Shapiro, J., & Gross, S. J. (in press). "Ethics and Professional Norms". In J. F. Murphy, *Professional standards for educational leaders: The empirical, moral, and experiential foundations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Professional Standards for Educational Leaders
Standard 2: Ethics and Professional Norms:
Effective educational leaders act ethically and according to professional norms to promote each student's academic success and well-being. Effective leaders: a) Act ethically and professionally in personal conduct, relationships with others, decision-making, stewardship of the school's resources, and all aspects of school leadership. b) Act according to and promote the professional norms of integrity, fairness, transparency, trust, collaboration, perseverance, learning, and continuous improvement. c) Place children at the center of education and accept responsibility for each student's academic success and well-being. d) Safeguard and promote the values of democracy, individual freedom and responsibility, equity, social justice, community, and diversity. e) Lead with interpersonal and communication skill, social-emotional insight, and understanding of all students' and staff members' backgrounds and cultures. f) Provide moral direction for the school and promote ethical and professional behavior among faculty and staff.

Introduction

This chapter focuses on the 2015 Standard 2, Ethics and Professional Norms. Standard 2 is considered to be one of the four "driver" standards along with Standard 1 Mission, Vision and Core Values, Standard 3 Equity and Cultural Responsiveness, and Standard 10 School Improvement.

Prior to the acceptance of the 2015 standards, a very real concern for those of us who teach Ethical Educational Leadership to aspiring educational leaders was that Ethics and Professional Norms would not be included as a separate standard. Apparently, we were correct to have this concern as some of the designers of the 2015 Standards felt that Standard 2 was a "given" and as such was so over-arching that it should be included in the introduction of the standards, but not as a separate entity. However, others on the working group realized that, without the creation of a separate standard, this important and flourishing area would not be treated with the gravitas it deserved. Additionally, since many of us believe that professional ethics is needed if educational leadership is to be called a profession, then it is truly important that it be seen as a field that deserves to be taught as a separate course or unit in graduate programs and should be a discrete entity of faculty development programs in schools and in central offices.

In this chapter, to understand better why Standard 2 should exist, we will provide some background to the new scholarship of Ethical Educational Leadership and for the need of teaching this burgeoning field to educational leaders. We will also describe an assignment regarding personal and professional codes as well as offer an introduction to paradoxes. Then we will turn to ethical decision-making. This is a way to put educational leaders' professional beliefs into practice by dealing with paradoxical situations and by making hard choices. The ability to make wise, intelligent and thoughtful decisions is extremely important for educational leaders in these very challenging times. Clearly, the next generation of young people's learning and well-being will be deeply affected by the decisions that they make.

While discussing ethical decision making, a few ethical decision making models will be mentioned. Two models, in particular, the Multiple Ethical Paradigms and Turbulence Theory, will be introduced and described. Following the description of the two models, ethics standards from 1996 and 2008 will be briefly reviewed. Then the 2015 Standard 2 itself and its functions will be deconstructed, utilizing the Multiple Ethical Paradigms and Turbulence Theory, to determine if the ethics of justice, critique, care and the profession are part of this standard. Finally, to help make this standard more accessible, exemplars will be described to enable an educational administrator to determine how a particular aspect of a standard can be actualized.

Ethical Educational Leadership: The New Scholarship

Just a glance at the Table of Contents of the Handbook of Ethical Educational Leadership (Branson & Gross, 2014) clearly shows the growth of scholarship in this field both nationally and internationally. Shields (2014) makes a strong case that this new knowledge is essential for educational leaders to study. She challenges the assumption of one senior colleague who said to her some years ago that "ethics has nothing to do with educational administration" (pp.24 & p.41). Instead, her argument places ethics at the center of learning in this current era of diversity and interdependence globally.

The flourishing of Ethical Educational Leadership can be traced back to the early 1990's. Previously, as Farquhar (1981) pointed out, after surveying UCEA member institutions, there was a paucity of ethics courses or units in educational administration programs. It was not until 1992 that Beck, Murphy & Associates (1997) saw marked progress in ethics being taught either as a separate course or in an infused manner in educational leadership. In particular, in 1995, The University Council for Educational Administrators' (UCEA) Center for Values and Leadership Education, originally housed at the University of Toronto and the University of Virginia, helped to move ethical leadership into the curriculum for educational administrators. Later on, the Consortium for the Study of Leadership and Ethics Education (CSLEE) was developed, encompassing a number of global centers and institutions and this organization helped to make ethical educational leadership an international field. Currently, the centers include: Asian Pacific Centre, Hong Kong Institute of Education (Hong Kong); Australian Catholic University (Australia); California State University Dominguez Hills, (USA); the Center for Principal Development, Umea University (Sweden); Loyola University Chicago (USA); New DEEL Center, Temple University (USA); Nipissing University (Canada); The Rock Ethics Institute and the Willower Center, The Pennsylvania State University (USA); the University of Oklahoma (USA); and the University of Western Ontario (Canada). These centers and institutions place ethics and values at the forefront of their educational leadership curriculum.

Today, to be effective, an educational administrator needs to have knowledge of this growing field of Ethical Educational Leadership. This field encompasses values, virtues, decision-making and standards (Shapiro, 2015). Ethical Educational Leadership expects k-12 administrators to think rationally, empathetically and comprehensively before making an important ethical decision that may affect faculty, staff, parents and especially students.

Values, Virtues and Standards: Different Ideals

Early on, educational ethicists turned to diverse values that they believed were essential for leaders to possess in education. For example, Branson (2009, 2010; Branson & Gross, 2014) highlights wisdom and moral integrity; Haiyan and Walker (2014) focuses on empathy; Begley (2006) and Begley & Johannson (2003) stress self-knowledge and sensitivity; Gross (2014; Gross & Shapiro, 2015) turns to exemplars who exhibit a wide range of salient qualities; and Bredeson (2005) encompasses values when he describes ethical architects as school leaders. Some of these writers emphasize the need to teach values to future educational leaders through moral literacy (Tuana, 2007).   Others, such as Starratt (2004), do not turn to values. Instead, Starratt does advocate the importance of specific virtues. His foci are: responsibility, authenticity and presence.

Another major way that educational ethical values are gleaned is through the various standards designed by professional organizations. They include, for example: the past National Policy Board for Educational Administration's ISLLC Standards (1996; 2008) and the current National Policy Board for Educational Administration's Professional Standards (2015); the American Association of School Administrator's Statement of Ethics for Educational Leaders (2007); and the University Council for Educational Administrators' Code of Ethics for the Preparation of Educational Leaders (2011). The latter was developed in a participatory process over six years by a number of educational leadership faculty members (Shapiro & Stefkovich, 2016, p.22). Many other local, national and international organizations have designed their own codes, focusing frequently on important values and virtues that educational leaders should possess. Above all, it is important for educational leaders to develop their own codes consisting of values and even behaviors.

Personal versus Professional Ethics Codes: The Importance of Reflection

A number of us, who teach ethics, usually give an assignment asking our graduate students, who are aspiring educational leaders, to create two codes. One of these is a personal code that lists the values and behaviors of their interactions with their families and friends. The other code, the professional one, asks them to develop a list of values and behaviors that they turn to when they are in their work environments. For some students, the codes are similar. While for others, they are very different. Discussing the similarities and differences in small groups becomes a worthwhile and fascinating activity. Some students are so affected by the codes that they place them nearby at home and at work so that they can remember to read them each day. The importance of reflection cannot be underestimated. There is so little time in the busy life of an educational leader to actually carry out the reflective process. When given the opportunity, developing ones' own personal and professional codes can be of great importance to educational leaders as they are intrinsic and authentic. They can prepare educational administrators for the challenges ahead.

Being an Ethical Person versus Acting Ethically: Dealing with Paradoxes

Developing ones' own personal and professional ethical codes is an excellent start to becoming an ethical educational leader, however, it is only a beginning. In an era of wars, terrorism, hurricanes, volcanoes, tornados, financial uncertainty and high stakes testing, educational leaders face a myriad of complex problems. They need to take into account evacuation plans, lock-downs, immigration issues, psychological problems, and even global events. Each day, educational leaders face paradoxes that often challenge their own values. These paradoxes can be categorized, for example, as security versus civil liberties, community standards versus individual rights, equality versus equity, accountability versus responsibility, and many more. Thus, it is important to prepare educational leaders for some of the paradoxes they will have to face while providing them with time to think through their values and explore their possible reactions to the situations in safe spaces.

Ethical Dilemmas: Educational Leaders Challenges

There are many kinds of dilemmas that educational leaders face today. For example, they must deal with not only the bullying that occurs frequently in the playground or lunch room, but also now there are cases of cyber-bullying and sexting. They have to take into account the problems that come from the carrying of guns and the difficulties of immigration. The variety of ethical dilemmas that they face are many and varied. Here is one example of an ethical dilemma that an educational leader might face in this era of high-stakes testing.

Test Rooms versus Rest Rooms

It's time for standardized test week at the Wonderbrook Middle School. State testing regulations say that students cannot use the restrooms during tests. Leaving a proctor to watch the rest of the class, the teacher, Ms. Smith, escorts a student who urgently needs to use the bathroom. Ms. Smith's action is reported to the principal by another teacher, who fears that the rules were broken, and that Ms. Smith might have placed the reputation of the school in jeopardy. You are the principal, what do you do? On the one hand, should Ms. Smith and the student be reprimanded for breaking a testing regulation? On the other hand, is it really right to not allow a student to go to the bathroom, even during tests?

The above example is only one of the many cases that educational leaders face today. In this instance, the ethic of justice (rules and regulations) is pitted against the ethic of care (concern for others) and the profession (best interests of the student). Additionally, because of the pressure related to standardized testing placed on schools today, the turbulence level is bordering on severe. To help leaders deal with these problems a number of models are now part of the new scholarship in Ethical Educational Leadership. The next section discusses briefly some of the models in the literature and focuses on two models, the Multiple Ethical Paradigms and Turbulence Theory.

Ethical Decision Making: The Multiple Ethical Paradigms and Turbulence Theory

In the literature, not only are values and virtues emphasized, but also the actual process of ethical decision-making is highlighted. There are numerous ways to approach educational ethical decision making. Strike (2007), for example, focuses on evidence-driven decision making. He believes that a decision should be "supported by evidence" and that the decision should be "implemented morally" (pp.111-113). Cranston, Ehrich and Kimber (2014) propose a different ethical decision making model. Their five part model contains: "the critical incident, individual decision makers and their personal values; the factors or forces that illuminate the ethical dilemma; the choices available in resolving the dilemma; the action that is taken; and the implications of the decision or action for the individual, the organization and the community" (p.243).

Another model, for ethical decision-making, has been developed by Starratt (1994). He focuses on ethical decision-making using three lenses - - the ethics of justice, care and critique. Shapiro and Stefkovich not only utilize the three lenses, but they add a fourth -- - the ethic of the profession. Starratt's work provided a foundation on which Shapiro and Stefkovich (2001, 2005, 2011, 2016) were able to create their Multiple Ethical Paradigms for ethical decision-making. When faced with an ethical decision, Shapiro and Stefkovich ask educational leaders to turn to the Multiple Ethical Paradigms of justice, critique, care and the profession.

Let's take a look at the Multiple Ethical Paradigms in more detail. Although there is no expectation that the ethic of justice will be turned to by educational leaders, frequently, in a litigious society, they consider this lens to be the first step in the decision-making process. The ethic of justice (e.g., Beauchamp & Childress, 1984; Sergiovanni, 2009; Strike, 2006; Yodof, Kirp & Levin, 1992) is concerned with the legal system, fairness, and freedom. It takes into account questions such as: Is there a law, right, or policy that relates to a particular case? If there is a law, right, or policy, should it be enforced? Is the law enforced in some places and not in others? Why or why not? And if there is not a law, right, or policy, should there be one?

The ethic of critique (e.g., Apple, 2003; Freire, 1970; Giroux, 2006; Portelli, 2007; Reitzug & O'Hair, 2002; Shapiro, 2009; Shapiro & Purpel, 2005), inherent in critical theory and critical pedagogy, is aimed at awakening educational leaders to inequities in society and, in particular, to injustices in education at all levels. It asks leaders to deal with the difficult questions regarding social class, race, gender, and other areas of difference, such as: Who makes the laws, rules, and policies? Who benefits from them? Who has the power? Who is silenced?

The ethic of care (e.g., Beck, 1994; Ginsberg, Shapiro, & Brown, 2004; Marshall & Gerstl-Pepin, 2005; Marshall & Oliva, 2006; Noddings, 2003) directs educators to contemplate the consequences of their decisions and actions. It asks them to consider questions such as: Who will benefit from what I decide? Who will be hurt by my actions? What are the long-term effects of a decision I make today? And if someone helps me now, what should I do in the future about giving back to this individual or to society in general?

Finally, the ethic of the profession (e.g., Beckner, 2004; Begley & Johansson, 2003; Greenfield, 2004; Normore, 2004; Murphy, 2003; Strike, Haller & Soltis, 2005) expects educational leaders to formulate and examine their own professional as well as personal codes of ethics in light of standards set forth by Educational Leadership, and then place students at the center of the ethical decision-making process. It also asks them to take into account the wishes of the community. It goes beyond the ethics of justice, critique, and care to inquire: What would the profession ask me to do? What do various communities expect me to accomplish? What about clashes of codes—does this exist, and is there a problem? And what should the professional educator take into account to consider the best interests of the students, who may be diverse in their composition and their needs (Frick, Faircloth and Little, 2013; Stefkovich, 2006, 2014).

There is another ethic that is currently included under the Ethic of the Profession in the Shapiro and Stefkovich model, but it is considered to be a separate ethic by Furman (2004; Furman-Brown, 2002). She expands on what she characterizes as the "ethic of the community" and defines it as a process. Furman asks

leaders to move away from heroic (solo) decision-making and to reach conclusions with the participation of the community or communities.

Another model, Turbulence Theory (Gross, 1998, 2000, 2004, 2006, 2014; Shapiro & Gross, 2013) while not an ethic, is very much related to the Multiple Ethical Paradigms. When combined with the Multiple Ethical Paradigms, Turbulence Theory helps to identify the emotional intensity of a given ethical dilemma. The origins of Turbulence Theory came from a study of ten schools and districts in the US and Canada that were engaging in successful and sustained innovation in curriculum, instruction and assessment (Gross, 1998). Ironically, these schools and districts were also faced with various levels of disturbance, sometimes threatening the innovation that made them so attractive in the first place. This paradox led to a comparison of four levels of turbulence experienced by pilots (Braybrook 1985; Lester 1994). During light turbulence there is little or nearly no movement of the aircraft. In moderate turbulence, there are clearly noticeable waves of motion. In severe turbulence strong gusts threaten control of the craft and during extreme turbulence, the structural integrity of the aircraft itself is damaged or destroyed. By comparing disturbances in school settings to each of these levels Gross was able to better describe specific situations. Building on the initial work, a system of turbulence gauges was developed to help educators and researchers identify current levels of turbulence as well as where the turbulence level might go in the future (Gross, 2004).

Knowing that there are multiple levels of turbulence and that these levels might be altered up or down depending on specific actions of school and district leaders let to reflections on the underlying forces of turbulence itself. Three such integrated forces that work as a combined system have been identified (Gross 2006, 2014; Shapiro & Gross 2013). These drivers of turbulence include positionality, cascading, and stability. They provide critical context with which to understand and work with the inevitable turbulence that comes with educational leadership at all levels.

Positionality explains why one feels a specific way about a turbulent event depending on the position she or he has vis a vis that event (Alcoff 1991; Collins, 1997; Hauser 1997; Kezar 2000; Maher & Tetreault, 1993). Students may feel very differently than faculty or community members for instance. Even in one specific group, there are going to be differences. All students are not alike, therefore there will be differing levels of turbulence felt among them. Educational leaders need to empathize and put themselves in the place of the varied individuals involved in any turbulent situation. Constructing multiple turbulence gauges from different vantage points in a given dilemma is suggested for that very reason.

The second underlying force driving turbulence is cascading. Since no challenging situation in schools exists in isolation, events preceding a turbulent incident are important to take into account. A teacher strike, previous problems with high stakes testing, a failed school budget, a recent incident of violence all could cause the current turbulence to escalate to higher levels just as the cascade of rapidly flowing water speeds up as it tumbles over vertical drops on its way. At times, this works as a positive feedback loop (Senge, 1990), similar to the fire-bombing of Dresden in World War II, where the very intensity of the attack led to fire storms that built one atop the other (McKee, 1984). At other times, unrelated but mutually stimulating events spur on a cascade. Similar to the use of empathy to better understand the range of positions during turbulence, educational leaders who reflect on the potential of cascading events to escalate turbulence will be better prepared to guide their schools.

Finally, the perceived stability of an organization, such as a school, will influence the degree to which it is impacted by turbulence. Consider two schools, one has a reputation for high achievement, good community relations, and a strong bond among students, faculty, staff and administration. The second school has none of these advantages and suffers from poor morale, frequent faculty and administrative turnover and a poor record of achievement. Now imagine that both schools experience a negative community response to a new social studies curriculum where topics such as the constitutionality of flag burning are debated. The stability of the first school would likely lead residents to feel this topic, while not comfortable, could probably be handled well. Yet in the second school, reaction could be very different. Families and community members could simply regard this as just another misstep by a school administration and faculty that they do not trust. A similar case of community division was kept from escalating beyond control due to the perceived traditional quality of the school system's work. (Gross, 2001).

These three drivers of turbulence work as a combined system. At the most extreme cases, positionality among the parties seems mutually exclusive, cascading events bound one to another in escalating fury, and stability seems to have vanished, leading to ever higher, damaging levels of turbulence. History gives us examples such as the year 1968, where this was the case around the world (Kurlansky, 2004). More recent international contexts like the Arab Spring or even certain of our election cycles demonstrate similar levels of volatility. This situation calls to mind the metaphor of a see-saw where for one side to be up, the other must be down. Put into organizational language, there is no overlap in the Venn diagram of interests between the parties. For balance and shared experience to be regained, some common ground for outcomes needs to be developed.

It would be wrong to conclude that a leader's only reaction should be to diminish turbulence. In fact, many situations call for ratcheting-up turbulent levels to initiate constructive change (Gryskiewicz 1999). The use of action research (Lewin 1947) to experiment with new strategies in real time offers just one well-documented case in point. A school community, for example, might innovate by creating deep structural changes to its instructional program, simply because it felt stuck in outdated patterns. Large-scale historical examples such as FDR's New Deal show the possibilities of initiating turbulent new programs to confront the dynamic challenge of the Great Depression (Grafton, 1999).

The overarching lesson to be learned from Turbulence Theory is that turbulence is a constant in our organizations just as it is in the physical world. Change simply is a part of our universe (Hegel, 1892). Therefore, educators need to learn to work with the inevitable turbulence that comes with their jobs.

The Multiple Ethical Paradigm (MEP) and Turbulence Theory can combine to help educators think through ethical dilemmas in a systematic way. First, we encourage those facing ethical dilemmas to consider which of the ethical paradigms best informs their approach to the dilemma at hand. Next we suggest that they measure the turbulence level now facing their school. Third, after considering the ethical dimensions and turbulence level, educators need to make a plan of action. As mentioned above, this might include a strategy that will escalate turbulence or diminish it.? Finally, after deciding on a plan, they should attempt to predict the level of turbulence that may result. We believe that this approach will help educators navigate through the challenges of ethical dilemmas and possibly avoid misjudgments that have upended leadership engaged in educational reform (Sarason, 1990).

Ethics Standards 1996, 2008 & 2015: A Brief Comparison

In this section of the chapter, we will briefly compare and contrast the 1996, 2008 and 2015 ethics standards. This comparison will highlight the positive changes made in the new version of the ethics standard, indicating its driver status and its infusion into other standards.

In the 1996 version, Standard 5 focused on ethics. The overarching statement read:
A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.

What followed this statement were lists of Knowledge, Dispositions and Performances that a school administrator should uphold. The lists were long and comprehensive.
While very well intentioned, the standard's expectations were spelled out in such a way that they conveyed a prescriptive approach, holding administrators accountable for a great deal of knowledge and a myriad of dispositions and performances. It is important to keep in mind that this was only one standard, among five others, that was described with such specificity.

Turning to the ISLLC Standards of 2008, in the introduction, it was stated that the structure or "footprint" of the six original ISLLC Standards were retained, but that they were written for new purposes and audiences. The authors said that these standards reinforced the proposition in the original ISLLC Standards that leaders' primary responsibility was to improve teaching and learning for all children. But the 1996 standards were so prescriptive that it was hard to discern this focus. By 2008, the National Policy Board and others who designed the standards appeared to understand that an educational administrator would do better with less detail than the 1996 version.

Thus, while ethics continued to be Standard 5, it was developed as more of a synthesis of what was expected of an educational leader, providing only functions rather than dispositions and performances. Somehow, these standards appeared to be more manageable and appeared to show more confidence in the educational leader by not being so specific. The 2008 Standard 5 read:
 An education leader promotes the success of every student by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.
Functions:
A. Ensure a system of accountability for every student's academic and social success
B. Model principles of self-awareness, reflective practice, transparency, and ethical behavior
C. Safeguard the values of democracy, equity, and diversity
D. Consider and evaluate the potential moral and legal consequences of decision-making
E. Promote social justice and ensure that individual student needs inform all aspects of
Schooling.

Unlike the ISLLC Standard 5 of 1996 and 2008, in the Professional Standards for Educational Leaders 2015, ethics is now in an even more prominent position of Standard 2. Additionally, in this new version, not only is ethics an independent and "driver" standard, but it is also infused in a number of other standards. In those infused instances, however, ethics is sometimes explicitly stated while at other times, it is more implicit. For example, in Standard 1, core values are explicitly emphasized. While in Standard 3, the ethic of care is implicit as it focuses on equity and cultural responsiveness. Standard 5 also threads in an ethic of care, while emphasizing community and the support of students. Standards 6 and 7 turn to the ethic of the profession while supporting school personnel and community.

The Deconstruction of Standard 2: Using the Multiple Ethical Paradigms and Turbulence Theory

One way to understand the impact of the 2015 Standard 2 is to deconstruct it. This can be accomplished by turning to different models. For example, utilizing the Multiple Ethical Paradigms of justice, critique, care and the profession and by also adding the ethic of the community, we can determine if all of the ethics are covered in this new standard. Then we will turn to Turbulence Theory to see if the new standard makes sense using this model.

Using the Multiple Ethical Paradigms, we have placed in bold the ethics that Standard 2 and its various sub-categories describe.
> **Standard 2. Ethics and Professional Norm**s
> Effective educational leaders act ethically and according to professional
> norms to promote each student's academic success and well-being.
> **(Ethics of the Profession and Care)**
>
> Effective leaders:
> a) Act ethically and professionally in personal conduct, relationships with others, decision-making, stewardship of the school's resources, and all aspects of school leadership. **(Ethics of the Profession and Community)**
> b) Act according to and promote the professional norms of integrity, fairness, transparency, trust, collaboration, perseverance, learning, and continuous improvement. **(Ethics of the Profession and Justice)**
> c) Place children at the center of education and accept responsibility for each student's academic success and well-being. **(Ethics of the Profession and Care**)
> d) Safeguard and promote the values of democracy, individual freedom and responsibility, equity, social justice, community, and diversity. **(Ethics of Justice, Critique and Community**)
> e) Lead with interpersonal and communication skill, social-emotional insight, and understanding of all students' and staff members' backgrounds and cultures. **(Ethic of Care)**
> f) Provide moral direction for the school and promote ethical and professional behavior among faculty and staff. **(Ethic of the Profession)**

After deconstructing Standard 2 using the Multiple Ethical Paradigms, it is clear that all of the ethics are covered when describing the criteria for effective leaders. Most noticeable is that the Ethic of the Profession appears in most of the listed functions. The Ethic of Care is also very prominent. However, the Ethics of Justice, Critique and the Community are not neglected. Above all, the best interests of the student is at the center of this standard (Stefkovich, 2014). Thus, it is clear that this is a very comprehensive standard focusing on student learning and on leaders who are professional and who care.

In all six areas of this standard, educational leaders are likewise challenged to work with the turbulence surrounding their positions in order to act ethically. For instance, in a time of scarce resources, leaders must anticipate potentially divisive conflicts (a). This in turn will challenge relationships and the trust in fairness needed to sustain them (b). Parties may argue and confront one another over who exactly is working for the best interests of the students (c). Depending on how these debates are handled they may enhance or diminish the pursuit of equity and social justice (d). Again, depending on the skill with which this tension is dealt with it will impact the goal of having an inclusive school community (e and f).

Additionally, it is important to note that unlike the 2008 ethics standard, in sections c and d of this version, the term *responsibility* and not *accountability* is used. By moving away from accountability, that is often perceived of as a term of blame (Gross & Shapiro, 2016, pp.15-18; Shapiro, 1979; Shapiro & Gross, 2013, pp.107-109; Shapiro & Stefkovich, 2016, pp.148-150), the drafters of this current ethical standard appear to understand that outstanding and effective educational leaders truly care about and feel responsible for their students' academic success and well-being and do not need punitive directives, conveyed in the term accountability. However, they perceive, like Starratt, that responsibility is a virtue and worthy of attention.

Educational Exemplars of Standard 2: Providing Standard Bearers

We believe that the use of illustrative exemplars is important in rounding out the meaning of this standard by providing critical context. We have written an exemplar for each of the categories included in Standard 2. Our exemplars are taken from actual cases from our book, *Democratic Ethical Educational Leadership: Reclaiming School Reform* (2016). Please note that each case involves a leader facing a critical incident. We consider this to be important since the challenge of the incident in question reveals this leader's values as they are played out in action.

Below are the sub-categories of Standard 2 along with the exemplar case.

a) Act ethically and professionally in personal conduct, relationships with others, decision-making, stewardship of the school's resources, and all aspects of school leadership. **(Ethics of the Profession and Community)**

Lisa Kensler and Cynthia Uline (2016) depict the leadership of Superintendent Curt Dietrich who faced a critical financial challenge in the aftermath of the Great Recession. Rather than the budget slashing measures that others took, this leader decided to find a creative solution based on savings in energy. He established an energy policy for the district and a management structure to assure results including hiring manager of energy and operational facilities. Using a shared governance strategy, Dietrich led the effort of converting his district from being an energy waster to achieving an Energy Star rating. The money saved was sent to support classroom instruction, thereby modeling ethical, educational and environmental leadership (pp.54-58).

b) Act according to and promote the professional norms of integrity, fairness, transparency, trust, collaboration, perseverance, learning, and continuous improvement. **(Ethics of the Profession and Justice)**

Donnan Stoicovy (2016) is an elementary principal in central Pennsylvania. Her school enjoys a fine reputation in the community. However, when her school narrowly missed its achievement target, it was placed on warning by the state. Donnan led her school through this process by challenging the state's evaluation on the one hand and increasing dialogue within

the school and the community it served. The idea in both cases was to make sure that the state and the school community kept their focus on children and their learning. Her work helped to ensure that facts were not trumped by accusations. In the end the school weathered the storm. By her hands-on response, Donnan is an exemplar of this element of Standard 2 (pp.21-25).

c) Place children at the center of education and accept responsibility for each student's academic success and well-being. (**Ethics of the Profession and Care**)
Susan Shapiro (2016) wrote a vivid description of an early childhood director she calls Tammy who dramatically exemplified these qualities on 9/11. Tammy's school was very close to the World Trade Center towers placing all of her schools small children at risk. Thanks to her practice of distributive leadership she kept the children safe. Most parents were able to pick up their children but some could not. Tammy collected the children and with the help of a parent evacuated them to New Jersey. There, she made sure that parents knew their young ones were safe. After sleeping over at the home of a parent alum, the children returned to their homes back in New York. Tammy's quick thinking and effective outreach to those around her helped to reduce the extreme turbulence of that tragic day to a manageable level. Children's well being were clearly taken as a profoundly serious priority (pp.49-53).

d) Safeguard and promote the values of democracy, individual freedom and responsibility, equity, social justice, community, and diversity. (**Ethics of Justice, Critique and Community**)

Roger Barascout's (2016) account of Kevin Jennings demonstrates these qualities in action. Growing up as a gay person in an intolerant community, Jennings had to face homophobia, isolation and oppression. This did not stop him. As a teacher he started the Gay Lesbian and Straight Education Network (GLSEN) to support teachers, students and administrators who wanted to build an inclusive school community. GLSEN raised awareness of bullying and harassment facing LBGT students and its tragic consequences. This work led to policies to protect these students, widen the support of allies and educate schools and communities. Eventually Jennings' work moved to the national level where he became an Assistant Deputy Secretary in the US Department of Education. His example shows the power of building a democratic community that welcomes rather than fears diversity and supports all of its members (pp.144-148).

e) Lead with interpersonal and communication skill, social-emotional insight, and understanding of all students' and staff members' backgrounds and cultures. (**Ethic of Care**)

Lynne Blair's (2016) story of Rachel Scott hits particularly hard at a time when random gun violence seems to have a permanent place in our world. Rachel was one of the victims at Columbine High School and, like the two shooters, believed in starting a revolution. However, instead of a revolution based on killing innocent people, Rachel believed in one of compassion and connection. So she reached out to those in her school who were marginalized and ignored. After the tragedy, Rachel's father, Darrell Scott was left with a choice. He could mourn privately, something that everyone would understand. Or he could use Rachel's example as a foundation with which to respond. He took the second path and started Rachel's Challenge, a program that reaches high school students across the country with inspiring accounts and training. Cutting across boundaries with sensitivity and effective action, this is an example of leadership that turned a personal nightmare into an example of hope (pp.103-106).

f). Provide moral direction for the school and promote ethical and professional behavior among faculty and staff. (**Ethic of the Profession**)

Peter Brigg (2016) provides a clear example in the case of James Murray, a successful building leader. At the end of one school year principals were told about a pay for performance plan meant to motivate teachers to boost test scores. Others in the room were silenced but Murray spoke out, urging the superintendent and school board to reconsider. He argued that the plan was a poor fit

with district's values. Unmoved, the superintendent insisted that the plan would go forward but he also offered Murray a place on the planning committee. Murray accepted. He studied the research behind similar plans, listened to all points of view and quietly built up the reputation as a respected expert in the field. Murray's careful work enhanced his image as an ethical leader who placed students and faculty at the center. His presentations to the school board were so compelling that a majority was convinced to put the plan on hold (pp.116-120).

Conclusion

We believe that the 2015 Standard 2 is a marked improvement on the 1996 and 2008 Standard 5. This current version considers ethics and professional norms to be one of four driver standards, placing this category and sub-categories at the very center of the work of educational leaders. Ethics and professional norms are also infused into Standards 1, 3, 5, 6 & 7.

In this chapter, we strived to explain the use of Standard 2. We indicated how it could be utilized for decision-making and also showed how the standard could be deconstructed. In the latter case, it is clear that this standard includes both the Multiple Ethical Paradigms of justice, critique, care and the profession as well as community. We also know that it incorporates Turbulence Theory or the emotional context for making ethical decisions.

Additionally, we have added to this chapter exemplars to illustrate the sub-categories of Standard 2. Educators can choose to emulate some of the exemplars who are described. More than simply words, these exemplars indicate how to actually make a positive difference in the lives of students and staff.

We hope that educational leaders take this standard seriously and consider it carefully when making important ethical decisions that affect their staff, parents, community and above all, their students.

References

Alcoff, L. (1991–1992, Winter). The problem of speaking for others. *Cultural Critique, 20*, 5–32.

American Association of School Administrators. (2007) *Statement of Ethics for School Administrators*. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Apple, M. W. (2003) *The State and the Politics of Knowledge*. New York: Routledge Falmer.

Barascout, R. (2016). A bullied boy who grew up to change school climate. In S.J. Gross & J.P. Shapiro, *Democratic ethical educational leadership: Reclaiming school reform.* (pp. 144-148). New York: Routledge.

Beauchamp, T. L., & Childress, J. F. (1984) "Morality, ethics and ethical theories." In P. Sola (ed.), *Ethics, Education, and Administrative Decisions: A Book of Readings,* pp. 39–67. New York: Peter Lang.

Beck, L. G. (1994) *Reclaiming Educational Administration as a Caring Profession.* New York: Teachers' College Press.

Beck, L.G., Murphy, J. & Assocs. (1997). *Ethics in educational leadership programs: An expanding role.* UCEA: Columbia, MO.

Beckner, W. (2004) *Ethics for Educational Leaders*. Boston: Pearson Education.

Begley, P.T. (2006). Self-knowledge, capacity and sensitivity: Prerequisites to authentic leadership by school principles. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 44(6), 570-589.

Begley, P. T., & Johansson, O. (eds.) (2003) *The Ethical Dimensions of School Leadership.* Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Blair, L. (2016). Rachel's challenge: A caring connection. In S.J. Gross & J.P. Shapiro, *Democratic ethical educational leadership: Reclaiming school reform.* (pp. 103-106). New York: Routledge.

Branson, C. (2009). *Leadership for Age of Wisdom.* Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer Education.

Branson, C. (2010, March). Ethical decision making: Is personal moral integrity the missing link? *Journal of Authentic Leadership in Education*, 1(1), pp.1-8.

Branson, C. & Gross, S.J. (eds.) (2014). *Handbook of Ethical Educational Leadership.* New York: Routledge.

Braybrook, R. (1985). *The aircraft encyclopedia.* New York: Simon and Schuster.

Bredeson, P.V. (2005, Fall) Building capacity in schools: Some ethical considerations for authentic leadership and learning, *Values and Ethics in Educational Administration*, 4(1), pp. 1-7.

Brigg, P. (2016). Mr. Murray vs. merit pay. In S.J. Gross & J.P. Shapiro, *Democratic ethical educational leadership: Reclaiming school reform.* (pp. 116-120). New York: Routledge.

Collins, P. H. (1997). Comment on Hedeman's "The truth and method: Feminist standpoint theory revisited": Where's the power? *Signs, 22*(2), 375–381.

Cranston, N., Ehrich, L.C. & Kimber, M. Managing ethical dilemmas. In C.M. Branson & S.J. Gross. (eds.) (2014). *Handbook of Ethical Educational Leadership.* (pp.229-245). New York: Routledge.

Farquhar, R. (1981). Preparing educational administrators for ethical practice. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 27(2), 192-204.

Freire, P. (1970) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, trans. M. B. Ramos. New York: Continuum.

Frick, W.C., Faircloth, S.C. & Little, K.S. (2013, March). "Responding to the collective and individual 'Best Interests of Students': Revisiting the tension between administrative practice and ethical imperatives in special education leadership." *Educational Administration Quarterly* 49(2), pp.207-242.

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

Furman-Brown, G. (ed.) (2002) *School as Community: From Promise to Practice*. New York: SUNY Press.

Ginsberg, A. E., Shapiro, J. P., & Brown, S. P. (2004) *Gender in Urban Education: Strategies for Student Achievement.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Giroux, H. A. (2006) *America on the Edge: Henry Giroux on Politics, Education and Culture*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Grafton, J. (Ed.). (1999). *Franklin Delano Roosevelt: Great speeches.* Mineola, NY: Dover.

Greenfield, W. D. (2004) "Moral leadership in schools." *Journal of Educational Administration*, 42(2): 174–196.

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

Gross, S. J. (2000, October). *From turbulence to tidal wave: Understanding the unraveling of reform at one innovative and diverse urban elementary school for children at risk.* Paper presented at the Northeast Educational Research Association annual conference, Ellenville, New York.

Gross, S. J. (2001). Navigating a gale: Sustaining curriculum-instruction-assessment innovation in an urban high school for immigrants. *Journal of Research in Education, 11*(1), 74–87.

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

Gross, S. J. (2006) *Leadership Mentoring: Maintaining School Improvement in Turbulent Times.* Lanham, MA: Rowman & Littlefield.

Gross, S.J. (2014) Using turbulence theory to guide actions. In Branson, C.M., Gross, S.J. (Eds.) *Handbook on Ethical Educational Leadership.* New York: Routledge. Pp. 246-262.

Gross, S.J. (2014) Profiles in democratic ethical leadership: Educating for moral literacy through the power of exemplars. *10th Annual Moral Literacy Colloquium.* The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA. April 25-26, 2014.

Gross, S.J. & Shapiro, J.P. (2016). *Democratic Ethical Educational Leadership: Reclaiming School Reform.* New York: Routledge.

Gryskiewicz, S. S. (1999). *Positive turbulence: Developing climates for creativity, innovation, and renewal.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Haiyan,Q. & Walker, A. (2014). "Leading with empathy." In C. Branson & S.J. Gross, (eds.) (2014). *Handbook of Ethical Educational Leadership.* New York: Routledge.

Hauser, M. E. (1997). How do we really work? A response to "Locked in uneasy sisterhood: Reflections on feminist methodology and research relationships." *Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 28*(1), 123–126.

Hegel, G. W. F. (1892). *The logic of Hegel.* Oxford: Clarendon.

Kensler, L.A.W. & Uline, C.L. (2016). The transformation of a school district from energy hog to energy staf. In S.J. Gross & J.P. Shapiro, *Democratic ethical educational leadership: Reclaiming school reform.* (pp.54-58). New York: Routledge.

Kezar, A. (2000). Pluralistic leadership: Incorporating diverse voices. *Journal of Higher Education, 71*(6), 722–743.

Kurlansky, M. (2004). *1968: The year that rocked the world.* New York: Ballantine Books.

Lester, P. F. (1994). *Turbulence: A new perspective for pilots.* Englewood, CO: Jeppesen.

Lewin, K. (1947*). Frontiers in group dynamics II. Human Relations, 1*(3), 443–453.

Marshall, C., and Gerstl-Pepin, C. (2005). *Re-framing Educational Politics for Social Justice.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Marshall, C., & Oliva, M. (2006*) Leadership for Social Justice: Making Revolutions in Education*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

McKee, A. (1984). *Dresden 1945: The devil's tinderbox.* New York: E. P. Dutton.

Maher, F. A., & Tetreault, M. K. (1993). Frames of positionality: Meaningful dialogues about gender and race. *Anthropological Quarterly, 62*(3), 118–126.

Murphy, J. (2005) "Unpacking the foundations of ISLLC standards and addressing concerns in the academic community." *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 41(1): 154–191.

National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA) (1996). *Educational Leadership Policy Standards: ISLLC* 1996. Washington, D.C.: Council of Chief School Officers.

National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA) (2008) *Educational Leadership Policy Standards: ISLLC 2008*. Washington, D.C.: Council of Chief State School Officers.

National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA) (2015) *Professional Standards for Educational Leaders 2015*, Reston, VA: Author.

Noddings, N. (2003) *Caring: A Feminine Approach to Ethics and Moral Education*, 2nd ed. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Normore, A. H. (2004) "Ethics and values in leadership preparation programs: Finding the North Star in the dust storm." *Values and Ethics in Educational Administration*, 2(2): 1–8.

Portelli, J.P. Ed., (2007, Spring-Summer).Critical democracy and educational leadership issues: Philosophical responses to the neoliberal agenda. *Journal of Thought*, Special Issue, pp. 42(1).

Reitzug, U. C., & O'Hair, M. J. (2002) "From conventional school to democratic school community: The dilemmas of teaching and leading." In G. Furman-Brown (ed.), *School as Community: From Promise to Practice*, pp. 119–141. New York: State University of New York Press.

Sarason, S. B. (1990). *The predictable failure of educational reform: Can we change course before it's too late?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Senge, P. (1990). *The fifth discipline.* New York: Doubleday.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (2009). *The Principalship: A Reflective Practice Perspective*, 6th ed. Allyn & Bacon, MA: Boston.

Shapiro, H.S. (ed.) (2009) *Education and Hope in Troubled Times: Visions of Change for our Children's World*, New York, Routledge.

Shapiro, H. S., & Purpel, D. E. (eds.) (2005). *Social Issues in American Education: Democracy and Meaning in a Globalized World,* 3rd ed. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence

Erlbaum Associates.

Shapiro, J.P. (1979). The accountability movement in education: A contagious disease? *FORUM: For the Discussion of New Trends in Education.* 22(1), 16-18.

Shapiro, J.P. (2015).What is ethical leadership? In D. Griffiths & J.P. Portelli, *Key Questions for Educational Leaders.* (pp.91-98). Burlington, Ontario, Canada: Word & Deed Publishing Inc. & Edphil Books.

Shapiro, J. P., & Gross, S. J. (2008) *Ethical Educational Leadership in Turbulent Times: (Re)Solving Moral Dilemmas.* New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates/Taylor & Francis.

Shapiro, J. P., & Gross, S. J. (2013) *Ethical Educational Leadership in Turbulent Times:(Re)Solving Moral Dilemmas*, 2nd ed. New York: Routledge.

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

Shapiro, J. P., & Stefkovich, J. A. (2005) *Ethical Leadership and Decision Making in Education: Applying Theoretical Perspectives to Complex Dilemmas*, 2nd ed. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Shapiro, J. P., & Stefkovich, J. A. (2011) *Ethical Leadership and Decision Making in Education: Applying Theoretical Perspectives to Complex Dilemmas*, 3rd ed. New York, NY: Routledge.

Shapiro, J. P., & Stefkovich, J. A. (2016) *Ethical Leadership and Decision Making in Education: Applying Theoretical Perspectives to Complex Dilemmas*, 4th ed. New York, NY: Routledge.

Shapiro, S. H. (2016). The importance of building community: A preschool director's experiences on 9/11/01. In S.J. Gross & J.P. Shapiro, *Democratic ethical educational leadership: Reclaiming school reform.* (pp. 49-53). New York: Routledge.

Shields, C. Ethical leadership: a critical transformative approach. In C.M. Branson & S.J. Gross. (eds.) (2014). *Handbook of Ethical Educational Leadership.* (pp.24-42). New York: Routledge.

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

Stefkovich, J. A. (2006) *Best Interests of the Student: Applying Ethical Constructs to Legal Cases. Mahwah,* NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Stefkovich, J. A. (2014) *Best Interests of the Student: Applying Ethical Constructs to Legal Cases.* 2nd edn. New York: Routledge.

Stoicovy, D. (2016). Maintaining a commitment to democracy (In spite of high-stakes standardized testing. In S.J. Gross & J.P. Shapiro, *Democratic ethical educational leadership: Reclaiming school reform.* (pp. 21-25). New York: Routledge.

Strike, K.A. (2006) *Ethical leadership in schools: creating Community in an environment of accountability*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Strike, K.A., Haller, E.J. & Soltis, J.E. (2005). *The Ethics of School Administration* (3rd edn.) New York: Teachers College Press.

Tuana, N. (2007). Conceptualizing moral literacy, *Journal of Educational Administration*, 45(4), pp.364 – 378.

University Council for Educational Administration (2011). *UCEA Code of Ethics for the Preparation of Educational Leaders.* Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia.

Yodof, M., Kirp, D., & Levin, B. (1992) *Educational Policy and the Law*, 3rd ed. St. Paul, MN: West Publishing Company.