

Educating Higher Education and School Leaders in Matters of Peace

Susan Carson (Corresponding Author)

Grand Valley State University College of Education

920 Eberhard Center, 301 West Fulton Street

Grand Rapids, Michigan 49504-6495, United States of America

Tel: 616-331-6490 E-mail: carsons@gvsu.edu

Susanne Chandler

University of Michigan, Flint School of Education and Human Services

410 French Hall, Flint, Michigan 48502, United States of America

Tel: 810-766-6878 E-mail: chandles@umflint.edu

Elaine C. Collins

Grand Valley State University College of Education

920 Eberhard Center, 301 West Fulton Street

Grand Rapids, Michigan 49504-6495, United States of America

Tel: 616-331-6820 E-mail: collinel@gvsu.edu

Deborah Snow

University of Michigan, Flint School of Education and Human Services

410 French Hall, Flint, Michigan 48502, United States of America

Tel: 810-762-3284 E-mail: deborasn@umflint.edu

Abstract

Current reform efforts in the redesign of educational leadership programs in higher education call for rigorous coursework in management and education. Educational leadership models that are grounded in principles of restorative justice and peace education, however, are seldom targeted as part of this reform – although they may significantly enhance student achievement, communication, relationships, and general satisfaction in a learning community. This paper offers three brief case studies exploring experiments in educational reform that have integrated restorative justice principles into higher education and K-12 urban school district contexts. Data were drawn from a wide range of sources, including surveys, formal and informal interviews, student achievement scores, and journal entries. Characteristics are identified that can be integrated into educational leadership programs to promote nonviolence in learning communities.

Keywords: Urban, Peace, Education, Reform, Restorative justice

1. Introduction

1.1 Educating Higher Education and School Leaders in Matters of Peace

Current reform efforts in the redesign of educational leadership programs in higher education call for rigorous coursework in management (e.g., finance, human resources, organizational leadership, entrepreneurship, and negotiation) and education (e.g., child development, instructional design, assessment, faculty development, school law, and politics) (Levine, 2005). Educational leadership models that are grounded in principles of restorative justice and peace education, however, are seldom targeted as part of this reform.

As educational leaders and investigators have attempted to explore and work beyond traditional hierarchical leadership patterns, a statement by Fullan (2001) has become a central tenet: “The key to developing leadership is to develop knowledge and share it” (p. 132). Recent work in the pedagogy of peace education (Carter, 2005; Gervais, 2004; Harris, 1998, 2004; Stomfay-Stitz, 1993, 2001) has shown that there are a number of contextual, academic, and social variables which interact to create nonviolent, peaceful environments that foster learning and enhance school improvement efforts. Pennell (2004) and Cavanaugh (2006) link these variables to core principles of restorative justice, a community-oriented approach that creates social support for change that is culturally universal. According to these researchers, the role of educational leaders in a restorative justice context is to: (a) build trust, (b) heal harm to relationships, (c) restore the dignity of persons affected, (d) respect biculturalism and multiculturalism, (e) be aware of power differences, and (f) create safety. These, in turn, have the potential to foster improved student achievement.

To create nonviolent, peaceful environments, educational leaders need to promote collaboration and shift teacher attitudes toward pedagogy to improve learning and ultimately create a culture of caring (Liontos, 1992). Although the relationship between peace pedagogy and school improvement is clear for some educational leaders, few stories about the use of peaceful practices are reported in published accounts of leadership research.

To understand how restorative justice principles might be integrated into leadership programs and their relationship to learning, it is important to analyze how those principles play out in a variety of contexts. This paper reports on the methodological procedures and findings for an educational leadership peace project that began in an American Midwestern state in 2005. This project has systematically integrated restorative justice principles into three vastly different cultures: (a) a college of education and social work in an urban research university; (b) a college of education in an urban regional teaching university; and (c) a K-12 urban public school district where a climate of conflict, fear, and distrust impeded prior positive efforts for change. The project data discussed in this paper were collected from the fall of 2005 to the spring of 2007. The project is ongoing, and it has prompted similar work in three additional sites in other urban settings.

2. Methods of Inquiry, Data Collection, and Analysis

The researchers involved in the project included five female educational leaders from

different higher education venues. Two were deans – one from the urban research university and one from the urban regional teaching university. Three were teachers/faculty with backgrounds, respectively, in early childhood education, foundations and diversity, and math/science and technology.

The researchers were specifically interested in exploring ways in which restorative justice principles could be integrated into a learning community – i.e., how those principles could be used to construct a shared vision, reduce violence, improve communication, enhance relationships, address issues of race, and foster respect. To accomplish this, in all three settings they used a contrast/comparative perspective grounded in anthropological inquiry and action research methods (Reason, 2001). Care was taken from the beginning to construct a unified line of inquiry across the three contexts.

2.1 Data Collection

Data were collected from numerous sources in each setting to enhance reliability and include as wide a variety of perspectives as possible. Specifically, the various forms of data collection included: (a) surveys (Fontana & Frey, 1994; Janesick, 1994), (b) interviews (e.g., formal, informal, in-depth conversational), (c) participant observations, (d) photographs, (e) field notes, and (f) anecdotal records and documents. In addition, student success indicators were collected and analyzed, such as: (a) increased attendance, (b) increased standardized test scores, (c) increased academic success, and (d) overall decrease in behavioral referrals to a principal or counselor.

The researchers recognized from the beginning of the study that many subtle factors which are difficult to measure might have a direct impact on variation in student academic achievement. For example, these could include the individual students' qualities and skills as well as their environments in school, home, the community, and society at large. Ultimately, school districts mandate “acceptable” variables and measures of student achievement – in this case, enrollment and retention rates and increased standardized test scores – and the researchers chose to use this somewhat more concrete data.

In addition to these sources, other specific data were drawn from the three settings. In the urban research university, data about participant perspectives were collected over the course of two years. At the regional teaching university, data were drawn initially from a faculty/staff climate study survey administered at the beginning of the 2006-2007 academic year. In the K-12 urban public school district, data about the perspectives of the teachers, students, and researchers were collected during the first two years of an ongoing partnership that included the school district, the research university, and the regional teaching university.

2.2 Data Analyses

Within a macro context, data were analyzed according to steps in a methodology described by Glaser and Strauss (1967). Initial categories and concepts were identified. Then, as new data were collected and analyzed, these were continually refined. Data collection and analysis ended up being a cyclical process, with new information enriching and guiding the focus of the overall research. As categories emerged and grew, larger themes or frameworks were

tested to develop emergent theories; these were continually tested against new data.

Specifically, the data for each setting were analyzed for patterns, domains, coding, constructs, and triangulation. Multiple forms of analysis were used to ensure the reliability and validity of findings (Atkinson & Hammersley, 1994; Woods, 1994; Clifford & Marcus, 1986; Spradley, 1979, 1980). For example, these included: (a) document analysis for longitudinal change, (b) adoption or rejection of restorative justice practices, (c) analyses of student achievement variables, and (d) interview responses for patterns of similarity and difference. Changes noted over time were considered important across these case studies, so beginning and concluding documents and practices were given particular attention to assess the degree to which restorative justice and empowering practices were adopted or refused.

In addition to this data analysis process, regular debriefing sessions with the participants in each setting occurred throughout the project. While gathering additional information, these sessions also served as opportunities to check in during analysis.

3. Case Study 1: Urban Research University

3.1 Background

The School of Education & Human Services (SEHS) at this university was created in 1997, separating from its parent unit – the College of Arts & Sciences – amid a furor of infighting and misunderstandings. By everyone's accounts, the fledgling unit had a rocky beginning. A series of interim deans led the SEHS until late 2004, creating an environment with no stable leadership for eight years. There were internal disputes about the desirability of creating the school, perceived inequities in faculty governance, and issues related to gross under-funding.

In a North Central Association accreditation report just prior to 2004, the university was admonished for its inability to hire and retain a dean in the SEHS. Finally, a permanent dean was hired in November 2004 and the SEHS faculty began to hope that this new dean would champion their needs.

3.2 Method

A strategic planning process began in the fall of 2005. This was the first time the SEHS faculty had conducted a strategic planning process since the unit's inception. Except for two individuals, none of the faculty had participated in this type of process previously, which meant they were wary and motivated at the same time.

To initiate the strategic planning process, the new dean asked everyone, individually and collectively, "What are your dreams?" While this exploration was underway, an executive committee retreat of faculty members was held where a draft of possible goals was developed. While discussing different goals, one of the faculty members on the committee said, "Goals are not adequate enough. Perhaps we should be considering our values instead." From this conversation five values ultimately emerged, which became the foundation for the entire strategic planning process: (a) human dignity and worth, (b) diversity through difference, (c) integrity of intellectual leadership, (d) social justice, and (e) community engagement. These were embedded within an over-arching framework of stewardship, which was defined as

service-based leadership that is caring, socially and civically responsible, and committed to transforming the school community.

This work took several months. By this time, the SEHS had grown to include three departments: early childhood, education, and social work. It was decided that the five professional values, which applied across departments, should be advanced instead of specific goals.

The answers to the dean's "What are your dreams?" question, combined with the work on values and goals, ultimately triggered the creation of the SEHS Stewardship Strategic Plan Model. This laid the foundation for a restorative and social justice process that would eventually improve methods of scholarship and professionalism for the SEHS, its students, the university, and the area's K-12 community.

Since the creation of this strategic plan model, the SEHS has used a storytelling process to integrate and weave the framework of stewardship and the five values into every facet of the unit, including tenure and promotion, teaching, scholarship, policies and codes, student retention and support services, staff, school partnerships, and the curriculum.

3.3 Outcomes and Results

This strategic planning process, with its emphasis on values and the framework of stewardship, led to a well-focused definition of SEHS that continues to be used for many purposes and is applied across all theoretical and policy-related issues. It created inherent guidelines for professional behavior and decision-making. Eventually, it also opened up opportunities for integrated/joint degrees and programs across the SEHS's three departments.

The SEHS Code, which contains the unit's faculty governance policies, was reopened and revised. Specific timelines and practices related to supporting faculty through the tenure and promotion process were developed. As a result, systems are in place to help guide and encourage younger faculty, ensuring that they understand the requirements and process for professional advancement. Another outcome from the SEHS Code revision was an agreement among the faculty to consciously move toward equity and equality across all of the SEHS's governance structures (e.g., standing committees and the unit's executive committee).

The strategic planning process has motivated the SEHS faculty members to better understand what it means to be a steward. Intense discussions about the meaning, value, and practices associated with stewardship have moved the SEHS toward an overall vision of its possibilities. This has also united the faculty in a commitment to stand together for equity and access, and to work for social justice. As part of this commitment, the SEHS "adopted" a local K-12 school district that had a long track record of failure. Within this partnership the belief in stewardship has been tested as concepts for change were developed that did not follow the traditional authoritarian model.

Another outcome has been a subtle change in the behavior of faculty and staff. They more consistently model their expressed values. They now come forward to help in various situations, asking collectively, "How can we help in this situation?" They are showing an

increasing ability to work together quickly to develop and implement a plan of action.

Every major SEHS initiative has become one of great depth and meaning. A different perception of timelines came when the faculty realized that they believe the soul of a university is to provide thoughtful imperatives – a contrarian notion in today’s competitive world.

Also, under the framework of stewardship there has been an increased awareness of the intense needs of the university’s students and the region’s public K-12 constituencies. In attempting to answer those needs, the SEHS is reaching out further. It has become more willing to find and bring in external assistance and resources when situations outstrip the school’s capacities.

Finally, focusing on stewardship and the five foundational values has created an awareness that the SEHS has a unique environment, one that requires continual vigilance and protection to prevent a reversion to old habits. Time and care must be taken to assure that new SEHS faculty and staff receive the mentoring and training needed to understand, sustain, and enhance the school’s environment.

3.4 Lessons Learned

The SEHS faculty have emerged from this process with a greater understanding of restorative justice practices as a method for enhancing community stewardship. Problems were addressed and beginning steps were taken for conflict resolution that focused on equity and building positive relationships.

A specific lesson learned from the strategic planning process was that lack of trust is a difficult, recurring issue to erase in bureaucratic agencies. Questions continue to come forward, such as, can processes be embedded that help to remove insecurities regarding equity? Is it possible to have true systemic reform that will promote desired values? Are there strong enough stewardship models for tenure and promotion that alleviate the unknowns of the process and promote equity?

Another lesson learned was that, over time, the SEHS’s culture *could* change for the better when the people involved focused on a small number of key values and the theme of stewardship. When the focus on these fundamentals was lost temporarily, efforts for change drifted.

One of the greatest lessons learned in creating the SEHS was that the work involved in stewardship and restorative justice is an ongoing pursuit that requires the commitment of each individual. It does not end when a formal strategic plan is finalized. People must feel they are in a safe environment to risk learning and unlearning habits, maintain dialogue around issues of diversity, and support one another in change. Restorative justice offers ways for the peaceful management and resolution of conflicts, and these methods can be learned and practiced by communities of all sizes and kinds. But patience is needed. Because they tend to be unfamiliar, people may initially take a long time to learn and practice these methods.

4. Case Study 2: Regional Teaching University

4.1 Background

In the second case study, the researchers involved were interested in integrating principles of restorative justice (e.g., trust, dignity, multiculturalism, awareness of safety, healing of harm) into the organizational culture of a college of education (COE), which was described by a strong majority of faculty and staff as isolating and harmful. Problems centered on issues related to power and voice, leadership, diversity, communication, and professionalism. It is important to note that the problems experienced in this COE were comparable to those found in the larger university culture.

The dean of the college formed a climate study committee for the 2006-2007 academic year. This committee consisted of two academic unit heads, the director of community outreach, a faculty member, and the dean. Enhancing the college's climate was a stated priority for the year. Because a new strategic planning cycle was just beginning in the college, the dean of the COE believed that this kind of study would lead to the creation and incorporation of much-needed initiatives to create a better climate.

4.2 Method

To assess the current climate, a survey was constructed. The COE climate study team chose to use a modified form of a climate study administered by the university. The team wanted to determine if the findings of the COE would replicate those of the larger whole. Survey Monkey was used to compile and calculate results. The survey was administered in October 2006. It was completed by 91% of the administrative staff, 100% of the secretarial staff, 81% of the tenure track faculty, and 72% of the visiting/affiliate faculty, for a total return of 83%.

Upon analysis of the quantitative data, the researchers found that their initial hypotheses were supported. Specifically, two categories surveyed showed significant results. A total of 37% of the respondents indicated they "usually" or "sometimes" felt isolated because of their beliefs/perspectives. Also, 50% indicated they believed the college's climate only sometimes supported healing in relation to harm done to relationships.

Although a minority – just over one-third – of the COE indicated they felt isolated as a result of race, gender, age, and sexual orientation, the climate committee believed strongly that if a single member of the community felt his/her values and ways of being were rejected by the dominant majority, alienation and further divisiveness would occur. Therefore, both majority and minority voices held power in the debate.

Qualitative data proved more difficult to analyze because many of the stated comments were in direct opposition to either the minority or majority voice. For example, comments included the following:

"Not enough cultural diversity in the faculty and staff"

"COE goes over the top for minorities, less for others, reverse of what you may think"

"Do not feel personal beliefs impact treatment. People are so welcoming and accepting here"

“Little opportunity to know beliefs/perspectives, nor safety to express ideas not shared by most others”

Discussions around how to share these data were heated and lively, spanning many weeks. Because the committee could not reach consensus, members chose to engage the broader COE community at three separate retreats. At the first retreat, faculty were presented with the quantitative findings. It was agreed that the second retreat would be framed by a discussion of Dr. Wangari Muta Maathai’s (2004) Nobel Prize-winning strategies of community mobilization that led to a reconceptualization of Kenyan practices related to the environment. A third retreat was scheduled to envision what the climate might be like in the COE if current behaviors of communication and constraining structures were changed.

4.3 Outcomes and Results

The three retreats offered significant opportunities for sharing. By the third retreat it was agreed that principles needed to be developed that all members of the college could support and implement in helping to lead the organization toward positive change. Also, a structure for academic unit reorganization was created that sought to improve communication by equalizing power across two departments while still maintaining programmatic integrity.

4.4 Lessons Learned

Several lessons emerged from the climate study process. For example, integrating nontraditional principles of restorative justice into a traditional leadership culture may result in backlash from those who expect, and are comfortable with, traditional authority figures focused on control. Also, change may develop more slowly in large groups of people, where agreed-upon constructs of communication and behavior may take longer to form.

In building a leadership model that incorporates principles of restorative justice, it is important to include formal training that integrates nontraditional peace initiatives – such as collaborative groups, sustainability, community building, and storytelling – at both the personal and organizational levels. These initiatives should be designed to help address some of the current manifestations of low self-esteem found in U.S. culture, which include hesitation to try new things, denial of problems obvious to others, projection of blame/responsibility for problems, hypersensitivity to criticism, grandiosity, and decreased power or control over the environment – all risk factors that have been identified by the Eighth National Conference on the Classification of Nursing Diagnoses (Bulechek & McCloskey, 1989).

Partnership models such as those described by Riane Eisler can also be integrated to create nurturing leadership structures with nontraditional values and supports. In these models, accountability flows not only from the bottom up but also from the top down. As stated by Eisler (2000):

Educational structures orienting to the partnership model are not unstructured or laissez-faire; they still have administrators, managers, leaders and other positions where responsibility for particular tasks and function is assigned. However the leaders and managers inspire rather

than coerce. They empower rather than disempower, making it possible for the organization to access and utilize the knowledge and all of its members. (p.21)

Finally, a lesson emerged around trust and patience. Formalized training and the construction of a partnership model are not enough. It is equally important to examine the structure of traditional schooling practices, which frequently perpetuate isolation and injustice. In building alternative models where listening and engagement in a safe context prevail, trust, patience, and flexibility are needed because the change process will often contain ambiguities.

5. Case Study 3: K-12 Urban School District

5.1 Background

The School of Education & Human Services (SEHS) at the urban research university described in Case Study #1 had the opportunity to partner with a small, urban, K-12 school district that was facing state intervention and restructuring. It was struggling with issues related to race, school violence, urban socioeconomic realities, shockingly low graduation rates, high dropout rates, and five years of failing AYP (adequate yearly progress) under federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) requirements. To compound this, the district's teachers did not have a contract, the school board and administrators were unhappy with the teachers, the teachers were unhappy with the administration and distrusted the board, and parents were confused and distrusted the school district in general. In short, the situation was complex and turbulent when the partnership, which is still underway, was formalized in the spring of 2005.

A full-time university/school liaison position was created to ensure that the partnership developed a climate of mutual understanding, honest communication, and democratic involvement. The partnership began with a meeting between SEHS faculty and the district's administrators. This was followed by a "get-acquainted" meeting to explore possible collaborations that involved SEHS faculty and the teachers.

The next step was a town hall meeting with a panel of school board members, the district superintendent, the SEHS dean, and a representative from the state board of education. A few teachers, several university faculty, and many parents and community members were in the audience. Although some questions from the audience were directed toward the partnership, most addressed concerns about student achievement, safety, and family involvement in the schools. Parents expressed frustration and concern with the overt animosity between district administration and teachers, asking how the partnership would relate to their expressed concerns.

5.2 Method

The researchers approached the partnership by building relationships with individuals and creating teams centered on common educational goals. In addition to defining the university's and the district's shared commitment of funding, human resources, time, and other resources, a conscious decision was made to be open and authentic in communication and to consistently model civility and respect. Specific efforts included: (a) the full-time

university/district liaison and a social work liaison; (b) faculty release time; (c) dedicated social work interns, education interns, and student teachers; (d) on-sight teaching of university classes, including model lessons in school classrooms; (e) grant writing sessions with teachers; (f) support for after-school programs; (g) participation in administrators' meetings; (h) a college credit technology course for high school students; and (i) curriculum development collaboration.

In addition to these specifically focused endeavors for school improvement, a more comprehensive "peace initiative" was planned to help heal relationships, promote mutual understanding and respect, facilitate communication and cooperation, and empower all members of the district.

Because the relationships in the district were so strained and fraught with conflict, most of the stakeholders seemed unable to take positive action. In response, the university faculty shared information about peace education practices as an approach to promote healing, positive relationships and social behavior, and nonviolent problem solving. District members were especially interested in learning more about the educational practices of an integrated primary school in Northern Ireland that exemplified respectful relationships and academic excellence.

Two teachers from one elementary school in the district agreed to work with the university faculty to create more positive and supportive classrooms. The school district superintendent authorized experimental classrooms in which teachers would work with a faculty member to implement changes based on research and best practice (Bredekamp & Copple, 1997; Comer, 2001; Hannaford, 2002; Learning First Alliance, 2001; Noddings, 1995; Shonkoff & Phillips, 2000). They invited other teachers in their building to join the project, and three others accepted. This group met on a weekly basis to read, reflect, analyze, and plan together.

5.3 Outcomes and Results

An overarching goal of the partnership in general, and of the peace initiative in particular, was to improve communication and cooperation within the district. As the university/district liaison and faculty members continued to visit classrooms and meet with teachers, personal relationships developed and teams were formed that allowed dialogue to move beyond lamenting challenges to exploring possible actions.

Because the violence, negativity, and mistrust ran deep, one step forward and two steps back became the reality of change in this setting. Small but meaningful marks of progress were made. For example, people began to stop and listen to one another instead of carrying on conversations in passing.

As they learned more – especially about the educational practices of the Northern Ireland primary school – the school district personnel became interested in developing curricular and instructional strategies that would promote healing and positive relationships within classrooms, schools, and the district at large.

Throughout the first year, the teachers gained confidence and became more positive in their interactions with students. The teachers and students became increasingly independent and

creative in their classrooms, with more positive and supportive relationships, and increased student engagement. This led to discussions about plans for developing more relevant curricula and developing leadership roles to foster change in the school and the district.

Finally, weekly meetings between the teachers and the university faculty became forums for reflection, critique, and planning. These weekly meetings also allowed teachers to support each other.

5.4 Lessons Learned

There have been several important lessons learned to date under this ongoing partnership. The first was that faculty in a large, urban research university – just because they, too, are in an urban setting – do not necessarily understand the challenges faced by urban K-12 school districts. In addition to the support and services they offer, faculty have significant lessons to learn in this type of partnership.

Another lesson was related to trust. When every relationship is laced with hidden agendas, power struggles, fear, and passive resistance, the lack of trust among stakeholders must be openly identified and acknowledged. Ultimately, everything else, including all possibilities for change, hinged directly on this issue. To promote student achievement, more positive teaching attitudes, a better classroom environment, and a more cooperative relationship between the district's administration and the teachers' union, trust had to first be restored.

A third lesson was that the restoration of trust required the most intense pedagogical urgency and sophisticated methodology, but it was possible. Over time, the teachers gained confidence and became more positive in their interactions with students. In spite of their frustration with the school's climate, they expressed satisfaction with the climate in their own classrooms. They also expressed greater satisfaction with teaching and were no longer considering transferring to other careers.

Finally, as restorative justice practices began to take hold, everyone involved began to see that each person had to take ownership of his/her own concerns. They had to step up to the plate and become active leader participants. Channels of communication needed to be opened with opportunities for safe discussion. Students, teachers, and staff needed to be empowered to share their stories and hear the stories of others – and to have those stories become part of the learning environment. Everyone needed to learn to think more critically and reflectively – and to openly share those reflections – for the partnership to succeed.

6. Discussion

Previous social science studies of violence in urban settings correlate characteristics such as poverty, racial and ethnic composition, family composition, and housing density to violence (Smith & Smith, 2006). Devine (1996), for example, believes that one of the factors leading to the high incidence of violence in inner city schools is overcrowding. In contrast, other researchers such as Kandakai, Price, Tellojohann, and Wilson (1999) attribute violence to psycho-social factors such as “exposure to violence in the home or community, parental violence, substance abuse, negative peer relations, cognitive deficits that impede one's ability

and/or willingness to practice socially acceptable resolution measures, previous victimization, parental involvement, and single parenthood” (p.190). While attribution characteristics differ between researchers, what remains constant is the belief that exposure to violence in schools has a devastating effect on daily functioning. Instead of focusing on student achievement, students and teachers spend most of their time in a defensive mode reacting to violence in the community.

One outcome of this devastation is the current rate of urban high school dropouts. Campbell (2003) posits that the number of students graduating from inner city high schools is about equal to the number of students dropping out of these schools. In fact, many scholars claim that the United States has a dropout crisis (Greene, 2002; Swanson, 2004; Swanson & Chaplin, 2003; Miao and Haney, 2004; Warren, 2005). The new school of thought is that the true graduation rate is substantially lower than the rate that had been reported for years by the National Center for Education Statistics and other governmental agencies (National Center for Education Statistics, 2007).

In the past 25 years, rising wage differentials between high school graduates and dropouts have increased the economic incentives to graduate from high school. The real wages of high school dropouts have declined since the early 1970s, while those of more skilled workers have risen sharply (Autor, Katz, & Kearney, 2005). According to the Alliance for Excellent Education (2006), almost 1.3 million students didn't graduate from U.S. high schools in 2004, costing more than \$325 billion in lost wages, taxes, and productivity over their lifetimes. A single 18-year-old dropout earns \$260,000 less over a lifetime and contributes \$60,000 less in federal and state income taxes. Combined income and tax losses for one cohort of 18-year-olds who drop out is \$192 billion, which is currently 1.6% of the GDP (Campaign for Educational Equity, 2005).

Coupled with this loss of wage productivity is the loss of other personal benefits, such as improved family health status, improved child development, and the enhanced ability to gain additional individual knowledge. High school dropouts are more likely to be unemployed, earn lower wages, have higher rates of public assistance, and are more likely to be single parents and have children at a younger age (Swanson, 2004).

Of more importance, perhaps, there is also a loss of public benefits: (a) crime reduction, (b) improved social cohesion, (c) increased technological improvements, (d) more equitable income distribution, (e) increased savings rates, and (f) increased charitable giving (Haveman & Wolfe, 1984). Clearly, something needs to be done to redirect inner city student and teacher attitudes toward a culture of achievement.

To this end, reform efforts in the redesign of educational leadership programs should include leadership models grounded in principles of restorative justice. Leadership models found in non-Western philosophical approaches, such as those grounded in calm, peaceful strength, may enhance faculty engagement, student learning, communication, relationships, and satisfaction in the learning community. It is imperative that we begin to assure that administrators, teachers, and students are familiar with restorative justice principles. They must be systematically integrated into both K-12 and university contexts. Improving the

performance of leaders may be one of the most feasible methods for increasing achievement and engagement.

Perhaps the single most important lesson learned throughout the three case studies was related to trust. Nothing else could occur or be restored until issues of trust were openly considered. All three case studies demonstrated that to restore trust was the most difficult issue in trying to bring forward the processes of restorative justice.

In each case study, the researchers initially assumed that if honest and open approaches were offered, trust would be established and restorative justice processes could begin. This wasn't so in any of the three contexts. Trust had been diminished by perceptions of past stories (factually true or not) that had, unknowingly or knowingly, built-in frames of fear, helplessness, and bitterness. It required extremely hard work to begin to rebuild the trust that had been lost.

7. Conclusion

Restorative justice principles are sound. However, getting to the process is not easy; in fact, it was the most difficult practice for everyone involved in all three case studies. Also, training in these principles is not provided in educational leadership programs to any great extent. But without such support, a restorative justice framework cannot be implemented successfully.

Educational leadership, if it is to be honest and inclusive, needs restorative justice practices. But, at this point, because it is typically not included in the practice and instruction of leadership, the support necessary for individual leaders to sustain their implementation of these ideals is predominately individually motivated. To a person, each of the educational leaders across these three case studies spoke of the extreme weight of dread they faced as they tried, often in what seemed in vain, to pull the process forward.

Ultimately, what emerged from these three case studies was a basic reality. Educational leaders need to be taught the value and processes of restorative justice. But they also need to be provided with ongoing support from all levels of leadership. Without this support, they cannot succeed. And ultimately, this means students are less likely to succeed. Even with only this basic understanding, the principles and process involved in restorative justice must be undertaken. To know and not act, particularly for the greater good, is an offense to the professional ethics of all educators. It is important to take one step at a time, even if the steps are small.

References

Alliance for Excellent Education. (2006, March 1). *High school dropouts cost the U.S. billions in lost wages and taxes, according to Alliance for Excellent Education* [Press release]. Washington. [Online] Available: http://www.all4ed.org/press_room/press_releases/03012006 (May 8, 2007).

Atkinson, P., & Hammersley, M. (1994). Ethnography and participant observation. In Denzin & Lincoln (Eds.), *The handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 248-261). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Autor, D., Katz, L., & Kearney, M. (2005, October). *Trends in United States wage inequality: Re-Assessing the revisionists* (NBER Working Paper No. W11627). [Online] Available: http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=807616 (September 2005).

Bredenkamp, S., & Copple, C. (1997). *Developmentally appropriate practice in early childhood programs*. (Revised ed.). Washington DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Bulechek, G., & McCloskey, J. (1989). Nursing interventions: Treatments for potential nursing diagnoses. In M. Carroll-Johnson (Ed.), *Classification of nursing diagnosis: Proceedings of the eighth national conference*. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott.

Campaign for Educational Equity. (2005, October 24-25). *The Social costs of inadequate education*. Findings presented at the First Annual Teachers College Symposium on Educational Equity, Columbia University. [Online] Available: http://www.tc.columbia.edu/i/a/3082_socialcostsofinadequateEducation.pdf (May 8, 2007).

Campbell, L. (2003, Dec/Jan). As strong as the weakest link: Urban high school dropout. *The High School Journal*, pp. 16-24.

Carter, C. (2005, April). *A place for peace: Standards as policy foundations in USA*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Québec, Canada.

Cavanaugh, T. (2006, April). *Creating schools of peace and nonviolence in a time of war and violence*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Clifford, J., & Marcus, G. (1986). *Writing culture: The poetics and politics of ethnography*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Comer, J. (2001). Schools that develop children. *The American Prospect*, 12(7), pp. 30-35.

Devine, J. (1996). *Maximum security: The culture of violence in inner-city schools*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Eisler, R. (2000). *Tomorrow's children: A blueprint for partnership education for the 21st century*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Fontana, A., & Frey, J. (1994). Interviewing: The art of science. In Denzin & Lincoln (Eds.), *The handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 361-376). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a culture of change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Gervais, M. (2004). The Baha'i curriculum for peace education. *Journal of Peace Education*, 1(2), pp.205-208.

Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). *Discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago, IL: Aldine Publishing Co.

Greene, J. P. (2002a). *High school graduation rates in the United States: Revised*. Paper

Prepared for the Black Alliance for Educational Options. New York, NY: Manhattan Institute for Policy Research. [Online] Available: http://www.manhattan-institute.org/html/cr_31.htm (May 28, 2003).

Greene, J. P. (2002b). *Public school graduation rates in the United States* (Civic Report No.31). New York, NY: Manhattan Institute for Policy Research. [Online] Available: http://www.manhattan-institute.org/html/cr_31.htm (May 28, 2003).

Hannaford, C. (2002). *Awakening the child heart*. Captain Hook, HI: Jamilla Nur Publishing.

Harris, I. (1998). *Peace education*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company Publishers.

Harris, I. (2004). Peace educators teach strategies for peace. *Journal of Peace Education*, 1(2), pp.239-243.

Haveman, R., & Wolfe, B. (1984). Schooling and economic well-being: The role of nonmarket effects. *Journal of Human Resources*, 19, pp.377-407.

Janesick, V. (1994). The dance of qualitative research design: Metaphor, methodolatry, and meaning. In Denzin & Lincoln (Eds.), *The handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 209-219). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kandakai, T., Price, J., Tellojohann, S., & Wilson, C. (1999). Mothers' perceptions of factors influencing violence in schools. *The Journal of School Health*, 69(5), pp.189-195.

Learning First Alliance. (2001). *Every child learning: Safe and supportive schools*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. [Online] Available: <http://www.learningfirst.org/publications/safeschools/> (September 2005).

Levine, A. (2005). *Educating School Leaders*. Education Schools Project. (Report #1). Washington, D.C.

Liontos, L. B. (1992). Transformational leadership. *Eric Digest*. Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED347636).

Maathai, W. (2004, October). Lecture presented at the Nobel Prize Award Ceremony, Stockholm, Sweden. [Online] Available: <http://nobelprize.org/mediaplayer/index.php?id=867> (November 2008).

Miao, J., & Haney, W. (2004). High school graduation rates: Alternative methods and implications. Boston College Research Paper, Version 2. [Online] Available: <http://www.bc.edu/research/nbetpp/statements/nbr5.pdf> (October 2004).

National Center for Education Statistics. (2007, December). *The American high school graduation rate: trends and levels*. National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper No. 13670. [Online] Available: <http://www.nber.org/papers/w13670> (November 2008).

Noddings, N. (1995). Teaching themes of care. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 76, pp.675-681.

Pennell, J. (2004, December). *Culture, safety, and family violence*. Keynote address presented

at the New Frontiers in Restorative Justice: Advancing Theory and Practice Conference, Auckland, New Zealand.

Reason, P. (2001). Learning and change through action research. In J. Henry (Ed.), *Creative management*. London: Sage.

Shonkoff, J. P., & Phillips, D. A. (Eds.) (2000). *Neurons to neighborhoods: The science of early childhood development*. Washington DC: National Academy Press.

Smith, D., & Smith, B. (2006, Feb/Mar). Perceptions of violence: The views of teachers who left urban schools. *The High School Journal*, pp.34-42.

Spradley, J. (1979). *Ethnographic interviewing*. Beverly, MA: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Spradley, J. (1980). *Participant observation*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Stomfay-Stitz, A. (1993). *Peace education in America: 1828-1990*. Metuchen, NJ: The Press, Inc.

Stomfay-Stitz, A. (2001). *Peace education and ecological sustainability: A blueprint for the future*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.

Swanson, C. (2004, December 9). *Setting the stage for a national dialogue: Graduation rates and NCLB*. Presented at the Alliance for Excellent Education Graduate Rate Symposium, The National Press Club, Washington, DC. [Online] Available: www.all4ed.org/publications/MeasuringGraduationToMeasureSuccess.html (November 2008).

Swanson, C. B., & Chaplin, D. (2003). *Counting high school graduates when graduates count: Measuring graduation rates under the high stakes of NCLB*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute. [Online] Available: http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/410641_NCLB.pdf (May 23, 2003).

Warren, J. R. (2005). State-level high school completion rates: Concepts, measures, and trends. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 13(51). [Online] Available: <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v13n51> (November 1, 2006).

Woods, P. (1994). Symbolic interactionism: Theory and method. In LeCompte, Millroy & Preissle (Eds.), *The handbook of qualitative research in education* (pp. 337-404). New York: Academic Press.