From Preparation to the Principalship:
Towards a Framework for Social Justice in Leadership

Mariama Smith Gray
Cal State University East Bay

Noni Mendoza-Reis
San José State University

This article is a response to the clarion call for leadership preparation programs to ground their work in social justice pedagogies and policies in light of the current sociopolitical context of multiple pandemics. It includes four distinct sections. We begin with an analysis of the state of leadership preparation in California. Next, we synthesize the articles published in the CAPEA journal since 2005 that address leadership preparation frameworks for diversity and social justice to create an early framework for social justice leadership and preparation for the journal. We review social justice frameworks for both leadership preparation and practitioners. We conclude with recommendations for future submissions from our members to address the focus area of diversity and social justice.

Keywords: social justice, educational leadership, principal preparation programs

The call for leadership preparation programs to ground their work in social justice pedagogies, policies and practices is again at the forefront of the field. In the last year, multiple pandemics of COVID-19, structural racism, deepening socioeconomic inequality, and increasing environmental degradation (Ladson-Billings, 2020) have sparked a national discussion of school practices that exacerbate and maintain social and economic inequities, including school policing, lack of access to technology, and food insecurity. These inequities have brought a moral imperative to prepare educational leaders who can align their pedagogies, policies and practices with social justice into sharp relief and in turn, reinforced our commitment to preparing leaders who voice their dedication to social justice.

Along with a moral imperative to prepare social justice leaders, there are at least two other imperatives that drive our work as faculty in leadership preparation programs. First, is the representation gap between students and leaders of color. Our student population is increasingly diverse, heightening the incongruence between the demographics of students and school leaders. A recent policy brief from the UCLA Civil Rights Project/Proyectos Civiles illustrates the increasing diversity of the 6.1 million students in California schools. According to the brief, California students are 55% Latinx, 22% white, 12% Asian or Pacific Islander, 5% Black, 1% American Indians, and 4% multiracial (Orfield & Jarvie, 2020). These student demographics are not reflected in California's school leaders. A 2017-2018 report from National Center for Education Statistics described the ethnicity of California principals as 66.1% white, 22.5% Hispanic, 6.1% Black, and 5.3% Other (American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian, Pacific Islander).

Our second imperative includes the persistent failure rates of students of color who have been marginalized through systemic inequities. In California, one measure of student success is the percent of high school graduates who have met the requirements for "college and career readiness." The measure is based on students' completion of "rigorous coursework" ranging from the state's A-G requirements to community college classes, passing challenging exams like the International Baccalaureate or Advanced Placement, or receiving a state seal of biliteracy (CDE, 2021). In 2019, the high school graduation rate was 88%. Of these, about half, or 44.1% met the college and career readiness indicator prior to graduation. Upon further disaggregation, the results reveal disproportionate numbers by race, class, and disability, as noted in Table 1. American Indian, African American, Pacific Islander, and Hispanic students are the least prepared for college or career according to state indicators. Other low college and career readiness rates include students who are in foster care, multilinguals, homeless, economically marginalized, and/or receive special education services.

Table 1
California Dashboard 2019 College and Career Readiness Completion Rates

Indicator	% Completed	Student Enrollment
African American	27.7	30,255
American Indian	0.5%	2,864
Asian	74.0	45,829

English Learners	16.8	71,834

Table 1 (continued)

Filipino	64.5	14,805
Foster Youth	13.3	6,364
Hispanic	36.1	270,276
Homeless	1.4	30,375
Pacific Islander	33.5	2,488
SES	35.8	343,216
Students with Disabilities	10.8	59,064
Two or More Races	49.7	14,689
White	53.8	118,333

Source: State of California Dashboard,
https://www.caschooldashboard.org/reports/ca/2019/academic-performance#college-career

These imperatives are cause for programs to continue to look beyond "universal, one-size-fits-all approaches to leadership preparation" (Lopez, Magdaleno & Reis, 2006, p. 11). As noted in a recent report by the Wallace Foundation (Grissom, Egalite & Lindsay, 2021), schools with diverse populations require a new kind of thinking and exceptional leaders who practice social justice. Among the conclusions from this report are that leaders must develop "an equity lens, particularly as they are called on to meet the needs of growing numbers of marginalized students" (p. 92); principal diversity is also cited as a contributing factor in improved outcomes for students and faculty of color. Moreover, the report suggests that white educational leaders learn the skills, expertise, and social justice practices of principals from racially and ethnically diverse groups. This recommendation is important because California statistics mirror the national data of approximately 22% of principals of color (National Center for Education Statistics, 2020) and 6% of superintendents (Kowalski, 2013). To be clear, these statistics indicate that the candidates in our leadership preparation programs may not fully understand the sociopolitical context of the students in their schools. However, while the report is a clarion call for equity-driven educational leadership preparation and professional learning, it leaves the details of leadership preparation for social justice to the field of educational leadership.

In this article, we take up where the Wallace Report concludes. The Wallace Report clearly states "what" is needed, but not "how" to go about it. To generate possibilities to answer the "how"

for preparing leaders to take on significant issues of equity in education, we turn to three distinct bodies of literature. We begin with a synthesis of articles published in the CAPEA Journal, *Educational Leadership and Administration: Teaching and Program Development,* between 2005 and 2020 that address leadership preparation frameworks of diversity and social justice. These articles highlight the journal's early conceptualization of social justice leadership preparation and development. Next, we analyze the recent scholarship of social justice leadership preparation frameworks to identify how the field of educational leadership conceptualizes the preparation of pre-service educational leaders for social justice oriented educational leadership. Third, we review the scholarship of social justice leadership, highlighting new and emerging social justice frameworks for practicing educational leaders. We conclude with recommendations for future submissions that address the focus area of diversity and social justice leadership preparation.

Synthesis of Articles Published in the CAPEA Journal 2005-2020

In this section, we synthesize the CAPEA Journal articles that have addressed social justice leadership theory and frameworks to conceptualize the journal's early framing of social justice leadership preparation and development. We analyzed the archives of *Educational Leadership and Administration: Teaching and Program Development* for articles focused on social justice leadership theory and frameworks that were published between 2005—when the journal published its first article about social justice—and 2020. Our review uncovered four articles: Barbara and Krovitz's (2005) *Preparing Principals to Lead the Equity Agenda*, Elizabeth Reilly's editorial notes for volumes 15 and 18, *Toward Equitable Schools: Reflections and Challenges* (2005) , *The Future Entering: Reflections on and Challenges to Ethical Leadership* (2006), and *Developing Leadership for Equity: What Is the Role of Leadership Preparation Programs*? (Lopez, Magdaleno and Reis, 2006). We briefly review each article before putting them in conversation with one another to form an early framework for social justice leadership pedagogy.

The articles provide an early framework for social justice leadership preparation and development. Barbara and Krovitz's (2005) *Preparing Principals to Lead the Equity Agenda*, was written from the perspective of what the authors call "equity leadership." Although they do not explicitly define this term, the authors posit that equity leadership is characterized by investing in the resources that serve the most vulnerable students. To do this, educational leaders must: 1) understand the difference between an equitable education and an equal education, 2) understand the significance of race, 3) examine white privilege through the testimony of communities of color, and 4) have strong district support. The framework for equity leadership draws on the early scholarship regarding the achievement gap, as well as moral leadership, organizational change, race, and the then emerging field of Critical Whiteness Studies. These themes would be echoed in later frameworks and more explicitly defined, and the call to expand equity leadership would be extended to leadership preparation.

In *Toward Equitable Schools: Reflections and Challenges* (2005), former Educational Leadership and Administration editor, Elizabeth C. Reilly, advances a vision for leadership preparation in the editorial notes to volume 15. Arguing for a need to level the playing field of education, Reilly centers educational leadership as foundational to the effort, and uses Twale and Place's assessment model for educational leadership preparation in the same volume to illustrate her point. The model calls on educational leadership programs to examine the collegiate ideology/ethos, academic culture, mission statement, managerial climate, and organizational structure as a means of program assessment. Moving from Twale and Place's assessment model to

the larger field of educational leadership, Reilly closes with a few recommendations for the field: 1) include the voices of our students and those who we are attempting to help in our research, 2) integrate issues of social justice and equity in teaching, 3) share ideas of social justice and equity with others and in a community of practice, and 4) leverage leadership power to advocate for education policy that advances equity (pp.130-131); she returns to a focus on advocacy in later volumes, sharpening her focus on advocacy within a leader's sphere of influence.

Reilly's second article, *The Future Entering: Reflections on and Challenges to Ethical Leadership* (2006), emphasizes ethical leadership, a concept borrowed from the business community that gained traction in education in the late 1990s. Ethical leadership—also known as moral or values-based leadership—is a term wrought with definitional issues, but can be summed up as "exercising influence in ways that are ethical in means and ends" (Rhodes, 2006, p. 9). Reilly makes clear the spheres of influence that ethical leaders address and the desired "ends" of their efforts:

> The moral imperative of ethical leadership is the addressing of the most sensitive issues our society faces—issues of access to the basic rights of all human beings: to freedom, to justice, and to equity, but equally important, to responsibility and to duty (Beckner, 2004). Second, they ask us to recognize that by taking action, we fulfill the responsibility entrusted to us as educators: to alleviate suffering and to initiate healing within our spheres of influence. (p.165)

According to this framework, ethical leaders have a moral imperative to act at the individual level, including within the sphere of their professional influence in leadership; the local and regional levels, such as within their departments, schools, and programs, to address policy issues at each of these levels; and the societal level, bridging the connection between local, state, and federal spheres of influence.

In *Developing Leadership: What is the Role of Leadership Preparation Programs?* Lopez, Magdaleno and Reis (2006) report on the efforts of a transformative colloquium of educational leadership faculty from CSU East Bay, San Jose State, and Fresno State who studied a "leading for equity approach." During the colloquium, a focus group of CAPEA participants responded to the question, *"What can our Educational Leadership Departments and Programs start doing to change the way we prepare administrators to serve in today's schools?"* The focus group responded with recommendations for programs, curriculum, and instruction. Programs were encouraged to prioritize recruitment of candidates from districts with the greatest need for leadership by working with stakeholders to recruit candidates of color through a cohort model. Focus group participants suggested that programs continue to follow up on graduates to document successful practices. Recommendations for curriculum and instruction included strengthening equity and social justice concepts through an examination of course syllabi. Participants recommended that candidates be taught to challenge the status quo by consistently asking difficult questions, and encouraged programs to include courageous conversations about race in the curriculum.

In reviewing the journal's publications over the past fifteen years, we initially despaired at the disappointingly small number of articles with a social justice framework. Nonetheless, the journal is committed to publishing more scholarship about social justice frameworks and empirical studies related to their application. Given the small number of articles, we put the three articles in conversation with one another by pulling tenets of social justice leadership from each of the

articles. When read in this way, they provide an early framework for social justice leadership.
Social Justice Tenets from CAPEA Submissions 2005 – 2020

1. Educational leadership is foundational to social justice in education. It includes leadership preparation grounded in the principles and practices of social justice leadership and continues with strong district support (Barbara and Krovitz, 2005).

2. Educational leadership preparation programs must internally assess their work and consider how it aligns with principles and practices of social justice leadership (Reilly, 2005).

3. Educational leaders must understand the difference between an equitable education and an equal education and invest in the resources that serve the most vulnerable students (Reilly, 2005).

4. Educational leaders must have a good understanding of race, including the role that race plays in reproducing historic inequities. They must be willing to listen to and learn from the experiences of communities of color. White educational leaders must reflect on and address the impact of their unearned white privilege in education (Barbara and Krovitz, 2005).

5. Educational leaders must engage in ethical leadership in every sphere of their influence, including leadership preparation (Reilly, 2005), the individual level, and various organizational (e.g. program, department, university) and systemic levels (e.g. policy, federal) (Reilly, 2006).

6. Educational leadership programs must be attentive to their role in adopting a "leading for equity" approach that includes continual examination of programmatic, curricular and instructional areas to align with social justice leadership (Lopez, Magdaleno, and Reis, 2006).

Within the field of educational leadership, the scholarship regarding social justice leadership has expanded since the publication of the CAPEA journal's first articles in 2005 and 2006. However, the development of theory and frameworks for social justice leadership remains an emerging field. In the next section, we provide an overview of social justice pedagogies and frameworks that bridge the time of CAPEA's publications, 2005 and 2006, and the beginning of our analysis, 2010, before reviewing the literature from 2010-2020.

Advances in Social Justice Leadership Preparation, 2010-2020

To understand the most recent advances in social justice leadership, we review social justice pedagogies, theory, and a handful of representative frameworks for the last decade, from 2010 to 2020. We searched for literature using various combinations of these keywords: social justice, equity, leadership, principal, school administrator, education administration, preparation, professional development, theory, pedagogy, principles, tenets, and frameworks. Next, we reviewed the abstracts to identify articles about social justice pedagogies, theories and frameworks in education. We were left with a set of empirical and theoretical articles that addressed social

justice leadership preparation for pre-service educational leaders and practicing educational leaders. We followed up with a final search using specific theoretical constructs like anti-racist leadership, and culturally responsive leadership to ensure we had found a good selection of works about educational leadership. To minimize repetition, we selected one example for each of the most popular and commonly discussed pedagogies, theories, and frameworks. Finally, we divided the review into two sub-sections: social justice leadership preparation pedagogies, theories, and frameworks for pre-service educational leaders, and social justice leadership pedagogies, theories and frameworks for practicing educational leaders. In the section that follows, we share the results of our systematic review of the literature regarding social justice leadership preparation and development.

Pre-Service-Social Justice Leadership Preparation Pedagogies, Theories, and Frameworks

Pedagogies

Numerous scholars have proposed social justice frameworks for leadership preparation programs to address social issues of race, disability, and language (Brown, 2005; Capper, Theoharis & Sebastian, 2006). With principals learning on the job (Graham, 2007), often from other leaders who lack skill in addressing social issues (Swanson & Welton, 2019) and the shifting demographics of schools, there is a clear need for preparation programs to equip pre-service educational leaders for equity work (Marshall, 2004). In our review of articles regarding pre-service leadership preparation, the majority focused on instructional pedagogy and program design. The result is a body of scholarship that includes specific practices for teaching and learning (i.e., pedagogy), as well as social justice leadership preparation frameworks that offer ideas to guide educational leadership program structures and philosophy, including two excellent reviews that will bring readers quickly up to speed on the field of educational leadership for social justice prior to 2005. McCabe and McCarthy's (2005) examination of the emerging social justice discourse in educational leadership and the challenges for universities and other programs that prepare education leaders is essential reading for anyone trying to understand the history of social justice leadership preparation. Similarly, Jean-Marie, Normore and Brooks (2009) extend themes in educational research on preparing educators to engage in social justice and consider the field's capacity for "preparing school leaders to think globally and act courageously about social justice for a new social order" (p.1).

Though beyond the scope of this study, Table 2 outlines promising pedagogical practices for preparing pre-service educational leaders for equity work, (See also Hafner, 2010). Mariama Gray synthesized the list from a systematic review of social justice leadership pedagogies for pre-service educational leaders from 2005 to 2020 using the search terms: social justice, equity, leadership, principal, school administrator, education administration, preparation, professional development, pedagogy, and practices. Dr. Gray identified common themes in the literature which she synthesized as a table of evidence-based practices from teacher education and educational leadership that have been shown to develop pre-service leaders' capacity to achieve greater equity in their schools and foster student success.

Table 2
Evidence-based Pedagogical Practices for Pre-service Educational Leaders

❑ Critical readings, videos, podcasts with discussion (Theoharis & Causton-Theoharis, 2008)	❑ Case studies/role playing (Capper et al., 2006)
❑ Critical consciousness raising and reflection (Capper, Theoharis & Sebastian, 2006)	❑ Sustained conversations about race (Swanson & Welton, 2019)
❑ Emphasis on funds of knowledge & community cultural wealth (Moll et al., 2012; Yosso, 2005)	❑ Discomfort pedagogy (Freitas & McAuley, 2008)
❑ Educational plunge (Brown, 2005)	❑ YPAR/Community relationship building (Bertrand & Rodela, 2018)
❑ Neighborhood walks (Capper et al., 2006)	❑ Explicit instruction in leadership theory (DeMatthews et al., 2017) & global perspectives (Theoharis & Causton-Theoharis, 2008)
❑ Racial/cultural biographies, life histories & Genograms (Ohito & Oyler, 2017)	
❑ Affective experiences that facilitate embodied knowledge (Franklin-Phipps, 2020)	❑ Outlining specific steps for structural change (Theoharis & Causton-Theoharis, 2008)
❑ Equity audits (Capper et al., 2006)	❑ Naming inclusive counter-hegemonic practices (Ohito & Oyler, 2017)
❑ Race caucus/Affinity group (Obear & Martinez, 2013)	©Mari Smith Gray, 2020

Note. Copyright Mariama Smith Gray 2020.

Frameworks for Pre-Service Programs

While there are many frameworks focused on diverse issues of equity, the scope of our review considers the work of authors who use the terms "social justice" or "equity" in their definitions of leadership preparation. Our analysis takes up the scholarship regarding social justice leadership since 2010. It is not an exhaustive review of all leadership frameworks, but rather a synthesis of the representative works that address social justice leadership preparation for the past decade. We focused our scholarship search on pre-service school leadership preparation, in contrast to in-service leadership development. We further limited our analysis to scholarship published from 2010 to 2020.

The research we reviewed regarding social justice in educational leadership exhibits some common themes. They include the importance of critical reflection and reflexivity (Furman, 2012), action (Furman, 2012), ethics (Dantley & Tillman, 2010), the salience and impact of race (Gooden & Dantley, 2012) and other social locations like gender, sexual orientation, disability, linguistic identity (Theoharis & Scanlan, 2015) and their connection to learning and achievement. In this section, we highlight three of the articles we reviewed. The articles written by Furman (2012) and Gooden and Dantley (2012) extend the work of Capper, Theoharis & Sebastian (2009) who proposed a framework for social justice leadership preparation with three domains, critical consciousness, knowledge, and practical skills focused on social justice; as well as an alignment of the curriculum, pedagogy, and assessment with the three domains. Bertrand and Rodela's (2018) framework for Collective Transformative Agency (CTA) emphasizes an uncommon yet important aspect of leadership preparation: youth and community voice. When put together, the three articles offer a diversity of ideas for preparation programs who want to equip leaders for social justice.

Furman (2012) proposed the Praxis-Dimensions-Capacities framework for leadership preparation programs. The framework is organized around three nested concepts. The first is that social justice is praxis. Praxis requires both reflection and action. The second concept is that social justice leadership is enacted in multiple dimensions in life, including the personal (knowledge of self), interpersonal (development of trusting communication and relationships), communal (democratic development of community), system (critique, assessment, and transformation of

systems), and ecological (sociopolitical contexts). The third concept is the development of social justice capacities for both reflection and action in every dimension. In Furman's model, preparation for pre-service educational leaders must combine critical reflection with action if leaders are to foster a school-wide culture and practice that provides students with access to educational opportunity.

Gooden and Dantley's (2012) *framework for social justice leadership preparation* is based on their study of six UCEA affiliated programs and modules that focus on diversity leadership. The framework builds on previous scholarship that illuminates pre-service leaders' need for critical self-reflection and praxis, and critique of the traditional theories of leadership taught in most preparation programs. Among their findings is that pre-service educational leaders' learning about race (and other social issues) is often confined to just one course in diversity. Arguing that race has received "short shrift" in many preparation programs, the authors propose the integration of race-focused discussions and learning throughout leadership preparation, and define the practices that prepare pre-service principals to lead for diversity. These practices include: 1) self-reflection, 2) a grounding in a critical theoretical construction, 3) a prophetic and pragmatic edge, 4) praxis, and 5) the inclusion of race language.

Pre-Service Theories

Bertrand and Rodela (2018) note that most social justice leadership literature overlooks the leadership of youth, parents, and community educators, especially when they are non-school based leaders who are from communities of color. The framework for *Collective Transformative Agency (CTA)* which borrows from Critical Race Theory (CRT) (Crenshaw et al., 1995; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Delgado & Stefancic, 2017), CHAT (cultural history activity theory) (Vygotsky, 1978), distributed leadership (Spillane, 2006), and transformative leadership (Shields, 2010), promotes an expansive definition of leadership for preparation programs. Collective transformative agency includes those not often characterized as leaders such as youth, parents, community educators, and members of historically marginalized communities. A second tenet of the framework is integration, including the integration of family and community approaches in faculty work, and the integration of frameworks of community cultural wealth across courses and assignments.

A collective transformative agency approach to leadership preparation is multi-leveled. At the organizational, district, and site levels, it encourages leadership candidates to engage in collaborative and participatory research with educational leaders, youth, parents, community educators, and members of historically marginalized communities. At the university level, it encourages the faculty who prepare educational leaders to re-examine their assumptions about leadership, especially since leadership is often characterized as an individual endeavor. Moving from individual leadership to collective leadership requires leadership faculty to engage in ideological change. That is, to expand their definition of equity in decision-making practices to include the voices of diverse members of the school community such as students, parents, community educators, and members of historically marginalized communities, and communicate this expansive view of leadership to their leadership students.

9

Social Justice Leadership Pedagogies, Theories and Frameworks for Practicing Educational Leaders

In the section that follows, we examine several social justice leadership pedagogies, theories, and frameworks from the last decade. Our selection process began with a systematic review of the scholarship regarding social justice leadership practices for educational leaders from 2010 to 2020. Using different combinations of the search terms social justice, equity, leadership, principal, school administrator, education administration, pedagogy, and practices, we focused our scholarship search on in-service leadership learning and development. We identified the following frameworks: a tri-level framework for leadership, abolitionist leadership, indigenous and decolonizing school leadership, emancipatory leadership, applied critical leadership, transformative leadership, culturally competent, and culturally responsive school leadership that met our search goals.

Table 3 offers a synthesis of the characteristics of social justice leadership practices based on Mariama Gray's analysis of the field that are described in the frameworks (see also Khalifa, Gooden & Davis, 2018).

Table 3
Synthesis of Characteristics of Social Justice Leadership Practice

❑ Requires ideological clarity
❑ Begins with critical self-reflection and critical consciousness
❑ Identifies the sources of educational inequities
❑ Is praxis:
  ❑ Is action-oriented and transformative
  ❑ Is reflective
❑ Is committed and persistent
❑ Is inclusive and democratic
❑ Is relational and caring
❑ Works to eliminate marginalization, inequity of opportunity, and disparate outcomes
	❑ Incorporates indigenous ways of knowing, communities of color, students, and families
	❑ Recognizes, critiques, and attends to asymmetrical power relations
	❑ Is leadership at the personal, institutional, and pedagogical levels
	❑ Addresses social issues
	❑ Is fostered in leadership preparation
	
	Sources: Furman, 2012; Mendoza Reis, 2020; Santamaria & Santamaria, 2015; Theoharis & Causton-Theoharis, 2008
	©Mari Smith Gray, 2020

Note. Copyright Mariama Smith Gray, 2020.

Reculturing Instructional Leadership for Schools with Multilingual Learners: A Tri-Level Framework

A tri-level framework for leading with a social justice orientation addresses leadership for schools with multilingual learners (Mendoza-Reis & Flores, 2014). The authors argued for the "critical role of administrators in advocating for access, equity, and achievement policies that will improve K-12 outcomes for the growing segment of the U.S. school population" (p.192). The tri-level framework proposes three levels for school leaders to consider: (1) institutional, (2) pedagogical, and (3) personal. The three levels are guided by several theories and pedagogies grounded in critical pedagogy (Freire, 1997), sociocultural theory (Portes & Salas, 2011: Tharp & Gallimore, 1995), cultural historical activity theory (Portes, 2005), and critical race theory (Solorzano & Delgado Bernal, 2001; Yosso, 2005).

At the institutional level, this framework requires school leaders to interrogate structural

barriers by asking themselves if they are reproducing or disrupting inequities, and asks leaders to respond with advocacy and activism (Radd, Generett, Gooden & Theoharis, 2021)

The pedagogical and second level of this framework requires that administrators understand the content knowledge necessary for leading schools with multilingual learners, including culturally relevant and culturally sustaining practices, sociocultural theories of education, language acquisition theories, and the socio-political issues affecting the education of multilingual learners.

The personal level requires that leaders have ideological clarity about leading schools with multilingual learners. Bartolomé, (2000), further clarifies,

> "Ideological Clarity" refers to the process by which individuals struggle to identify and compare their own explanations for the existing socioeco-nomic and political hierarchy with that of the dominant society. The juxtaposing of ideologies should help teachers to better understand if, when, and how their belief systems uncritically reflect those of the dominant society and thus maintain the unequal and what should be unacceptable conditions that so many students experience on a daily basis (p. 98).

The tri-level framework requires leaders to have the moral courage to resist and transform the status quo and challenge policies of oppression, lead with integrity and by example, build a culture of collaboration, authentically engage with parents, and most importantly, be honorable, humble and caring (Flores & Mendoza-Reis, 2015).

Abolitionist Leadership

Abolitionist leadership (Gray, Chambers, Southern & Walton, 2021) is an emerging framework based on the collective work of the faculty, students and alumni of California State University, East Bay's Department of Educational Leadership, their thought partners, and Harvey (2021). As praxis, the framework for abolitionist leadership draws on scholarship from critical race theory (Crenshaw et al., 1995; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Delgado & Stefancic, 2017), prison abolition (Davis, 2003; Kaba 2021) and abolitionist teaching (Laura, 2014; Love, 2019, Anderson-Zavala et al., 2017) to center the dismantling of anti-blackness and carcerality in education. Abolitionist leaders understand that schools are microcosms of an anti-Black, carceral society, and that anti-Blackness and carceral logics structure every part of our educational system (e.g. student tracking, disciplinary processes, Eurocentric curriculum and instruction, the disproportionality of students qualified for special education services, the organization of the school day), iincluding leadership practices.

While the CSU East Bay definition is still being refined in community with thought partners from the prison abolition and educational abolition communities, the preliminary principles of the framework include: 1) an abiding love for Black people and other marginalized communities affected by the carceral state, 2) the disruption and interrogation of anti-Black and carceral thinking, 3) the conscious, intentional and active creation of new humanizing systems, 4) the centering of supportive, nurturing, caring and humanizing relationships, 5) an investment in community, 6) self-reflexivity that cultivates awareness of injustices and understanding of why the carceral state needs to be abolished, 7) active and engaged emancipatory efforts, 8) the empowerment of diverse members of the school community, and 9) leadership from members of historically silenced communities.

Applied Critical Leadership

Arguing that, "leadership in the new century needs to come from the experience and knowledge base of the largest number of people in many parts of the United States and many parts of the world: Indigenous people and people of color" (p. 23), Santamaria and Santamaria (2015) propose Applied Critical Leadership (ACL). ACL is a practice of culturally responsive leadership that is grounded in the embodied and lived experiences of leaders from communities of color and indigenous communities, their professional practice, and equity. ACL has interdisciplinary theoretical foundations. It integrates ideas from the transformative and culturally responsive leadership practices of more than eleven indigenous and culturally linguistically diverse educational leaders in the U.S. and New Zealand with the authors' lived experiences as members of communities of color, along with critical pedagogy, and critical race theory to form a framework for counteracting inequitable relations of power that maintain disproportionate outcomes for communities of color and create enduring change. ACL intentionally departs from transformative practices of leadership which "includes more progressive versions of previously understood and traditional notions of educational leadership" (p. 36), including the notion of leadership as management.

Leaders who practice ACL draw from their identities as members of cultural communities and integrate non-dominant practices in their leadership. White educators who "race themselves outside of whiteness" can practice ACL by intentionally leading through non-white, non-dominant frames of reference. Leaders who practice ACL draw on their cultural or identity-based strengths and are responsive to the local context in their practice of leadership. They have a deep connection to their local community and seek out connections, collaborations, and professional learning opportunities with others at the local and global levels for the purposes of improving their school community.

Emancipatory Leadership

Simmons (2015) proposed a theory and pedagogy of Emancipatory Leadership (EL) guided by a school leader's vision and agenda for liberation education with a goal of challenging and eradicating systems of oppression. Nested in critical pedagogy (Freire, 1968, 1970), Simmons proposed four tenets of emancipatory leadership: 1) cognitive skills that extend beyond professional content knowledge and management skills to include an understanding of institutional inequities; these understandings contribute to Freire's concept of "conscientization" and critical pedagogy, 2) interpersonal skills are developed such that an EL leader understands how leadership influences the social and cultural climate of institutions, 3) intrapersonal skills are evidenced by uncompromising values and beliefs in liberation education, and 4) language that includes a strong voice for equitable education for all in PK-20 institutions.

Transformative Leadership Theory

Although transformative leadership appeared earlier in the literature, Shields (2010) was among the first to articulate a theory of transformative leadership as it applied to practicing school leaders. Shields (2010) made the distinction between transitional, transformational, and transformative leadership theories by emphasizing the need for education to focus both on academic excellence and on social transformation. Furthermore, in transformative leadership there

is a commitment to interrogating inequitable educational outcomes for historically marginalized groups and reconstructing them with a more socially just approach. Similar to previous frameworks in this section, transformative leadership is nested in critical pedagogy (Freire, 1997). Issues of justice and democracy are important in transformative leadership. Shields (2010) posits that, "transformative leadership takes account of the ways in which the inequities of the outside world affect the outcomes of what occurs internally in educational organizations (p. 684). Transformative school leaders are courageous activists who take risks to change inequitable systems in their schools. Central to transformative leadership is the notion of the common good, and a belief about the role of public schools in building and maintaining our democracy.

Culturally Responsive School Leadership

Khalifa, Gooden, and Davis (2016) synthesized 108 books, articles, and reports about Culturally Responsive School Leadership (CRSL) to identify the leadership behaviors consistent with CRSL. The authors use the term Culturally Responsive School Leadership because it is most commonly referenced in leadership studies; the term "responsive" emphasizes the need for an action-based social justice leadership grounded in a sense of urgency. CSRL is a liberatory framework with four behaviors: 1) critical self-awareness/critical consciousness where leaders are clear about values, beliefs and dispositions necessary to lead schools with children of color and those situated in poverty, 2) culturally responsive curricula and teacher preparation where the leader's role is ensuring that teachers practice culturally responsive teaching, 3) culturally responsive and inclusive school environments where school leaders are intentional about hiring teachers and staff who will develop and promote a culturally responsive school context, 4) engaging students and parents in community contexts emphasizes the ability of school leaders to be responsive of the sociopolitical context of the school community**.**

Indigenous and Decolonizing School Leadership

Building on earlier work in Culturally Responsive School Leadership, Khalifa, Khalil, Marsh and Halloran (2019) developed a framework for Indigenous and Decolonizing School Leadership (ISDL) after reviewing 35 sources that included journal articles, books, reports, and dissertations about indigenous leadership. Important to this framework is an understanding of how current leadership practices can perpetuate practices of colonization. The theory has five common strands, including the practices of (1) prioritizing self-knowledge and self-reflection; (2) enacting self-determination for community empowerment; (3) centering community voices and values; (4) serving through altruism and spirituality; and (5) approaching collectivism through inclusive communication practices with parents and students.

Concluding Remarks and CAPEA Journal Recommendations for Future Articles

The call for social justice approaches in leadership preparation is not ahistorical. Requests to reframe leadership preparation programs with social justice orientations have appeared in the scholarship for decades. Twenty years ago, Riehl (2000) recommended that leadership preparation programs include social justice approaches. In 2002, Grogan and Andrews reviewed the history of principal preparation and development from 1890-2000. In their conclusion they offered nine recommendations, including for leadership programs to recruit into leadership educators "who have already demonstrated skills as inquiring and reflective professionals and a deep commitment

to social justice" (p. 250). A second recommendation called for programs to prepare aspiring principals to "understand their ethical and moral obligations to create schools that promote social justice" (p. 250). Indeed, our own synthesis of articles published in the CAPEA journal dates back to 2005 when similar recommendations were made by CAPEA authors.

Our analysis of these authors found that few articles in the CAPEA journal addressed social justice but those that did emphasized important components of social justice leadership that included attention to issues of race and power in education, and ethical and equity-focused leadership. An extensive review of the literature regarding social justice leadership was beyond the scope of this article. However, in addition to an historical perspective on social justice leadership, we included a review of current and emerging frameworks for social justice leadership preparations and practice.

Given our analysis and the current state of the profession, it is clear that there is a need for scholarship that describes the successful program elements of preparation for and practice of leadership for social justice. We call on scholars to study the kinds of readings, assignments and assessment of program elements that prepare leaders for social justice leadership and invite their submission to the CAPEA Journal. There is an undeniable demographic mismatch between California's student population and its school leaders. The recent Wallace report acknowledges the importance of diverse leaders to serve diverse learners. Therefore, we call on scholars to study how programs and districts can recruit and support diverse leadership candidates and invite their submission to the CAPEA Journal.

References

Anderson-Zavala, C., Krueger-Henney, P., Meiners, E & Pour-Khorshid, F. (2017). Fierce urgency of now: Building movements to end the prison industrial complex in our schools. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 19(3), 151-154, DOI: 10.1080/15210960.2017.1331743

Arriaza, G., & Mendoza-Reis, N. (2006). Equity leadership in schools. *Educación y Ciencia*, 10 (34), 7-20.

Barbara, M., & Krovetz, M. (2005). Preparing principals to lead the equity agenda. *Educational Leadership and Administration: Teaching and Program Development*, 17, 11-19.

Bartolome, L. (1994). Beyond the methods fetish: Toward a humanizing pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review*. 64(2). 173-195. DOI: 10.17763/haer.64.2.58q5m5744t325730

Bertrand, M. & Rodela, K. C. (2018). A framework for rethinking educational leadership in the margins: Implications for social justice leadership preparation. *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, 13(1), 10-37.

Brown, K. M. (2005). Social justice education for preservice leaders: Evaluating transformative learning strategies. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 38(2), 155-167, DOI: 10.1080/10665680590935133

Burke, A. (2013) The Latino education crisis: The consequences of failed social policies, by Patricia Gándara and Frances Contreras. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 36(3), 371-374, DOI: 10.1080/15235882.2013.837119

California Department of Education. (2020). *Fingertip facts on education in California - CalEdFacts.* Retrieved from https://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/cb/ceffingertipfacts.asp

Cambron-McCabe, N., & McCarthy, M. M. (2005). Educating school leaders for social justice. *Educational Policy*, *19*(1), 201–222. https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904804271609

Capper, C.A., Theoharis, G., Sebastian, J. (2006). Toward a framework for preparing leaders for social justice. *Journal of Educational Administration,* 44(3), 209-224.

Crenshaw, K., Gotanda, N., Peller, G., & Thomas, K. (1995). *Critical race theory. The key writings that formed the movement*. W.W. Norton & Company: New York, 276-291.

Dantley, M. E. & Tillman, L. C. (2010) Social Justice and Moral Transformative Leadership, in C. Marshall & M Oliva (Eds.). *Leadership for social justice: Making revolutions in education*, (pp.19-31). Allyn & Bacon.

Davis, B. W., Gooden, M. A., & Micheaux, D. J. (2015). Color-blind leadership: A critical race theory analysis of the ISLLC and ELCC standards. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *51*(3), 335-371.

Delgado, R. & Stefancic, J. (2017). *Critical race theory: An introduction*. (Third Edition). New York University Press: NY.

Flores, B. & Mendoza-Reis, N. (2015, March). *Changing the pedagogical culture of schools with English learners.* Reculturing Instructional Leadership. Paper presented at California Association of Bilingual Education (CABE). March, 2015. San Diego, CA.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (M. Ramos, Trans.). Seabury Publishing. (Original work published 1968)

Frey, W.H. (2018). The US will become 'minority white' in 2045, census projects. *Brookings Institute*. Retrieved from: https://www.brookings.edu/blog/the-avenue/2018/03/14/the-us-will-become-minority-white-in-2045-census-projects/

Furman, G. (2012). Social justice leadership as praxis: Developing capacities through rough preparation programs. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 48(2), 191-229.

Galloway, M. K., & Ishimaru, A. M. (2015). Radical recentering: Equity in educational leadership standards. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *51*(3), 372-408.

Gooden, M.A. & Dantley, M. (2012). Centering race in a framework for leadership preparation, *Journal of Research on Leadership Education*, 7(2) 237–253.

Graham, B.F. (2007). Assessing educational leadership preparation frameworks. In L. K. Lemasters & R. Papa (Eds). *At the tipping point: Navigating the course for the preparation of educational administrators.* (pp.40-48) DEStech Publications, Inc.

Gray, M., Chambers, E., Southern, S. Walton, M. (2021, March). Toward a framework for abolitionst leadership: Understanding the relationship between abolitionism and educational leadership. Paper presented at the meeting of the California Association of Professors of Educational Administration, Hayward, CA.

Grogan, M. & Andrews, R. (2002). Defining preparation and professional development for the future. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 38*(2): 233-256. DOI: 10.1177/0013161X02382007

Hafner, M. M. (2006). Teaching strategies for developing leaders for social justice. In C. Marshall & M. Oliva (Eds.). *Leadership for social justice: Making revolutions in education*, (pp.167-193). Allyn & Bacon.

Harvey, R.S. (2021). *Abolitionist leadership in schools: Undoing systemic injustice through communally conscious education*. Routledge: New York.

Khalifa, M. A., Gooden, M. A., & Davis, J. E. (2016). Culturally responsive school leadership: A synthesis of the literature. *Review of Educational Research*, *86*(4), 1272-1311.

Khalifa, M.A., Khalil, D., Marsh, T.E.J., & Halloran, C. (2019). Toward an indigenous decolonizing school leaderships: A literature review. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 55(4) 571-614.*

Kowalski, T. J. (2013). District Diversity and Superintendents of Color. *Educational Leadership Faculty Publications.* 19. Retrieved from https://ecommons.udayton.edu/eda_fac_pub/19

Ladson-Billings, G. L. & Tate, W.F. (1995). Towards A Critical Race Theory of education. *Teachers College Record*, 97(1), 47-64,

Lara, C.T. (2014). *Being bad: My baby brother and the school to prison pipeline*. Teachers College Press: New York.

Lindsey, R.B., Robins, N. Kikanza & Terrell, R.D (2003). Cultural proficiency: A manual for school leaders. Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press.

Lopez, G. R. (2003). The "racially neutral" politics of education: A critical race theory perspective. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 39(1), 68-94.*

López, J. A., Magdaleno, K. R., & Reis, N. M. (2006). Developing leadership for equity: What is the role of leadership preparation programs? *Educational Leadership and Administration: Teaching and Program Development*, *18*, 11-19.

Love, B. L. (2019). *We want to do more than survive: Abolitionist teaching and the pursuit of educational freedom*. Beacon Press.

Lowery, K. (2019) 'What are you willing to do?': the development of courage in social justice leaders. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*. DOI: 10.1080/13603124.2019.1690698

Marshall, C. (2004). Social justice challenges to educational administration: Introduction to a special issue. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 40(1), 3-13.

Mendoza-Reis, N., & Flores, B. (2014). Changing the pedagogical culture of schools with Latino English learners: Re-culturing instructional leadership. In P. J. Mellom, P. R. Portes, S. Spencer, & P. Baquedano-Lopez (Eds.), *U.S. Latinos and education policy: Research-Based directions for change.* New York, NY, USA: Routledge Press.

Mendoza-Reis, N. & Smith, A. (2013). Re-thinking the universal approach to the preparation of school leaders: Cultural proficiency and beyond. In L. C. Tillman, & J. J. Scheurich (Eds.), *Handbook of research on educational leadership for equity and diversity* (pp. 651-669). New York, NY, USA: Routledge Press.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2020). Characteristics of public school principals. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_cls.asp and https://nces.ed.gov/surveys/ntps/tables/ntps1718_19110501_a1s.asp

Owens, A., Reardon, S. F., & Jencks, C. (2016). Income segregation between schools and school districts. *American Educational Research Journal*, 53(4), 1159-1197.

Portes, P.R. (2005). *Dismantling education inequality: A cultural-historical approach to closing the achievement gap*. New York: Peter Lang.

Portes, P. R. & Salas, S., Eds. (2011) Vgotsky in 21st century society: Advances in cultural-historical theory and praxis in non-dominant communities. New York: Peter Lang.

Reardon, S. F. (2016). School segregation and racial academic achievement gaps. *RSF: The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences*, 2(5), 34-57.

Reilly, E. (2005) Toward Equitable Schools: Reflections and Challenges. *Educational Leadership and Administration: Teaching and Program Development*, 15, 125-130.

Reilly, E. (2006). The future entering: Reflections on and challenges to ethical leadership. *Educational Leadership and Administration: Teaching and Program Development*, 18, 163-168.

Santamaria, L.J. & Santamaria, L.P. (2015). Counteracting educational injustice with applied critical leadership: Culturally responsive practices promoting sustainable change. *International Journal of Multicultural Education*, 17(1), 22-41.

Shields, C. (2010). Transformative leadership: Working for equity in diverse contexts. *Educational Administration Quarterly* 46(4) 558–589.

Simmons, J. (2015)*. A theory of emancipatory leadership. In M. Khalifa, N. Witherspoon Arnold, A. F. Osanloo & C. Grant (Eds.). *Handbook of urban educational leadership.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Solorzano, D. & Delgado Bernal, D. (2001). Critical race theory, transformational resistance and social justice: Chicana and Chicano students in an urban context. *Urban Education,* 37, 308-342.

Swanson, J, and Welton, A. (2019). When good intentions only go so far: White principals leading discussions about race. *Urban Education*, 54(5), 732-739. U.S. Census Bureau (2019). *Quickfacts: California.* Retrieved from https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/CA

Tharp, R. & Gallimore, R. (1995). *Rousing minds to life: Teaching, learning and schooling in social context.* Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind in society: the development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Yosso, T. (2005) Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory on community cultural wealth. *Race, Ethnicity and Education. 8(1) 69-91.*