

In Pursuit of Socially Just and Socio-Culturally Responsive Educational Leadership Preparation: One Ed.D. Program's Process of Transformation

¹Brad Porfilio ²Katie Strom

Abstract

Despite the clarion call from educational leaders, scholars, and doctoral students for educational leadership preparation to provide learning experiences to ensure students persist to become transformative school leaders, most educational leadership programs struggle to make this happen. The purpose of this reflective essay is to capture how converting a doctoral educational leadership program from a quarter system to a semester system afforded two faculty members the opportunity to redesign their doctoral program into one that specifically focuses on social justice. We not only capture how the semester conversion process afforded us the opportunity to ensure the program was tied to preparing transformative school leaders, but highlight how it allowed us to implement programmatic supports predicated on ensuring that more students graduate. We believe the insights we gleaned from redesigning the Ed.D. program will assist other educational leadership faculty and directors. They will be able to graduate more leaders who are equipped to build socially-just schools and solve complex problems facing the communities they serve.

Keywords: Social justice, culturally-responsive leadership, and doctoral students

¹**Brad Porfilio** is Director of the Educational Leadership Program Ed.D. Program and Professor of Leadership at San Jose State University. In addition to this leadership position, Brad was the former Associate Dean of Research and Faculty Affairs at Seattle University as well as the Director of the Educational Leadership for Social Justice Program Ed.D. Program at CSU East Bay. He received a Ph.D. from the University of Buffalo in the Social Foundations of Education. His research focuses on transformative leadership, urban education, gender and technology, cultural studies, and neoliberalism and schooling. His scholarship has received six American Educational Studies Association Critics' Choice Awards. The Awards are given annually to outstanding titles of interest to scholars in educational foundations.

²**Katie Strom** is an Assistant Professor in the Educational Leadership Department at California State University, East Bay. She teaches courses on critical perspectives on education and qualitative research methods in the Educational Leadership for Social Justice Ed.D. program. Her research focuses on preparing educators to work for social justice in classrooms and school systems and putting posthuman/materialist theories to work in educational research. Dr. Strom received her Ph.D. at Montclair State University in Teacher Education and Teacher Development. She has recent publications in *Teacher Education Quarterly*, *Teachers College Record*, and is the co-author of the book *Becoming-Teacher: A Rhizomatic Look at First-Year Teaching* (Sense, 2017). Prior to pursuing her doctorate, Kathryn was a history teacher and school leader in southern California.

Recommended Citation: Porfilio, B., & Strom, K. (2019). In pursuit of socially just and socio-culturally responsive educational leadership preparation: One Ed.D. program's process of transformation. *Journal of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, Special Issue #2 on Educational Leadership and Social Justice*, 3(2).

Introduction

During the past twelve years, there have been calls from scholars, administrators, and policymakers to alter the nature of educational leadership doctoral programs in North America (Evans, 2007; Goldring & Schuermann, 2009; Olsen & Clark, 2009; Shulman, Golde, Bueschel, & Garabedian, 2006). Rather than conceptualizing leadership in terms of characteristics individuals must possess, or roles they must fill, to successfully lead educational institutions; numerous scholar-practitioners involved in the preparation of school leaders believe leadership must be linked to the goal of transforming educational and social institutions and the material conditions encountered by marginalized social group (Furman, 2012; Shields, 2010; Skrla, Bell McKenzie, & Scheurich, 2007). In essence, these social actors argue educational leadership preparation must ensure future leaders develop the skills, critical insights, and courage necessary to “meet both the academic and the social justice needs of complex, diverse, and beleaguered education systems” (Shields, 2010, p. 562) as well as work collectively with the ‘Other’ to build a social world free from hate, hostility and oppression.

The increased interest in reconfiguring educational leadership programs, however, has not translated into the adoption of a transformative, socially-just orientation by most of such programs (Boske, 2011, p. 362). In some cases, program leaders, faculty and students who embrace a critical orientation to leadership preparation, and seek to infuse these perspectives into their programs, encounter resistance by those who occupy positions of power in the academy (Porfilio & Daniels, 2013). The dominant power brokers often fear an explicit social justice orientation program might draw the ire of students, faculty members, and the general public who conceptualize educational leadership with its dominant traits-based focus or believe, incorrectly, educational leaders must remain neutral in the face of oppression and injustice. In other cases, those who educate school leaders or directors of educational leadership programs may lack the insight or ability to tie programmatic aims, pedagogies, and curricula to transformative leadership preparation.

The purpose of this article is to capture how the process of converting an educational leadership program from a quarter-based to a semester system provided the perfect opportunity for two doctoral faculty members to ensure their program was designed to prepare transformative school leaders. The essay is also designed to highlight how the semester conversion process pushed us to reconsider how to transform our program to be socio-culturally responsive to our students, who tend to be people of color and first-generation college graduates. In the following sections, we first offer a brief overview of relevant literature, followed by a discussion of our institutional context and the semester conversion process. We then outline several key ideas that guided our program transformation, providing specific examples of the ways these informed specific changes or modifications, and offer a discussion of implications for the field of Ed.D. preparation.

Literature Review

The theoretical foundation of the Educational Leadership Social Justice program is grounded in several intellectual traditions, including critical pedagogy (e.g., Freire, 1970) and transformative leadership (Shields, 2010, 2015). Critical pedagogy originated from intellectual work generated by Frankfurt School theorists in Germany during the early 1920s (Darder, Baltadano, & Torres, 2009). These theorists, including Herbert Marcuse, Theodor Adorno, Max Horkheimer, and Jürgen Habermas, unpacked the role that institutions, culture, knowledge, and desire played in giving rise to authoritarian politics, global conflicts, and oppression in industrialized societies and the territories

colonized by Western imperial powers (Giroux, 2009). They also offered insights regarding how to develop alternative social arrangements where freedom, joy and love may flourish. In the 1960s, Paulo Freire's cultural and intellectual work built upon the ideas of the Frankfurt School. His work (e.g., Freire 1970, 1985, 1998) provided insight into how to teach and lead for social transformation. Among his noted accomplishments, Freire created literacy campaigns across Latin America in the 1960s with poor, illiterate peasants dealing with unjust social conditions in their community, working collaboratively to create critical consciousness (Gibson, 2007).

Over the past several decades, critical scholars and educators have embraced Freire's work because of its overt stance towards social justice and transformation. However, many critical pedagogues disagree about what they consider to be the sources of unbalanced power relationships and oppression in schools and other social contexts (Darder, Baltodano, & Torres, 2009; Malott & Porfilio, 2011). Consequently, critical pedagogy now consists of insights from several intellectual fields, including feminist studies, environmental studies, critical race theory, cultural studies, and Indigenous studies (Darder, Baltodano, Torres; Kincheloe & McLaren, 2007; Strom, Porfilio, & Plough, 2016). These intellectual fields offer different perspectives regarding what gives rise to social maladies as well as suggest the steps necessary to "remake schools on the ideal of justice, equity, and democracy" (Darder, Baltodano, & Torres, p.3).

The Educational Leadership Social Justice program has also embraced the insights generated by scholars such as Kathleen M. Brown, Michael Dantley, Kathryn Bell McKenzie, and Carolyn Shields, who have captured how school leadership must be viewed as a cultural practice predicated on humanizing schools and communities (Brown, 2006; Dantley & Green, 2015; Shields, 2010; Bell McKenzie, Skrla, Scheurich, 2005). In many educational leadership programs, school leaders are neither provided the outlets to reflect upon why educational institutions are structured to keep in place the dominant societal interests nor offered possibilities of the ways school leaders can become active in the struggle for building socially-just schools (Shields, 2010, 2015). To ensure school leaders generate the knowledge, skills, courage, and dispositions necessary to challenge unjust policies, practices, and arrangements in schools and other contexts, scholars who embrace a transformative approach to leadership have argued a social justice orientation must be woven into the fabric of educational leadership curriculum, pedagogy, programs and policies (Brown, 2006).

Context

California State University East Bay is one of the most diverse postsecondary institutions in the nation (Author institution, 2015). Located on the Pacific coast of the United States, CSUEB is classified as a Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI) and an Asian American Native American Pacific Islander Serving Institution (AANAPISI). As of the 2015-2016 academic year, the demographics of the Educational Leadership for Social Justice (ELSJ) Ed.D. program's three current cohorts (a total of 62 enrolled doctoral students) included 24% Latino, 24% White, 36% Black, 11% Asian (Chinese, Pakistani, and Vietnamese) and 5% Middle Eastern (Turkish and Irani) students (Strom, Porfilio, Plough, 2016). Prior to being called upon by the university administration to convert the educational leadership program from quarters to semesters in 2015, the Educational Leadership Ed.D. program at CSUEB had been in existence since 2008. From its conceptualization, the doctoral program was committed to leadership as a transformative endeavor. Not only is this purpose witnessed by title of the program (different from the name of the degree) being Educational Leadership for Social Justice, but also by the mission of the program to ignite the leadership capacity needed for creating vital, democratic, and caring K-12 educational institutions and systems. From

its outset, the program was also geared for full-time working adults who complete their coursework and dissertation projects in three years. Over the past two years, the program has become hybrid in nature, with students completing sixty percent of their studies in face-to-face meetings on campus and forty percent via online learning platforms.

The authors of this paper were not part of conceptualizing or developing the Ed.D. program. In fact, we had only been part of the Ed.D. faculty for a relatively short time before engaging in converting the program to semesters (e.g., one of us for one semester and the other for two and a half years). However, we both listened attentively to the program's students, to programmatic faculty, and alumni to ensure a social justice orientation was pervasive across the program. Based on the informal feedback given by the aforementioned parties and surveys completed by doctoral students, we felt there was a need for students to develop deeper insights surrounding what is responsible for power differentials, oppression, and social inequalities inside and outside schools. We also believed the program must ensure students become confident engaging in research, while simultaneously equipping them to write in a scholarly manner for an academic audience.

Transformative Ideas Guiding Programmatic Change

The actual semester conversion process—from conceptualization to entering the new course descriptions and syllabi in the university database—took several months and involved multiple levels of stakeholders. The bulk of the conceptual work was completed at a two-day retreat in June 2015, where the four core doctoral faculty gathered and talked our way through the current course sequence and content, examined syllabi and other materials from other social justice programs, and reviewed our own students' dissertation projects to develop an outline of the transformed program. We then assigned each of the four members of the group a set of courses, for which we developed course descriptions and syllabi, including key readings/materials and signature assessments. Over the summer, we shared and refined these descriptions, syllabi, and the course sequence as a whole. We brought our draft conversion plan to a two-day retreat in September 2015 where we received feedback from other programmatic faculty, adjunct professors, and program alumni. For three months afterward, we continued to engage in iterative cycles of revision and feedback before receiving full faculty approval in January 2016. In what follows, we discuss the key changes we made, offering our rationales and descriptive examples from the new courses.

More Purposefully Operationalizing Social Justice

Because the term “social justice” is both a term that is used to connote many different meanings as well as a phrase with political consequences (Jean-Marie, Normore, & Brooks, 2009), we believed it was imperative to provide our students a specific definition of this broad terminology at the outset of their doctoral studies. Thus, in the “Social Foundations of Education” course, students learn that developing a social justice orientation is grounded in becoming self-aware regarding how systems and structures perpetuate and expand oppressions in our society. In addition to examining the scholarship offered by several critical educators who pinpoint how schools in the U.S have historically perpetuated the interests of dominant culture over the interest of social groups marginalized on the axes of race, class, gender, ethnicity and religious background (e.g., Spring, 2013; Chomsky & Macedo, 2000; McLaren, 2016), students engage in a self-reflexive study of how systems and structures have impacted their own life experiences. For many of our students, the examination makes them cognizant, for

the first time, of how systemic forces are responsible for the numerous obstacles and oppressive conditions they and their family members have grappled with due to color of skin, religious background, class status, gender, sexuality, or (dis)ability status. In juxtaposition, they also learn how occupying dominant identities along the lines of race, gender, age, dis(ability), sexuality, class, or linguistic background in social contexts, such as schools, peer groups, and religious institutions, affords them privileges not conferred to some of their peers or family members.

We also believed it was imperative that two themes weave through the coursework. First, every class should provide opportunities for students to learn about the factors and conditions responsible for reinforcing societal oppression and unbalanced power relationships. Second, all courses should address the ways leadership is tied to social transformation. We felt students would be in an excellent position to become transformative leaders if they were provided a coherent learning experience predicated on becoming agents of change during their three years of coursework. The “Critical Policy Studies in Education” course demonstrates the way we embed these ideas in each class. In this course, students are required to situate educational policies in their historical, social, cultural, political and economic contexts. They are asked to evaluate how several policies, such as Common Core State Standards, Zero-Tolerance Policies, and U.S. Department of Education competitive grant program Race to the Top (RTTP) have supported the interests of dominant social groups over minoritized groups. They also explore whether alternative educational policies are more likely to eliminate entrenched inequities and to promote social justice in educational settings.

We also moved to broaden the program’s theoretical focus so as to guide students to embrace an intersectional approach to understanding the notion of social justice. After collectively reviewing our students and alumni dissertation proposals and projects, we noticed that in the majority of these studies, the theoretical foundation undergirding the understanding of educational problems linked to social justice concerns emanated from intellectual traditions focusing on the social significance of race. Although we believe race is an important concern in understanding how social stratification and oppression operate in the U.S., we recognize social justice education requires an intersectional approach that considers multiple identities and related oppressions. We agree with Gorski and Goodman’s (2011) assertion that “we limit our understandings whenever we attempt to look at any one of these identities or oppressions outside of the context of the other people’s identities and oppressions” (p. 456).

To promote a rich, intersectional approach, we developed a course examining issues of social justice in education through multiple theoretical perspectives. In “Engaging Critical Social Theories for Designing Research for Equity and Social Justice,” students explore several intellectual traditions dedicated to exposing why there is oppression in schools and to building non-oppressive educational structures. These traditions include critical race theory (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995), critical Whiteness studies (Leonardo, 2002), critical disability studies (Erevelles, 2002), conflict theories (Bowles and Gintis, 2002; Giroux, 1983), feminist theories (Alcoff & Potter, 2012; Donovan, 2012), critical Indigenous theory (Brown and Strega, 2005), and ecopedagogy (Kahn, 2010). Students are also exposed to the potential limitation of each theoretical perspective in terms of how it unveils how contemporary social phenomena and conflicts, such as neoliberalism, global learning networks, media culture, and deindustrialization, have the potential of keeping in place unbalanced power relationships or building a democratic social order (Schechter, 2013).

Diversifying Understandings of “Educational Leader”

Another issue that guided our change process was to broaden the notion of *educational leadership* itself. In previous years, our programmatic understanding of educational leadership was focused on K-12 administration—that is, we thought of ourselves as preparing principals. Accordingly, our courses were also focused on preparing K-12 school administrators to work for systems-level change. In the past few years, however, we have shifted our definition of educational leadership to encompass P-16 and community settings. During this conversion process, we looked to reflect that change by ensuring course topics, assignments, and materials were relevant to diverse types of educational leaders and the issues they face on a day-to-day basis.

As an illustration, the “Curriculum and Instruction” course had previously concentrated exclusively on K-12 issues of instructional planning and pedagogy. This course was changed to “Transforming Teaching and Learning,” and modified to include theories of emancipatory teaching and learning for students *and* adults, as well as address professional development dedicated to support ongoing professional learning. We also noticed during our review of current courses that a gap existed in terms of opportunities to learn about community leadership. To address that, we created a new course entitled “Community Advocacy, Organizing, and Outreach” in which students learn strategies to engage in community activism and change processes. They also partner with a local community organization to pursue a Participatory Action Research project or case study (a shared assignment with the Qualitative Inquiry course).

A final example encompasses a change to our quantitative methods course offering. Previously, qualitative and quantitative methods were taught together in two consecutive courses. However, most of our students do not choose to engage in quantitative research for their dissertation projects. We also programmatically have reservations about the problematic tradition of positivism undergirding much quantitative research (Adams St Pierre & Roulston, 2006), which, among other things, contradicts constructivist understandings of knowledge creation (Hinchey, 1998). At the same time, as we are currently in a neoliberal era of accountability, it is also imperative that all educational leaders are able to critically interpret data. In districts and accountability research, numerical data is often used in ways that produce simplistic understandings of teacher performance, student achievement, and other variables. For this reason, rather than offering a Quantitative Methods course, we will now offer “Critical Data Analysis for Leaders,” which is dedicated to developing critical numeracy skills. Students will collect, analyze, and draw on data in complex, thoughtful ways to inform leadership practice aimed at increasing equity.

Supporting Diverse Students

Another major area of concern for faculty included providing sufficient supports for our students, who tend to be “non-traditional” doctoral program entrants—that is, students of color and first-generation college graduates. We have found that students who are culturally and linguistically diverse, as well as those who are from low-socioeconomic backgrounds, require explicit opportunities to learn patterns of academic language and support to translate that learning into writing. The genre of writing at the doctoral level requires fluency with sophisticated vocabulary and concepts and patterns of language found in specific academic structures such as problem statements, literature reviews, methods sections, findings reports, and discussions; as well as the ability to use both for specific purposes (building new arguments, synthesizing bodies of research, disseminating original research).

We approached infusing needed academic literacy supports into our new course sequence through two main avenues. First, we agreed that all courses should focus on a particular writing proficiency both related to the course and that would explicitly prepare students in terms of needed doctoral-level scholarly literacy. For example, the course “Defining Educational Issues” previously focused on exploring key literature in the field of educational leadership. In the new iteration, “Reading and Writing about Educational Leadership,” students focus on defining an issue of interest through a systematic review of literature, practicing the skills needed to draw on research literature to formulate an argument, and learning the linguistic patterns and text structures featured in literature reviews. As such, the revised course now both provides an opportunity to conduct a focused review of literature in students’ stated area of interest as well as guided practice for essential skills students need to develop for successful completion of their dissertation studies.

A second major source of support included creating an advisory structure for students. We recognized the need for students to have an advisor assigned to them as they begin the program (currently not assigned until their third year). This advisor would provide mentorship in academic literacy and other key aspects of doctoral work, as well as learn students’ strengths and areas of improvement to provide individualized supports throughout their journey. However, we have a very small faculty who are constrained by their allowable workloads. To solve this issue, we created a two-unit advisory course that could be strategically scheduled throughout the program sequence. We decided to hold the advisory during the fall of year one, which is a pivotal time for students in terms of determining potential areas of focus; during the summer of year 2, when students write their first qualifying exam; during the spring of year 2, as students write their second qualifying papers and dissertation proposals; and during the spring of year 3, as students are writing their findings and discussion chapters for their dissertations.

Scaffolding the Research Strand

Overlapping with student supports in literacy was the need for a well-scaffolded set of research courses that would rigorously prepare students to carry out inquiry to pursue goals of social justice in their local settings, while also providing ample opportunities for guided practice and formative assessment along the way. We began by revisiting the two benchmark “qualifying” exams and agreed that they would be presented as assignments tightly connected to their dissertations that served a dual purpose. These exams would both assess students’ progress in developing as critical scholar-practitioners as well as generate work that would be applied to their dissertation proposals. The first qualifying exam requires students to set out a thoroughly researched problem statement that will, with evolved thinking, lay the foundation for chapter one of their dissertation proposals. The second qualifying exam serves as a dissertation prospectus that, with edits and guidance from their chair and some expansion, will comprise most of their chapters one, two, and three of a dissertation proposal.

We also worked to ensure that the research sequence, both at the individual course level and as a whole, supported the development of key understandings, skills, and practices for completing a quality dissertation project with an explicitly critical perspective that would result in local, actionable knowledge. For example, during students’ Qualitative Inquiry course, they not only learn the foundational skills for designing and carrying out systematic inquiry, but they do so with signature methodologies featuring a practitioner focus and emancipatory possibilities (such as action research, participatory action research, and self-study of professional practice). As a second illustration, we combined previous courses on program evaluation and applied research methods into one research practicum course held in conjunction with the required residency students complete in

their third year. As the practicum experience, students plan and conduct a mixed-methods evaluation on an initiative or program within the institution with which they were serving their residency. This practicum, then, would provide students with a supported experience in which they practice the skills of designing a study, collecting data, analyzing data, and generating a report with findings and programmatic recommendations.

Discussion

Through the semester conversion process, we learned valuable lessons as we moved forward with teaching, mentoring students, and conducting research in our educational leadership doctoral program. We also believe our lessons are equally valuable to other faculty and administrators who aim to assist more students with completing their educational leadership doctoral degree as well as with preparing school leaders who “raise the academic achievement of all students in schools, prepare students to live as critical citizens, and provide those faculty interested in this work with inclusive, heterogeneous spaces that enrich their experiences and engage them in the curriculum” (Boske, 2011, p. 363). First, we realize the importance of taking advantage of all opportunities provided by university administrative units to assess whether the experiences and supports we provide students in our educational leadership doctoral program need to be altered to ensure students persist to complete their degrees as well as are equipped to lead for social transformation inside and outside P-16 educational establishments. Over the last forty years, institutions of higher education have become top-down bureaucracies that are “increasingly managed and operated like a traditional profit-seeking corporation” (Schutz, 2015). As a result, faculty are given fewer opportunities to work collectively for the purpose of providing input on how to alter programs so they best serve students. Arguably, those who are committed to mentoring students to become critical agents of change and transformation may even find fewer opportunities to alter programs than their conservative counterparts. Many university administrators feel threatened by faculty members and students who are apt to question the profit-making structure of universities or other institutional arrangements, which firmly keep in place the unearned privileges accrued by those who control the academic and social world. Thus, when any opportunities arise that will allow for this type of critical reflection and modification, they must be seized.

Second, there must be a concerted effort to ensure students receive a coherent learning experience across all coursework, which has the potential to prepare them to become transformative school leaders. After reflecting collectively on programmatic requirements, course syllabi, and students’ dissertation proposals and alumni dissertation projects, we found the Educational Leadership Program for Social Justice at CSUEB needed to be modified in order to prepare bold, socially responsible leaders who are capable of transforming the world of schooling and society. The coursework failed to give students a broad understanding of the systems, structures, pedagogies, practices, and processes behind the existence of power imbalances, oppressions, and inequalities in schools and society. When coursework was earmarked for preparing students to gain an understanding of how identities and oppressions are mediated in schools and in society, students’ explorations mainly focused on the ways race is socially constructed and racism is responsible for mediating privilege and oppression among social groups in the U.S. While we believe it is imperative for students to learn about how race is socially constructed and the role racism plays in oppressing and providing unearned privilege to social groups in the U.S, we felt the doctoral coursework must attend to “all identities and oppressions” if our students are to become transformative school leaders (Gorski & Goodman, 2011). Furthermore, we believed having a coherent program centered on social justice and transformative leadership would enable students to feel connected to a larger community of like-minded scholar-

practitioners. If students feel integrated and valued in a likeminded community during their studies, and if the instructional coursework is structured “to build skills and prepare (them) for the dissertation” (Rockinson-Szapkiw, Spaulding, & Bade, 2014, p. 301), they are more likely to complete their degrees. Thus, to increase student completion, courses and assessments should be linked together and build on each other to lead toward the dissertation in concrete and meaningful ways.

Another important point is ensuring that our program can support a diversifying population of students to successfully complete their doctorates. While the CSUEB doctoral program has been diverse since its inception, across the nation, students of color are more highly represented in educational terminal degree programs than any other field (United States Department of Education, 2017). Black students, in particular, are “clustered” in education-related terminal degree programs, earning nearly twice as many educational doctorates as Whites (Matthews, 2008). However, literature regarding race/ethnicity and the doctoral process shows that students of color have a more complicated path than their white peers to a terminal degree, resulting in longer degree completion trajectories and higher dropout rates (Felder, Stevenson, & Gasman, 2014; Gildersleeve, Croom, & Vasquez, 2011; Gardner & Holley, 2011).

Many complex factors contribute to these outcomes for Latino/a and Black doctoral students, including ones related to social justice. As Gonzalez (2007) reminds us, “[T]he academy has a history of exclusivity, racism, sexism, and elitism that works against people of color and women to preserve the status quo” (p. 298). Students of color report doctoral programs make them feel isolated and dehumanized (Gildersleeve, et al., 2011) and need supports, like mentoring, to learn the tacit knowledges implicit in doctoral culture. These include “coded systems of behavior [such as]...building relationships with faculty, establishing a research agenda ...and development of one’s academic voice” (Felder, et al. 2014, p. 36). We argue that, in addition to these, forms of doctoral-level academic literacy also serve as part of the “hidden curriculum” of doctoral studies (Jackson, 1968). We also recognize that academic literacy has its roots in a dominant, White language of elitism and that we need to find ways to ensure that our students are conversant with the language of power in academia while also able to insert their own voices, epistemologies, and experiences into their scholarship. By making scholarly speaking, reading, and writing an explicit part of our doctoral curriculum, while also encouraging our students to problematize it, we hope to address some of the racialized aspects that have historically hindered students of color from successfully completing their doctorates and contribute to a more nurturing, welcoming, and inclusive experience for them.

Although most of these changes will continued to be implemented until 2021, we have implemented some changes within the constraints of the quarter system. For example, we have instituted supports for students in the form of APA and Blackboard support modules, in which they participate during their first course in the program. We have also moved toward a critical focus in our research courses, emphasizing methodologies grounded in emancipatory views, such as participatory action research, and modes of inquiry that highlight voices and experiences of practitioners of color, such as autoethnography and self-study of professional practice. Further, and in response to our student interest, we have begun to expand our conceptions and curricular treatment of social justice to include topics such as critical disability studies. Although we cannot implement the advisory structure until the semester change, we have added a two-quarter workgroup as an additional scaffold to help students as they prepare for their second qualifying exam at the end of their second year in the program.

Conclusion

Throughout this paper, we described taking advantage of an institutional process—converting from quarters to semesters—to create a more coherent, supportive program to prepare a diverse array of educational leaders to become scholar-practitioners who can fight for social justice in a range of K-12, higher education, and community settings. In the current climate, institutions of higher education are geared toward supporting programs and initiatives linked to maximizing revenue, to preparing students to accept unjust social and economic relationships, and to thwart emancipatory forms of knowledge, which might challenge policies and processes that allow “relative handful of private interests handful of private interests to control as much as possible of social life in order to maximize their profit” (McChesney, 1999, p. 7). Not coincidentally, programs situated in educational leadership departments, as well as programs contained in various academic units in higher education with a critical orientation and mission like ours, are often difficult to maintain, much less to expand. Thus, when working with/in bureaucracies like large university systems, recognizing and acting on affordances, such as this one, are imperative.

References

- Adams St Pierre, E., & Roulston, K. (2006). The state of qualitative inquiry: A contested science. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 19(6), 673-684
- Alcoff, L., & Potter, E. (2013). *Feminist epistemologies*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Boske, C. (2011). Educating leaders for social justice. In C. Shields (Ed.), *Transformative leadership reader* (pp. 362-383). New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (2002). Schooling in capitalist America revisited. *Sociology of Education*, 1-18.
- Brown, K.M. (2006). Leadership for social justice and equity: weaving a transformative framework and pedagogy. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 40(1), 77-108).
- Brown, L. A., & Strega, S. (2005). *Research as resistance: Critical, Indigenous and anti-oppressive approaches*. Canadian Scholars' Press.
- Chomsky, N., & Macedo, D. P. (2000). *Chomsky on miseducation*. Chicago, IL: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Dantley, M. & Green, T.L. (2015). Problematizing notions of leadership for social justice. *Journal of School Leadership*, 25(5).
- Darder, A., Baltodano, M., & Torres, R. D. (2009). Critical pedagogy: An introduction. In B. Darder & Torres (Eds.), *The critical pedagogy reader* (2nd ed., pp. 1–21). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Donovan, J. (2012). *Feminist theory: The intellectual traditions*. New York, NY: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Evans, R. (2007). Comments on Shulman, Golde, Bueschel, and Garabedian: Existing practice is not the template. *Educational Researcher*, 36 (9), 553–559.
- Erevelles, N. (2000). Educating unruly bodies: Critical pedagogy, disability studies, and the politics of schooling. *Educational Theory*, 50(1), 25-47.
- Felder, P. P., Stevenson, H. C., & Gasman, M. (2014). Understanding race in doctoral student socialization. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies*, 9, 21-42.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum.
- Freire, P. (1985). *The politics of education: Culture, power, and liberation*. Westport, CR: Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Freire, P. (1998). *Pedagogy of freedom: Ethics, democracy, and civic courage*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Furman, G. (2012). Social justice leadership as praxis developing capacities through preparation. *Education Administration Quarterly*, 48(2), 191-229.

- Gardner, S. K., & Holley, K. A. (2011). "Those invisible barriers are real": The progression of first-generation students through doctoral education. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 44*(1), 77-92.
- Gibson, R. (2007). Paulo Freire and revolutionary pedagogy for social justice. In E. W. Ross and R. Gibson (Eds.) *Neoliberalism and education reform* (pp. 177-215). New York, N.Y.: Hampton Press.
- Gildersleeve, R. E., Croom, N. N., & Vasquez, P. L. (2011). "Am I going crazy?!": A critical race analysis of doctoral education. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 44*(1), 93-114.
- Giroux, H. (1983). Theories of reproduction and resistance in the new sociology of education: A critical analysis. *Harvard Educational Review, 53*(3), 257-293.
- Giroux, H. (2009). Critical theory and educational practice. In A. Darder, M. Baltodano, and R. Torres (Eds.), *The critical pedagogy reader* (2nd ed., pp. 27-51). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Goldring, E. & Schuermann, P. (2009). The changing context of K-12 education administration: Consequences for Ed.D. program design and delivery. *Peabody Journal of Education 89*(1), 9-43.
- González, J. C. (2007). Surviving the doctorate and thriving as faculty: Latina junior faculty reflecting on their doctoral studies experiences. *Equity & Excellence In Education, 40*(4), 291-300.
- Gorski, P. C., & Goodman, R. D. (2011). Is there a "hierarchy of oppression" in US multicultural teacher education coursework?. *Action in Teacher Education, 33*(5-6), 455-475.
- Hinchey, P. (1998). *Finding freedom in the classroom*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Ivankova, N. & Stick (2007). Students' persistence in a distributed doctoral program in education leadership in higher education: A mixed methods study. *Research in Higher Education, 93*-135.
- Jackson, P. (1968). *Life in classrooms*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Jean-Marie, G., Normore, A. H. & Brooks, J. S. (2009). Leadership for social justice: Preparing 21st Century school leaders for a new social order. *Journal of Research on Leadership in Education, 4*(1), 1-31.
- Kahn, R. V. (2010). *Critical pedagogy, ecoliteracy, & planetary crisis: The ecopedagogy movement*. New York, NY Peter Lang.
- Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. F. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. *Teachers College Record, 97*(1), 47-68.
- Leonardo, Z. (2002). The souls of white folk: Critical pedagogy, whiteness studies, and globalization discourse. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 5*(1), 29-50.
- Malott, C. S., & Porfilio, B. J. (Eds.). (2011). *Critical pedagogy in the twenty-first century: A new generation of scholars*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Matthews, J. (2008, May 11) Fewer Blacks earning degrees. *Baltimore Times*. Retrieved from <http://blackfolk.livejournal.com/6124990.html?thread=116452798>
- McChesney, R. (1999). Introduction. In N. Chomsky's *Profit over people: Neoliberalism and global order* (pp. 6-17). New York, NY: Seven Stories Press.
- McLaren, P. (2016). Revolutionary critical pedagogy: Staking a claim against the macrostructural unconscious. *Critical Education, 7*(8).
- Nettles, M. T., & Millett, C. M. (2006). *Three magic letters: Getting to Ph.D.*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Olsen, K., & Clark, C.M. (2009). A signature pedagogy in doctoral education: The leader-scholar community. *Educational Researcher 38*(3), 216-221.

- Porfilio, B. J., & Daniels, E. A. (Eds.). (2013). *Dangerous counterstories in the corporate academy: Narrating for understanding, solidarity, resistance, and community in the age of neoliberalism*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing
- Rockinson-Szapkiw, A. J., Spaulding, L. S., & Bade, B. (2014). Completion of educational doctorates: How universities can foster persistence. *International Journal of Doctoral Studies*, 9, 293-308. Retrieved from <http://ijds.org/Volume9/IJDSv9p293-308Rockinson0607.pdf>
- Schechter, D. (2013). *Critical theory in the twenty-first century*. New York, NY: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Shulman, L. S., Golde, C.M., Bueschel, A.C., & Garabedian, K.J. (2006). Reclaiming education's doctorates: A critique and a proposal. *Educational Researcher*, 35(3), 25-32.
- Shields, C.M. (2010). Transformative leadership: Working for equity in diverse contexts. *Education Administration Quarterly* 46(4), 558–589.
- Shields, C.M. (2015). From paradigm wars to transformative leadership: Can educational administration foster socially just schools? *The SoJo Journal: Educational Foundations and Social Justice Education* 1(1).
- Skrla, L., Bell McKenzie, K. Scheurich, J.J (2007). Concluding reflections on "Leadership for learning in the context of social justice: An international perspective." *Journal of Educational Administration* 45(6): 782-787.
- Spring, J. (2013). *The American school, a global context: From the Puritans to the Obama Administration*. McGraw-Hill Higher Education.
- Strom, K., Porfilio, B., & Plough, B. (2016). Educating educational leaders in a blended professional doctorate program: An initial action research inquiry. *Impacting Education: Journal on Transforming Professional Practice*, 1(1).
- Theoharis, G. (2007). Social justice educational leaders and resistance: Toward a theory of social justice leadership. *Educational Administrative Quarterly* 43(2) 221-258.
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2017). *Status and Trends in the Education of Racial and Ethnic Groups 2017* (NCES 2017-051). Retrieved from <https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=72>