to engage in some of the most important issues pertaining to schooling in both the US and abroad. The "movement" has helped to support, develop, and sustain ideas about the important ends of schooling and how we might better aspire to those ends with enlightened leadership. I continue to make connections between the activity of the New DEEL and likeminded organizations… and authors…,who eloquently discuss the ideals of democratic action. Professor William Frick

New DEEL enables me to crystallize my beliefs with like-minded scholarly practitioners to ensure that in by behavior, thoughts, and actions I model ethical leadership showing a strong sense of self. The notion of being an educational leader with integrity, someone whose values and actions are consistent, is an imperative for me. New DEEL helps me to assure that the ethical basis of my thinking is rooted in shared values both of the educational system and my own inner core. The New DEEL allows me to have a filter to test this in light of all of the competing values outside of education.

Professor Valery Storey

Introduction

Facing repressive accountability regimes and high stakes testing in the US and beyond, university and practitioner educators around the world decided to take action. Inspired by the democratic administration movement of the 1930's and 1940's and current scholarship in ethics, we started a movement called the New DEEL (Democratic Ethical Educational Leadership). Our mission is to create an action-oriented partnership, dedicated to inquiry into the nature and practice of democratic, ethical educational leadership through sustained processes of open dialogue, right to voice, community inclusion, and responsible participation toward the common good. New DEEL leaders include faculty, students, staff, parents, administrators and community members.

Since our inception in 2004, we have grown to include colleagues from over thirty universities as well as numerous school districts in the U.S., Canada, U.K., Hong Kong, Sweden, Australia, New Zealand, Taiwan and Jamaica. Results from our work include scholarship, new graduate programs, six successful international conferences, and support for emerging Progressive leaders in the K-12 system and in higher education.

Our article will illustrate the difference our international movement is making in the lives of students, families, practitioners, and university faculty as we strive to reclaim a Progressive alternative in our field of educational administration. We are presenting a descriptive account of our recent history along with an agenda for future development. We think our example will be useful in an era when Progressive Education is under direct attack in most of the world's developed economies.

Background

By the dawn of the 21st century, the field of educational administration in the US had turned away from the promise of the 1990's. The days of local innovation and what was

called *school restructuring* were largely gone. The new bywords of change were accountability and high stakes testing and the vehicle driving this movement was No Child Left Behind (NCLB). For the first time in American history, the federal government seemed bent on evaluating all public schools, based on a single indicator, known as Adequate Yearly Progress or AYP. Nor was this movement limited to North America. As far away as Australia, educators saw their freedom to make local decisions limited by ever more detailed plans created at departments or ministries of education. Few of these plans fit even the loosest definition of the hands-on experiential learning typified by Progressive education advocates.

Equally disturbing was the neo-liberal argument that if countries raised test scores and permitted market forces to dominate education policy, that income inequalities and high rates of poverty would somehow disappear. These policies were adopted by both Republican and Democratic administrations in the US and were touted as self-evident truths.

Given the punitive nature of NCLB and the power of the conservative think tanks and media supporting this attack, a hard shift to the right in education policy seemed in full swing. Progressive education appeared doomed and local democratic decision-making seemed out of favor. Yet, there was another narrative emerging from scholars in the field of educational administration calling for more Progressive, ethical and democratic forms of renewal for schools in the US and abroad (Aiken 2002; Begley, 1999; Begley & Zaretsky, 2004; Boyd 2000; Davis 2003; Gross 2004b; Reitzug & O'Hair, 2002, Sernak, 1998; Shapiro & Purpel, 2004; Shapiro & Stefkovich, 2005; Starratt, 2004; Young, Petersen, & Short 2002).

These writers were part of a long tradition linking social justice, democracy, with education. Jane Addams and Ellen Gates Starr made the same connection at Hull House (Addams 2002) as did Hilda Worthington Smith at the Bryn Mawr Summer School for Women Workers in Industry (Smith, 1929). At the height of the Great Depression, FDR initiated the Civilian Conservation Corps for unemployed men, also based on much the same logic, while Eleanor Roosevelt made a valiant effort to offer the same kind of program for women (Cook 1999, Gross 2004a).

Today's scholars also drew inspiration from the democratic administration movement of the 1930's and 1940's in the US. The parallel between the two eras seemed apt; the US faced harsh economic times in the Depression. At the turn of the 21st century, the technology bubble had burst and our economic future dimmed. The US faced a threat to its democracy from Fascist Italy, Nazi Germany, and Imperial Japan then, and faced an era of terror, war, and challenges to civil liberties in the post-9/11 world today. Therefore, it was instructive to recall our reaction in school leadership programs in the 1930's and 1940's was to emphasize democratic power sharing among administrators, teachers and parents. [1]

Also central to the thinking of this new group of scholars was the philosophy of John Dewey. In *The School and Society* (1900) Dewey railed against education that sought to mold children like so much raw material.

I may have exaggerated somewhat in order to make plain the typical points of the old education: its passivity of attitude, its mechanical massing of children, its uniformity of curriculum and method. It may be summed up by stating that the center of gravity is outside the child. It is in the teacher, the textbook, anywhere and everywhere you please except in the immediate instincts and activities of the child himself. (p. 34)

In *Democracy and Education* (1916) Dewey called on educators to re-think the connection between schools and the larger world:

But as civilization advances the gap between the capacities of the young and the concerns of the adults widens. Learning by direct sharing in the pursuits of grown-ups becomes increasingly difficult except in the case of the less advanced occupations. Much of what adults do is so remote in space and in meaning that playful imitation is less and less adequate to reproduce its spirit. Ability to share effectively in adult activities thus depends upon prior training given with this end in view. Intentional agencies-schools-and explicit material-studies- are devised. (pp.7-8)

The previous year, John and Evelyn Dewey depicted exemplars of what this kind of schooling would look like in their book, *Schools of Tomorrow* (1915). Everywhere in that text are scenes of children learning about the world through hands-on activities including model building, operating small stores, and acting. The connection between experiential learning and preparation for democratic citizenship is clear and intentional. Just as clear is Dewey's contention that the life of children, as children, matters rather than the concept of childhood as merely a preparation for adulthood (Kliebard 1987).

So while the external policy world of the early 21st century seemed dominated by an accountability movement reminiscent of the Essentialist ideals of William Bagley (1938) combined with market forces privatization inspired by Milton Friedman (1962), a counter perspective was emerging. Instead of training educational administrators to manage schools that marched to the beat of accountability and top-down management, a small but growing group began to work in an opposite direction. Raising the next generation of young people capable of running a democratic society was their first priority. A key to achieving this was to immerse future educational leaders in ethical decision-making. (Shapiro & Stefkovich, 2001, 2005, 2011, Starratt, 2004).

In *God has a Dream* (2005)*,* Archbishop Desmond Tutu's description of *ubuntu*, illustrates the potential of democratic-ethical educational leadership:

According to ubuntu, it is not a great good to be successful through being aggressively competitive and succeeding at the expense of others. In the end, our purpose is social and communal harmony and well-being. Ubuntu does not say, 'I think, therefore I am.' It says rather, 'I am human because I belong. I participate. I share.' Harmony, friendliness, community are great goods. Social harmony is for us the *summum bonum* – the greatest good. Anything that subverts, that undermines this

sought-after good is to be avoided like the plague. Anger, resentment, lust for revenge, even success through aggressive competitiveness, are corrosive of this good (p. 27).

In 2004, two Temple University faculty members, Steven Jay Gross and Joan Polinar Shapir decided to take action and moved to organize other like-minded educational administration academics and field administrators. They agreed on the name New DEEL, standing for Democratic Ethical Educational Leadership, and challenged themselves with the daunting job of changing the direction of educational administration in the US and abroad.

Early Development

Almost immediately, Gross and Shapiro shared their vision for a new movement in educational administration with faculty and department leaders from The Pennsylvania State University, the University of Vermont, Rowan University, the University of Oklahoma, the University Council of Educational Administration and the University of North Carolina at Greensboro as well as US and Canadian practitioner leaders. The group agreed that democratic citizenship and ethical leadership were the top priorities for our educational system in any era, and especially in the new century where violence, economic dislocation, and environmental degradation were daily news events. To develop the New DEEL, two winter strategy sessions were held at Temple University, the first in 2005 and the second in 2006. These resulted in refining the concept of the New DEEL, its implications for educational administration programs and the following mission statement that united the group:

The New DEEL's mission statement focuses on these values:

The mission of the New DEEL is to create an action-oriented partnership, dedicated to inquiry into the nature and practice of democratic, ethical educational leadership through sustained processes of open dialogue, right to voice, community inclusion, and responsible participation toward the common good. We strive to create an environment to facilitate democratic ethical decision-making in educational theory and practice which acts in the best interest of all students (Gross & Shapiro 2005).

Gross (2009) described the emerging values of the group in this way:

New DEEL members believe that the first job of the school is to help young people become effective citizens in a democracy. Learning how to earn a living is crucial but it is a close second, in their opinion. Democratic citizenship in any era is a complex task but it seems especially difficult in our era where international conflict and growing economic and social inequality are the rule. New DEEL members consider the either/or choice among school improvement, democracy and social justice critiqued above to be a false dilemma. They believe instead, that there is no democracy without social justice, no social justice without democracy, and that these

mutually inclusive concepts are indispensable ingredients to school improvement worthy of the name.

Just as important, the group's concept of educational leadership applied to teachers, students, parents, and community members just as much as the person sitting at the principal's desk. Moreover, to respond to the challenges of our era, educational leaders needed to move beyond their buildings and their school system's structure to make alliances with community leaders in areas such as health care and commerce.

All of this was inspiring but soon people asked just what was a New DEEL leader going to look like and what difference was there between this person and the typical educational administrator. The Mission Statement set a general direction aimed at reclaiming a more Progressive, socially just, and responsive school system, but now specifics were required. In response, the New DEEL vision for educational leadership was developed (Table-1)

Table 1: *Comparison of New DEEL Vision for Leaders with the Behavior of Traditional Leaders* (Gross, 2009)

New DEEL Vision for Leaders	Behavior of Traditional School Leaders
Transformational	*Transactional*
1. Guided by inner sense of Responsibility to students, families, the community and social development on a world scale.	Driven by an exterior pressure of accountability to those above in the organizational/political hierarchy.
2. Leads from an expansive community-building perspective. A democratic actor who understands when and how to *shield* the school from turbulence and when and how to *use* turbulence to facilitate change.	Bound by the system and the physical building. A small part of a monolithic, more corporate structure.
3. Integrates the concepts of democracy, social justice and school reform through scholarship, dialogue and action.	Separates democracy and social justice from guiding vision and accepts school improvement (a subset of school reform) as the dominant perspective.
4. Operates from a deep understanding of ethical decision making in the context of a dynamic, inclusive, democratic vision.	Operates largely from perspective of the ethic of justice wherein obedience to authority and current regulations is largely unquestioned despite one's own misgivings.
5. Sees one's career as a calling and has a well developed sense of mission toward democratic social improvement that cuts across political, national, class, gender, racial, ethnic, and religious boundaries.	Sees one' career in terms of specific job titles with an aim to move to ever greater positions of perceived power within the current system's structure.

This table contrasts the five transformational qualities of New DEEL leadership with the corresponding transactional qualities of more traditional leaders. In each of the five areas, the New DEEL leader is someone who sets off in a different, more challenging, and hopefully more rewarding direction. Item 1 contrasts the contractual demands of the accountability system with the deeper demands of following one's inner sense of responsibility for students, their families and the wider community. New DEEL leaders cannot focus solely on gaining better scores on standardized tests. Nor can they believe that making AYP is a route to a more just society.

In section 2 leaders are encouraged to act in democratic ways to help develop young people. This means understanding how turbulence works (Gross 1998, 2004. Shapiro and Gross 2008, 2013) and finding ways to protect those they work with from its excesses. In contrast, the traditional leader is a small part of a hierarchy that places constant demands and expects compliance. Members of the New DEEL feel strongly that the former models democracy while the latter exhibits authoritarian behaviors that undermine the school's attempt to educate for democratic life.

Item 3 speaks to the need for a coherent vision that connects rather than atomizes the values of democracy, social justice and school reform while encouraging dialogue and high quality scholarship.

A major element of New DEEL scholarship comes in item 4, namely the work of learning and practicing ethical decision making from a multi-dimensional paradigm. New DEEL leaders understand that the ethic of justice, encompassing laws, rights, rules and even guidelines, is important because it tells us what statutes and laws have to say on a given matter. But there are other ethics to consider in making important decisions. For example, there is also the ethic of critique that asks: Who made the law? In whose best interest? The ethic of care does not take notice of the law at all. Instead it asks: Who may benefit or be hurt by my decision? What are the likely long-term effects upon different people? Finally, the ethic of the profession takes into account professional ethics from different appropriate organizations as well as one's own code of ethics, both personal and professional. Above all, it asks: What is in the best interests of the student? Stopping with the ethic of justice will not suffice (Shapiro and Stefkovich 2011, Starratt 1994).

Finally, item 5 deepens the discussion of being an educator from merely holding a job to a life long calling. Members of the New DEEL believe that this is essential because only that kind of commitment will energize leaders sufficiently to transform our current system. Equally, seeing education as a *calling* honors the energy and sacrifice that these individuals have made.

The group developed a strong conceptual base and it quickly grew from a handful of academics, mostly in the US, to include educational administration faculty from over 30 universities and practitioner colleagues from Canada, Australia, Taiwan, Sweden, the UK, Hong Kong, New Zealand, Jamaica, as well as the US. Now a plan to turn the Progressive,

democratic ideals of the mission statement and vision for leaders into action was required. Using Furman's (2004) concept of the ethic of the community, the New DEEL was headed for the creation of an alternative way of envisioning and educating school leadership that centered on nurturing a new kind of community. Neither compliant behavior nor shallow heroics that might damage a person's career, were deemed acceptable. Instead, development in four interconnected areas was proposed and will be described in the following section of this article.

Coordinated Approaches to Realize our Progressive, Democratic and Ethical Vision for Educational Administration

Organizing our ideas into a coherent form and daring to say that we aimed to change the direction of our field was a start, but then came the task of developing a feasible strategy. Dedicating ourselves to this long-term process challenged each of us to live up to the five elements of the New DEEL vision for educational leaders, described in Table 1. Above all, item 5 had a profound effect. The concept of a *calling* and not a mere *job* resonated with all of us. We pondered just what it meant to change a field's direction and how would this be accomplished in a way that built a Progressive community from P-20. [1]

First, we believed that a new body of scholarship needed to be developed, while existing appropriate scholarship needed to be collected and shared. Second, we needed to bring people together with our own conferences to exchange ideas and perspectives and to enrich everyone's networks. This was both collegial and strategic. We realized that the development of community, with common values, was essential in an era of high stakes testing and accountability to make certain that Progressives did not feel isolated and vulnerable. Since 2007, we have seen our scholarship and conference initiatives grow. More recently, we decided that there was a need to add two additional projects: enhanced technology and a mentoring program for P-20 educators. Below we will examine our experience in each of these:

Building a Foundation for Transformational Change: Promoting New DEEL scholarship

If a Progressive movement in educational administration was to be constructed, its foundation needed to rest on a body of scholarship, new research, and the continuing evolution of questions and debates that are the hallmark of any rich field of inquiry. This meant developing new writing and helping our community access existing articles and books. Since the whole question of taking an ethical stand against the accountability movement's excesses was central to our mission, some of our own work in the field of resolving ethical dilemmas became important to share.

Two books, in particular, are notable in this area both for their content and in the way graduate student practitioners were made central to their development. The first is *Ethical Leadership and Decision Making in Education: Applying Theoretical Perspectives to Complex Dilemmas* (Shapiro and Stefkovich 2001, 2005, 2011). In this book, Shapiro and

Stefkovich expanded upon earlier work of scholars such as Starratt (2004) to develop a Multiple Ethical Paradigm of the ethics of justice (Sergiovanni 1992, 2009), critique (Giroux 1988), care (Gilligan 1982, Noddings, 2002) and the profession. Their addition of the ethic of the profession asks educators to consider what is in the best interests of the student as they ponder ethical dilemmas. This question looms large for everyone in the New DEEL as we ask: Are high stakes tests and a lock step, narrowed curriculum really in the best interests of the student? Just as importantly, we ask: Is our social inequality at all compatible with our country's democratic ideals?

Shapiro and Stefkovich provided a theoretical background and then shared ethical problems, developed by their students, thereby making the dilemmas authentic. Using the Multiple Ethical Paradigm, students then explored questions surrounding their dilemma showing its complexity and ways in which thoughtful solutions might be developed. Again, this process fit our New DEEL approach since it placed heavy responsibility upon individual educators to think through challenging problems rather than simply be willing to accept the dictates of an authority figure. In our view, democratic life demands this kind of skillful reasoning from citizens. This is also an example of our use of Progressive education's hands-on approach to learning and connecting school-based learning with conditions in the world beyond the halls of the academy. Shapiro and Stefkovich followed through in community building by creating graduate student panels at national and international conferences where they not only presented successfully but also made important connections to other P-20 educators facing similar dilemmas.

In a second book, *Ethical Educational Leadership in Turbulent Times: (Re)solving Moral Dilemmas*, Shapiro and Gross (2008, 2013) connect the Multiple Ethical Paradigms with Turbulence Theory. Turbulence Theory (Gross 1998, 2004b) helps students of organization consider the severity of a given dilemma, how that dilemma might be seen by different people, its chances to cascade into a larger problem, and how to gauge the relative stability of an organization facing turbulence. According to this theory, turbulence can be experienced at four levels (light, moderate, severe, and extreme), similar to the experience of airplane pilots. In addition, the forces of positionality, cascading, and stability act upon turbulence individually and in combination in ways that either raise or lower turbulence. Finally, a turbulence gauge can be constructed that allows students to consider current and possible future levels of turbulence as they weigh their response to the ethical dilemmas they confront. The combination of the two approaches now gives students a powerful way to face and reason through the problems facing conscientious educators in this era. The pattern of using student-authored dilemmas was followed in this book as well as was the habit of bringing practitioners to conferences to present.

While these two books are relevant to the New DEEL and are widely used by our group, they are only a small part of the scholarship supporting us. One can now find a growing number of books, book chapters, case studies, dissertations, and journal articles. Almost all of the authors are part of the New DEEL in one capacity or another. Some of the work was specifically written about the New DEEL, such as Storey's *New DEEL: An Ethical Framework for Addressing Common Issues in Florida Schools* (2011). Others, such as

Normore's *Leadership for Social Justice: Promoting Equity and Excellence Through Inquiry and Reflective Practice* (2008), included numerous contributions by scholars attempting to confront the core issues of social justice and social responsibility in the context of our current educational policy environment.

Many authors are American but others consider the issue of democratic life and its implications for school from an international perspective. Woods' (2011) *Transforming Education Policy: Shaping a Democratic Future* is one such example from the UK. Several writers are senior academics but the list is more than balanced by young scholars at or recently past the tenure stage of their careers. In many instances, they have been successful in finding co-authors among their New DEEL colleagues. Similar to making a point of bringing graduate students to conferences, this collegiality has become an integral part of building a strong, mutually supporting Progressive community. Publishing together grows our scholarship while it helps the authors establish some career stability. This is an example of what we mean by daring to change our field while not asking people to risk their positions.

If developing and enriching the literature on democratic and ethical educational leadership is a first step, sharing that scholarship is a logical next part of the sequence. Rounding out our commitment to develop and share a body of scholarship is the creation of new courses for masters and doctoral students in educational administration. Since our programs attract future leaders in elementary, secondary, and tertiary institutions, new courses offer us an excellent chance to build on our concept of a P-20 continuum of democratic ethical educational leadership in the making.

One course, developed just for the New DEEL by Gross, is called *Profiles of Democratic Ethical Leadership*. Using a wide cross-section of women and men from the US and around the world, both in our own time and from time past, students consider the common qualities these leaders demonstrate as they faced their greatest personal and professional challenge. Some come directly from the field of education, such as Ella Flagg Young. Others are identified with different professions, for example, Desmond Tutu and Soong Ching-ling. All have had a major impact on society and have, therefore, shaped education. Students consider the work of these leaders and construct a vibrant and organic definition of democratic ethical leadership that will inform our professional practice. Jerome Brunner's Concept Attainment Model (1966) is used to help in the creation of this definition[2]. His inductive, engaging approach is instrumental in helping students see the complexity of being a democratic ethical leader in any era.

Profiles of Democratic Ethical Leadership is one example of new coursework, but it is not an isolated case. At Temple University, the whole range of principal preparation courses was reworked and now has adopted a consistent New DEEL perspective. Similar work has taken place at other universities affiliated with the New DEEL.

Developing a Progressive, Democratic Ethical Educational Community through Conferences, Technology, and Mentoring

At our second winter strategy session, held in 2006, we were at a crossroads. Interest was increasing and pressure was building for us to take the next step and develop a conference of our own. The goal was to bring New DEEL scholars and practitioners together to exchange ideas, debate approaches and build a sense of common purpose and direction. In February, 2007, we held the first of these conferences with the title *What Do We Mean by Democratic and Ethical Leadership in an Era of Contention?* As the title suggests, the conference helped us to sharpen our common understanding of crucial ideas while it also helped us to broaden our audience. The following year presidential politics was heating up and we decided that the theme needed to reflect the aspirations and concerns of many in the US and around the world. *Fear versus Possibility* captured that spirit.

By the spring of 2009, much of the advanced economies in the world faced the worst financial crisis since the Great Depression. We focused on the challenges and potential opportunities of the times by entitling our conference *Reconstructing Our World: Developing Democratic Ethical Communities in Turbulent Times.* Yet, by the following year, policy pressures from those emphasizing market forces as the ultimate priority in education caused us to refocus our attention in a conference called *Our Children: Economic Warriors or Democratic Ethical Citizens?*

In 2011 we reflected our commitment to social justice and social responsibility by recalling Franklin Roosevelt's appeal to the nation to build upon the first Bill of Rights. *Really Leaving No Child Behind: It's More than Time for FDR's Second Bill of Rights* crystallized this possibility and caused many attendees to broaden their perspective by including Roosevelt's advocacy of Progressive legislation (Sunstein 2004). At this conference, we came to the conclusion that our society faced a crossroads. On the one hand, there was a vision that a laissez-faire, market-based economy would ipso facto result in an equitable society. On the other hand was Roosevelt's contention that democracy required assurances of stability, outlined in his Second Bill of Rights, and that this foundation would create a fair society and inspire generations who would value education.

Our conferences are designed to be intimate yet large enough to spur dialogue and debate. Typically this means between thirty to forty papers presented by scholars, graduates students or practitioners coming from many universities and school districts. A list of institutions represented at our conferences is included in the appendix to this article and includes a wide range of US universities as well as those from Australia, Canada, Sweden, Taiwan, and the UK. Our 6th conference was held in May 2013.

New DEEL keynote lectures honoring the ideals of scholarship and practice, women's leadership, excellence in teaching, and citizen service to education are a highlight of every conference. Over the years, these have focused on topics meant to challenge and inspire our group. For example, Arizona State University's David Berliner's lecture, *How the Lack of*

Caring for America's Children Impacts the Performance of Our Nation's Schools and Damages our Democracy, underscored our foundational connection between education policy and Progressive social policy. Temple University's James Earl Davis highlighted a similar concern, this time regarding racial inequalities in his address, *Leadership among "The Least of These": African American Males and the Challenge of Schools.* University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) Executive Director Michelle D. Young reminded us of the weighty decisions that groups like our need to consider in *The Politics and Ethics of Professional Responsibility.*

One of the most important things we do in the New DEEL is to nurture an intergenerational community of scholars. So we started to hold graduate student workshops at the conclusion of our conferences connecting established academics with the rising generation. At these sessions, senior scholars meet one-on-one with graduate students to help mentor them as they pursue early research projects. Often, these relationships carry on and deepen as graduate students launch their own careers as K-12 practitioners or higher education faculty.

In July 2010, we added a new kind of conference by holding the first Camp New DEEL in Vermont. Camp New DEEL was designed to build community, share our writing, enjoy a common reading, develop a vision for the schools and universities we would like to see, and plan for the future of the New DEEL around the world. By establishing this community, we followed a long tradition of summer institutes to built by cultural and politically focused communities in the United States.[3]

Creating Camp New DEEL was also inspired by the scholarship of Charles Tilly's writing on social movements (2004) in which he claims that successful social movements demonstrate worthiness, unity, numbers, and commitment or W.U.N.C. Tilly also describes the conditions needed for social movements to promote democracy.

In short, social movements promote democratization when-either as explicit programs or as by-products of their actions- they broaden the range of participants in public politics, equalize the weight of participants in public politics, erect barriers to the direct translation of categorical inequalities into public politics, and/or integrate previously segmented trust networks into public politics (p.143).

Along with our conferences and camps, we have made numerous presentations at the American Educational Research Association's (AERA) annual meetings and have created an important niche for ourselves in our learned society, The University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA). In fact, UCEA, through its Executive Director and members of it Executive Committee, have been crucial New DEEL colleagues giving key direction to us since our beginning. UCEA has a wide audience in the US and abroad and a growing number of UCEA members are affiliated with the New DEEL. We see our work at these conferences as community building as well, and we typically host a special New DEEL dinner for friends and families to socialize and share experiences.

International Reach

The New DEEL orientation has been international from the outset and that perspective became formalized in 2010 when we joined with like-minded centers at Nipissing University, Canada, Australian Catholic University, Umea University, Sweden, Penn State, and the Hong Kong Institute of Education to become the Center for the Study of Leadership and Ethics (CSLE). As one of UCEA's official centers, CSLE unites scholars and practitioners in the field of educational administration by holding annual conferences, and by publishing and sponsoring research opportunities. With colleagues in five countries around the world, we are better able to compare conditions and challenges and establish partnerships.

Research trips by Gross to Australia and Sweden have uncovered similar patterns of a narrowed, teacher-centered curriculum, heavy emphasis on high stakes testing, and the advance of market forces and privatization. In presentations before hundreds of administrators in both countries, the New DEEL mission and priorities for action have been well received. As one principal from a school near Stockholm recently put it, "I am a Progressive educator, but there is pressure to move away from those ideals." It is clear to us that the need for international ties and support is growing.

Acknowledging the Difference We Have Made To Date:

We continually ask ourselves what difference have we made to date and how would we know it. Clearly, the policy world has not been turned around; in fact, the case can be made that things have gotten worse for Progressive educators in the years since we started our work. Yet, it would be wrong, in our opinion, to conclude that we have not made a contribution to the creation of an alternative vision for education in an age dominated by neo-liberal market forces and high stakes accountability policies.

First, we have brought together hundreds of scholars and practitioners representing three generations of Progressive educators through our conferences. Their shared stories, scholarship, and passion have helped to create an alternative community with its own history and values.

Next, we have helped to nurture numerous young scholars from their doctoral work into their first academic jobs and through to tenure and promotion. While many of these people are at our own university, many more come from across the US and abroad. They represent the next generation of educational leadership and administration professors who, in turn, will teach practitioners and future higher education faculty. Since we believe that our work will require a multi-generation approach, this is a critical role for us to play. We provide publishing opportunities, presentations at national and international conferences, and chances to network with like-minded academics and practitioners.

Finally, we have identified and honored key individuals in the areas of citizen service to education, scholarship that impacts practice, women's leadership in education, mentoring,

and graduate teaching that is inspired by Progressive education principles. Each of these is reflected in a lecture and award at our conferences. In this way, we believe that we have helped to sustain key Progressive education traditions for our students and colleagues in the US and abroad.

Preparing for the Work Ahead:

The coming academic year (2013-2014) will mark the end of our first decade making this a good time to consider the challenges and directions that we see ahead. At times, it feels as though we are in mid ocean; far away from either shore and facing heavy seas. Still, our community is growing and we have plotted a reasonable, though long course. While the general conditions that inspired us still pertain, new challenges have emerged.

The first of these is the coming of the Common Core State Standards, now adopted by nearly every state. This is a historic change from previous experiences in American curriculum history since the Common Core marks the first attempt at what amounts to a nationalized curriculum (Mathis 2010). While some consider the Common Core a mere outline of advisable directions for the nation's public schools, the multiplicity of suggested instructional material and the coming of two national tests to measure acquisition of Common Core skills makes this a robust project, and to our way of thinking, a dangerous one.

By organizing the broad outlines of the curriculum at the national level, local experiments, often associated with the very hands-on experiential learning associated with Progressive education, will likely be viewed with suspicion since they do not directly connect to the larger pattern of top-down mandates. In addition, such a sweeping change in curriculum control threatens to accelerate the pattern of curriculum narrowing witnessed in the implementation of NCLB (Ravitch 2010). What role can community related projects possibly play when a nationalized test will determine success or failure for the individual student as well as for her teacher and school? Preparing for such a limited future evaluation seems to us the antithesis of Dewey's contention that learning matters for the child as she or he is now.

The fact that much of the impetus and funding for the Common Core came from the Gates Foundation, and is being pushed directly from Bill Gates himself, speaks to the role of what is now referred to as Venture Philanthropists (Saltman 2010). The power of the Venture Philanthropists represents the second new challenge. Foundations such as the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, The Walton Family Foundation, and the Broad Foundation now appear at the center of this movement which is dedicated to market-based and high stakes accountability reforms that challenge, not only Progressive education, but the public schools themselves since these groups favor charter schools, both privately and publicly managed. Those of us in higher education are not immune from the reach of these foundations since privatization in such fields as leadership preparation has long been a staple of the Broad Superintendent's Academy. Reading the literature coming from the Venture Philanthropists, it is clear that their goals for education are more narrowly confined to career preparation rather than raising the next generation capable of sustaining a democratic society (Baltodano,

2012).

Finally, those supporting Progressive education must act in a world where threats to physical security, economic dislocation, radical technological transformation, and environmental crisis are taken as part of daily life. Each of these conditions could easily ratchet up tensions for our students, their families, and their communities. Taken together, they raise the potential for serious ethical dilemmas that today's and tomorrow's educators must learn how to resolve. That is why we made these issues the centerpiece of our 6th New DEEL conference.

At this point perhaps the best we can offer are thoughtful questions: In a dangerous world, how do educators contribute to a sense of realistic security for our society's children? In a world filled with tensions and adversarial relationships, how do we help our young expand the sense of "we" to include "the other"? How shall we advocate for our most needy school children and their families in a time of budget cutting? What kind of economic security do we envision for our youth and how might we advocate for that vision? How do we encourage technologies that do not exploit fellow educators (the on-line challenge)? What can we do to help our young use technology rather than being used by technology (including cyber bullying, hyper-consumerism, hurried lives)? How can we raise awareness of the environmental price we ask the world to pay for our lifestyles in a fair and constructive way? What vision do we want to share with our children for the world they are to inherit from us? What kind of models do we want to be for saving the environment from abuse? How will we infuse the curriculum with these ideas? Questions such as these make the need for ethical decision-making more important than ever for tomorrow's educational leaders.

Over the next decade, we will have to find new and more effective ways to respond to all of the challenges raised above, as well as unforeseen ones just over the horizon. In addition to accelerating our work in scholarship and continuing our international community building efforts we will need to invent new approaches.

One possibility is to further develop our New DEEL curriculum work for aspiring P-20 educational leaders. While our own program has adopted a New DEEL perspective into course work, this is not sufficiently the case in universities where we have colleagues. We have networked within the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA), our learned society, from our earliest days and it seems likely that this will increase over time as we push for more influence over the direction of our field.

Allied with our curriculum plans is the development of P-20 mentor/protégé cohorts. As described earlier in this article, mentoring has long been a goal for the New DEEL since we believe that our work cannot be done well in isolation. At this point we have an intergenerational team working with scholars who specialize in mentoring research. Each team member is currently in a mentoring relationship with a colleague and the team will comprise the first cohort. From there, they will design a methodical plan to expand the mentoring program for New DEEL colleagues in the US and abroad. The team will submit a

proposal to present its work and related research at the 2014 American Educational Research Association (AERA) annual conference.

A third aspect of our work is to break out of the current silos we find ourselves in and engage in consistent dialogue with the wider community. Simply put, there are severe limits on what we can achieve if we only work within our own circle of academic and practitioner colleagues in our own programs and schools. Like our plans for the mentoring program, we have started this project first with our own practice.

During his sabbatical year, one of us (Steve Gross) attended state board of education meetings regularly and presented policy papers relevant to board agenda items in his home state of Vermont. He also testified at the state senate, spoke out at county legislative breakfast meetings, and joined a community planning team for local school reform. Joan Shapiro served as Temple University Faculty Senate President in the 2012-2013 academic year. Her term included the arrival of a new university president and the appointment of a new provost along with a new budgeting model that held serious implications for every program across all campuses. Joan emphasized shared governance and other New DEEL values into her work with university leaders, faculty, and board members. In both cases, being a consistent presence over time broke down previous barriers and helped to build new alliances. We need to find ways for all of our New DEEL colleagues to break out of their usual confines and start dialogues like these. In our view, not doing so merely concedes the field to those who oppose Progressive education and its values.

Fourth, we need to build bridges to like-minded organizations in the US and around the world. Our own network is expanding but not fast enough and we know that we are only one small piece of the robust response needed in the coming decade. We have made a start by finding such organizations as the National Education Policy Center (NEPC) at the University of Colorado. Their reviews, publications, and blogs have become an invaluable source for research-based facts on such issues as the efficacy of charter schools or the negative implications for democracy resulting in NCLB. As we speak out more publicly, we will need to transcend our necessarily focused areas of expertise and organizations such as NEPC can help us broaden our perspective. But we also need to forge reciprocal alliances and find where our work fits that of others. These are early days for that effort but time is short and the threat to democratic public education is more real than ever, in our view.

Together these four elements represent our effort to imagine a new level of engagement that combines a greater intensity in teaching our New DEEL approach to rising educational leaders with the support and strategies that will help them to succeed both internally and beyond the confines of their workplace. It is our best strategy so far in helping them become exemplars of the New DEEL vision for leadership in our turbulent era.

Conclusion

Since the founding of our field nearly a century ago, there has been a tension. Cubberly (1916) urged educational administrators to behave like the business leaders of that era.

Echoes of that argument have cascaded down to our own time and have picked up momentum in the past thirty years. Yet, there is a different and equally established tradition for educational leaders, namely emerging from the ideals of Ella Flagg Young and John Dewey, who emphasized Progressive education and democratic school leadership.

The accountability movement did not achieve its dominant position over night, but rather evolved over the decades since the Nation at Risk report (National Commission on Excellence in Education 1983). Those of us who desire a very different direction for our field and the children we serve need to have an equally long-range perspective. In the eight years since our beginning, we have made a small but successful start. We believe that the New DEEL represents one pathway towards the development of a Progressive, democratic, educational community that can nurture the rising generation of scholars and practitioners of educational administration.

Perhaps the words on Dewey's tombstone best describe our need to remember our place in the long line of like-minded educators and our duty to the future:

> The things in civilization we most prize are not of ourselves. They exist by grace of the doings and sufferings of the continuous human community in which we are a link. Ours is the responsibility of conserving, transmitting, rectifying and expanding the heritage of values we have received that those who come after us may receive it more solid and secure, more widely accessible and more generously shared than we have received it. (From: A Common Faith. John Dewey UVM Class of 1879)

Endnotes:

[1] We were inspired by the Democratic Administration movement in our field, yet we had to acknowledge that the field of Educational Administration had a strong conservative tradition often modeled on corporate hierarchies. The foundational work of Cubberly (1916) and the critique of this pattern by Counts (1927) are two prime examples. So we realized that the New DEEL was going to have to swim against strong anti-Progressive currents.

[2] Our version of Brunner's Concept Attainment Model involved the examination of examples of a given concept, in this case democratic ethical leadership. We would then write down the example's attributes. Then a second example was then provided. Attributes from the first example that are found in the second example were kept, those that not in evidence were eliminated. We also asked about qualities found in the second example that may have also been in the first as a double check. This process was repeated until we have looked carefully at all of the characters in the course. From this, our grounded definition of democratic ethical leadership emerged.

[3] These included: the Chautauqua Institution founded in 1874 (Morrison, 1974); The Bryn Mawr Summer School for Women Workers founded in 1921 (Heller 1984, 1986); The Bread Loaf Writers' Conference established in 1926 (Bain & Duffy 1993, Morrison 1976); and the Highlander Research and Education Center that began its work in 1932 (Adams & Horton 1975, Horton, Kohl, & Kohl 1990).

References

Adams, F., Horton, M. (1975). *Unearthing seeds of fire: The idea of highlander*. Winston-Salem, NC: John F. Blair.

Addams, J. (2002). *Democracy and social ethics*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Aiken, Judith. (2002) The socialization of new principals: Another perspective on principal retention. *Educational Leadership Review 3* (1), 32-40.

Bagley, W C. (1938) An Essentialist's Platform for the Advancement of American Education, *Educational Administration and Supervision* 24 (April):241–256.

Bain, D. H., Duffy, M. S. (1993). *Whose woods these are: A history of the bread loaf writers' conference 1926-1990*. Hopewell, NJ: Ecco.

Baltodano, M. (2012) Neoliberalism and the demise of public education: The

corporatization of schools of education. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education v 25 n 4 pp 487-507*. P 496

Begley, P. T. (Ed.). (1999). Values *and educational leadership*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Begley, P. T. & Zaretsky, L. (2004) Democratic school leadership in Canada's public school systems: Professional value and social ethic. *The Journal of Educational Administration*, *42*(6), 640-655.

Boyd, W. L. (2000) The r's of school reform and the politics of reforming or replacing public schools. *Journal of Educational Change*, *1*(3), 225-252.

Bruner, J. (1966). *Toward a theory of instruction*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Cook, B. W. (1999) *Eleanor Roosevelt. Volume 2: 1933-1938*. New York: Viking

Counts, G. S. (1927). *The social composition of boards of education: A study in the social control of public education*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Counts, G. S. (1932). *Dare the schools build a new social order?* Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Cubberly, E. P. (1916). *Public administration*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Davis, J. E. (2003). Early schooling and the achievement of African American males. *Urban Education*, *38* (5), 515-537.

Dewey, J. (1900). *The school and society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Dewey, J, & Dewey, E. (1915). *Schools of tomorrow*. New York: E.P. Dutton.

Dewey, J. (1916) *Democracy and education*. New York: Free/

Friedman, M. (1962). *Capitalism and freedom.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Furman, G. C. (2004). The ethic of community. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 42; 215–235.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Giroux, H.A. (1988). *Schooling and the struggle for public life: Critical pedagogy in the modern age.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Gross, S. J. (1998) *Staying centered: Curriculum leadership in a turbulent era*. Alexandria, Virginia: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Gross, S. J. (2004a) Civic hands upon the land: Diverse patterns of social education and curriculum leadership in the civilian conservation corps and its analogues 1933-1942. In C. Woyshner, J. Watras, & M. Smith Crocco (Eds.) *Social Education in the Twentieth Century: Curriculum and Context for Citizenship*. NY: Peter Lang.

Gross, S. J. (2004b). *Promises kept: Sustaining school and district leadership in a turbulent era.* Alexandria, VA: The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Gross, S. J. (2009). (Re-) Constructing a Movement for Social Justice in our Profession. In A. H. Normore (Ed.) *Leadership for Social Justice: Promoting Equity and Excellence Through Inquiry and Reflective Practice* (pp. 257-266). Charlotte, N.C. Information Age.

Gross, S. J. & Shapiro, J.P. (2005). Our new era requires a new deel: Towards democratic ethical educational leadership. *The UCEA Review*, 1-4.

Heller, R. R. (1984). *Blue collars and blue stockings: The bryn mawr summer school for women workers 1921-1938.* In J. Kornbluh & M. Fredrickson (Eds.), Sisterhood and solidarity: Workers education for women 1914-1984. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Heller, R. R. (1986). *The women of summer: The Bryn Mawr summer school for women workers, 1921-1938.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ.

Horton, M. , Kohl, H. & Kohl, J. (1990). *The long haul: An autobiography.* New York: Doubleday.

Kliebard, H. M. (1987). *The struggle for the American curriculum: 1893-1958*. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Koopman, O., Miel, A. & Misner, P. (1943). *Democracy in school administration*. New York: Appleton-Century.

Mathis, W. J. (2010). *The "Common Core" standards initiative: An effective reform tool?* Boulder and Tempe: Education and the Public Interest Center & Education Policy Research Unit. Retrieved May 23, 2013 from http://epicpolicy.org/publication/common-core-standards.

Morrison, T. (1974). *Chautaugua: A center for education, religion, and the arts in america.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Morrison, T. (1976). *The first thirty years 1926-1955.* Middlebury, VT: Middlebury College Press.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Noddings, N. (2002). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education (2nd ed.).* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press

Normore, A. H. (Ed.). (2008). *Leadership for social justice: Promoting equity and excellence through inquiry and reflective practice*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age.

Ravitch, D. (2010) *The death and life of the great american school system. How testing and choice are undermining education.* New York: Basic.

Reitzug, U. C., & O'Hair, M.J. (2002). Tensions and struggles in moving toward a democratic school community. In G. Furman-Brown (Ed.), *School as community: From promise to practice* (119-142). New York: SUNY Press.

Saltman, K. J. (2010) *The gift of education: Public education and venture philanthropy.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1992). *Moral leadership: Getting to the heart of school improvement.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (2009). *The principalship: A reflective practice perspective,* 6th edition. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Sernak, K. (1998). School leadership-balancing power with caring. NY: Teachers College Press.

Shapiro, H. S., & Purpel, D. E. (2004). (Eds.) *Critical social issues in American Education: Democracy and meaning in a globalizing world*. (3rd ed.). Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Shapiro, J. P., & Gross, S. J. (2008). *Ethical educational leadership in turbulent times: (Re)solving moral dilemmas.* New York: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Shapiro, J. P., & Gross, S. J. (2013). *Ethical educational leadership in turbulent times: (Re)solving moral dilemmas (2nd edition).* New York: Routledge.

Shapiro, J. P., and Stefkovich, J. A. (2001) *Ethical Leadership and Decision Making in Education: Applying Theoretical Perspectives to Complex Dilemmas*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Shapiro, J. P., & Stefkovich, J.A. (2005). *Ethical leadership and decision making in education: Applying theoretical perspectives to complex dilemmas* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Shapiro, J. P. & Stefkovich, J.A. (2011). *Ethical leadership and decision making in education: Applying theoretical perspective to complex dilemmas (3rd edition).* New York: Routledge.

Smith, H. W. (1929). *Women workers at the bryn mawr summer school.* New York: Affiliated Summer School for Women Workers in Industry, and New York: American Association for Adult Education.

Starratt, R. J. (1994) *Building an ethical school: A practical response to the moral crisis in schools.* Abingdon, Oxon, UK: Routledge Falmer.

Starratt, R. J. (2004). *Ethical leadership*. San Franscisco: Jossey-Bass.

Storey, V.A. (2011). *New DEEL: An ethical framework for addressing common issues in Florida schools*. JAPSS.

Sunstein, C.R. (2004). *The second bill of rights: FDR's unfinished revolution and why we need it more than ever.* New York: Basic.

Tilly, C. (2004). Social Movements 1768-2004. Boulder, CO: Paradigm.

Tutu, D. (2005) *God has a dream.* New York: Doubleday

Woods, P. A. (2011). *Transforming education policy: Shaping a democratic future.* Bristol, UK: Policy.

Webb, L., McCarthy, M.C. (1998). Ella flagg young: Pioneer of democratic school administration. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *34*(2), 223-242.

Young, M. D, Petersen, G. J., Short, P. M. (2002). The complexity of substantive reform: A call for interdependence among key stakeholders. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 38*(2), 137-175.