Leadership as Love: Supporting Teaching Practices Through the Enabling Constraints of Alberta's Teaching Quality Standard

Derek Markides

To understand education, one must love it or care deeply about learning, and accept it as a legitimate process for growth and change. To accept education as it is, however, is to betray it. To accept education without betraying it, you must love it for those values that show what it might become. (Battiste, 2013, p. 190)

Abstract

School leadership roles and responsibilities are changing, subsuming managerial expectations and increasing focus on the priorities of school-based collaboration, collective culture, and community engagement by seeking stakeholder consolation and trust. Ultimately, school leadership is now, more than ever, about pedagogical responsibility and relationality—the art and science of modeling effective practice in relation to teachers, learners, and the community. Changes in Alberta's Teaching Quality Standard (TQS) (Alberta Education, 2017b) from a checklist to that of a growth-focused continuum have necessitated an evolution of the supervision and evaluation practices by school leaders. Seemingly objective evaluation practices are no longer adequate for the determination of teacher ability relative to competencies and their indicators. By shifting evaluation and supervisory paradigms from the safe and objective toward the messy and dialogical it is possible for school leaders to better understand the interconnected and complex nature of teacher practice and identity. By enacting pedagogies of love as defined by bell hooks (2001) as a combination of care, commitment, knowledge, responsibility, respect, and trust it is possible to better understand teacher practice and pedagogy through a lens that provides the space for failure and struggles and ultimately growth and success—something stronger and more robust, something different that could not have been there before. It is the enactment of pedagogies of love that may allow for teacher personal and collective growth through relationality.

Keywords: Pedagogies of love, teaching standards, educational leadership, becoming, supervision and evaluation, ecological sensibilities, complexity, dialogue*.*

We are in a constant state of transformation. We are acted upon by infinite influences that cause us to evolve: our paradigms, beliefs, vernacular, understandings, and knowledges, regardless of how unrecognizably small the transformations may be. As educators, we are evolving through

the process of becoming (Britzman, 2003)—a recognition of the tentative nature of our identity as educators. The process of becoming is the acknowledgment of the evolution of our teaching identity by the impacts of the reflexive considerations of our childhood experiences with education and the ways that the act of teaching impacts us. Given the tentative and emergent nature of teacher pedagogy and practice, how can school leaders support the growth of teachers in a good way? How can school leaders engage with teacher colleagues to support divergent understandings of learning, knowledge, and curriculum? Considering the unexplored possibilities of teacher growth nurtured through school leaders enacting pedagogies of love may be one way forward.

Clingan (2010) posits that all growth and transformations come as enactments of love. Wagamese (2019) suggests that love is a means for one to become the person they were meant to be. In the life of educators, our understandings are perturbated each and every day as a result of interactions with students, parents, and colleagues. For those of us who are open to feedback and seek out growth opportunities, we enact pedagogies of love each day as we become better at the work that we do. Through this chapter, I discuss how it may be fruitful for school leaders to consider teacher growth and evaluation through a lens of pedagogies of love. By considering the possibilities associated with utilizing bell hooks' definition of love as pedagogy, it is possible to reimagine educator growth as an individual and collective movement along a dynamic spectrum towards mastery which will not create the end-focused, negative feedback checklist.

Alberta's TQS and LQS: An Evolution, No Longer a Checklist

In Alberta, the new Leadership Quality Standard (LQS) (Alberta Education, 2017a) and Teaching Quality Standard (TQS) (Alberta Education, 2017b) are constructed as a framework of competencies and indicators that help administrator and teachers to identify and support growth and change in pedagogies and practices. This newest iteration of the TQS is unlike its predecessors

because the indicators are no longer a checklist of objectively achievable characteristics or traits. Through extensive dialogues with other administrators, post-secondary liaisons, and district leaders I have come to better understand that these indicators are all about personalized growth within a robust collective community of supporters. None of the competencies exist as mutually exclusive characteristics and none of the indicators can be seen as independent; therefore, assessing individual growth cannot happen or be understood in a positivistic manner. The assessment, supervision, and evaluation of teacher and administrator growth relative to these standards could be better served through a conceptual framework of complexity or ecological sensibilities where relationality and connection are emphasized as priorities. The achievement of all of these indicators and competencies would be more about growth along a dynamic continuum—enactments of pedagogies of love—where their enmeshed and irreducible nature would be understood as strengths.

According to Adams (2016), "the practices of school leaders comprise the second-highest impact on student learning" (p. 6), the first being the pedagogies and practices of the teacher. However, administrators can positively impact classroom didactics and pedagogies through their management and instructional leadership. Instructional leadership has changed over time from an exclusive focus on the principal dictating learning agendas towards an intention of distributed and collective leadership whereby transformations of teaching practices require leaders to learn along-side teaching staff. In Alberta, shifts in practice have evolved in a similar manner to the changes that the Teaching Quality Standard (TQS) evaluation documentation of Alberta teachers from prescriptive checklists towards that of a growth framework of interconnection and irreducibility. Some of these changes can be shown when a comparison of Alberta Education (1997) and Alberta Education (2017b) are considered. While positivistic and reductionistic language permeated the

previous iteration of the TQS document, a much more open and less prescriptive angle appears to have been taken in its subsequent iteration.

At the time of the initial construction of this accountability document the language of safety and objectivism was prominent within the context of Albertan education, curriculum, and schooling and its associated metaphors (Davis et al., 2015). And while this language was an adequate means to hold teachers to high professional standards of accountability, over time these standards have become inadequate. When the 1997 version of the TQS was created there was no leadership standard document; in fact, divisions were left to establish their own criteria for educational leadership standards. It was not until 2019 that a Leadership Quality Standard (LQS) (Alberta Education, 2017a) was released as the provincially mandated evaluation criteria. This document shares many similarities with the TQS. The newest versions of these documents were written in parallel as a means to accentuate the connections between the two standards.

An important contextual reference in Alberta is that administrators that are LQS certified are also TQS certified and members of the same association. Upon further attention to the language of the two evaluation documents, the most prominent changes are the language and the associated assessment criteria that would need to be considered to determine the adequate attainment of the competency indicators. The 1997 version of the TQS was written utilizing checklist-style prescriptive outcomes which allowed for the simplistic binary of meeting or not meeting. As a result of the change in language and intention of the newest version of the TQS a much broader, holistic, reflexive, and dialogical manner of assessment seems to be required.

The newly developed LQS (Alberta Education, 2017a) was officially adopted as an evaluative standard for practicing administrators within Alberta as of September 2019 (College of Alberta School Superintendents, 2018; Alberta Education, 2018). As a result, the competencies of:

Fostering Effective Relationships, Modelling Commitment to Professional Learning, Embodying Visionary Leadership, Leading a Learning Community, Supporting the Application of Foundational Knowledge about First Nations, Métis and Inuit, Providing Instructional Leadership, Developing Leadership Capacity, Managing School Operations and Resources, and Understanding and Responding to the Larger Societal Context and their indicators will be used as measures for administrator growth (Alberta Education, 2017a).

In Alberta, administrators are members of the Alberta Teachers Association (ATA), as a result, they are now obligated to meet the evaluative standards of the new Teaching Quality Standard (TQS) (Alberta Education, 2017b) as well. The competencies that teachers are evaluated relative to include are Adhering to Legal Frameworks and Policies (Alberta Education, 2017b, pp. 4-7).

- Fostering Effective Relationships
- Engaging in Career-Long Learning
- Demonstrating a Professional Body of Knowledge
- Establishing Inclusive Learning Environments
- Applying Foundational Knowledge about First Nations, Métis and Inuit

One may notice the TQS and LQS share competencies which use parallel language, and the descriptors are similar with the exception that the LQS reference a responsibility to students, teachers, and community, and the TQS is limited to student and community relationships. The intention behind this language will become obvious in the following paragraphs but will certainly make it so that educational leaders can actively, collaboratively, and co-implicitly support teachers in their professional learning and growth.

Leadership as Love

Romanticized notions of love including passion and romantic love exist and can be problematic in educational contexts, it is my intention to trouble common perceptions of what love can mean and in turn what pedagogies of love can afford. Love, which is often intentionally removed from the curriculum is what should be considered part of the human curriculum (Clingan, 2015), and love is inherently interwoven within strong professional relationships and care. Greater possibilities exist for school and social when we engage in dialogue where love is at the heart of the work. bell hooks (2001, 2003) defines love as a combination of care, commitment, knowledge, responsibility, respect, and trust, where all of these characteristics work (inter/intra)-dependently. From bell hooks' definition of love, it is possible to better understand that love can provide room for failure, for struggles, for mistakes, and for hurt and grow into something stronger and more robust, something different that could not have been there before. It is the enactment of love that may allow for personal and collective growth through relationality.

Love is enacted and is not simply a feeling (hooks, 2001). In this sense, pedagogies of love could be the willingness for educators and educational leaders who embody care, commitment, knowledge, responsibility, respect, and trust to risk focusing on growth and change, mediated through their understanding of their students or staff. Richard Wagamese (2016) in an eloquent and incredibly intuitive manner suggests that:

> Love is not always the perfection of moments or the sum of all the shining days—sometimes it's to drift apart, to be broken, to be disassembled by life and living, but always to come back together and to be each other's glue again. Love is an act of life, and we are made more by the living. (p. 151)

Reframed this way love can afford for educators to risk moving away from tradition and consider the possible. The risk of the possible is the fear of the unknown—a deviation from the safety of prescription and construction (Biesta, 2013). In education, love manifests as a faith in the possible—the possible afforded in an unknown future supporting learners. For educators, love in this sense means that we must be able to let go of the belief that we can always know our impact on learning and learning outcomes. It is a faith in supporting learners in a way that is much bigger than outcomes, it is much bigger than solely meeting achievable, objective, quantifiable goals.

As educators of generations of young people, it is our moral and ethical responsibility to (re)consider our understandings of classroom pedagogies with a sense of urgency and humility— refocus on a shift toward pedagogies of love. Dialogical pedagogies may allow for tensions of individual understandings to be juxtaposed through ethical relationality. Markides and Miller (2018) suggest that "it is through this dialogical process—a diffuse revisioning of the past through the lens of the present in tension with another—that allows us to reconstruct our memories and thoughts" (p. 150). Weber (2017) shares:

> Love is not a pleasant feeling, but the practical principle of creative enlivenment. This principle describes the way in which living communities on this planet—groups of cells, organisms, ecosystems, tribes, families—find their own identities while also fostering the relationship that they have with others and with the system surrounding them. (p. 6)

hooks (2010) suggests that there is reciprocity between all members of the loving classroom community.

> The loving classroom is one in which students are taught, both in the presence and practice of the teacher, that critical exchange can take place without diminishing anyone's spirit … While teachers in their leadership are in the best position to create a climate of love in the

classroom, students have the power to share their love of learning in a manner that can ignite sparks in a teacher that may be emotionally disengaged. No matter the direction from which love emerges in the classroom, it transforms. (p. 162)

Faith in the possibility of education requires relationality, a faith in the relationships with others. Specifically, love in education requires critical caring colleagues that could help to perturbate our own practice. This can be a teacher-teacher dialogue, student-teacher dialogue, or a school leader-teacher dialogue. Moving us toward disequilibrium, challenging the status quo, and allowing for us to better support the specific context of all learners in our care. School leaders can afford this type of faith in the possible by providing time for teachers to come together, work, and engage in discourse regarding specifics of student learning constrained within the TQS. As teachers build strong relationships with each other, the enactment of their reflexivity would be the shift from a comfortable equilibrium and of a certainty around what education is and can look like. These enactments require structures of safety that will allow for teachers to empathetically challenge each other and their certainty of knowledge. This trusting relationality enacted through pedagogies of love is emotional work. It requires teachers to live in a state of discomfort, however, over time may help educators to understand that learning is an uncertain and transformative adventure that is more like an ongoing experiment than it is a linear pathway to the attainment of a static body of knowledge. In education, love can be beauty—the beauty of learner perseverance supported in the Brownian stumble towards coherence.

The enactment of pedagogies of love occurs through transformations in static understandings of knowledge. It is through transformations and growth that we enact pedagogies of love (Clingan, 2010). The benefit is that students may come to recognize

that the risk creates opportunities for great, new, and unconsidered outcomes. Classrooms focused on pedagogies of love could provide the opportunity for the betterment of all.

Paradoxes and Inadequacies of Past Paradigms

The paradox of teaching in a knowledge society is while schools and teachers are expected to create the human skills and capacities that enable knowledge economies to survive and succeed, they are also expected to teach the compassion, sense of community, and emotional sympathy that mitigate and counteract the immense problems that knowledge economies create. (Hargreaves, 2003)

Encouraging and supporting educators to embody alternative paradigms for knowing, teaching, and learning—paradigms which recognize the complexity of the entanglements between all entities—will allow students and educators to (re)story (Kovach, 2017) and (re)imagine their identities (Lyle, 2017). If we consider that schools are not places where we simply acquire the correct information to prepare for a known future, we may instead envision schools as places that may influence emergent identities where we learn to be humble and vulnerable members of an as-yet-unimagined society.

Transforming the role of education will require educators to exercise reflexivity and actively support student reflexivity supported by school leaders embodying and enacting the LQS competencies. By knowing oneself in a non-Cartesian, wholistic sense—in relation to others as (inter/intra-) connected with the environment—educators and students might understand themselves and learning in more emergent ways. Davies (2006) elaborates by advocating:

Our responsibility [as educators] lies inside social relations and inside a responsibility to and for *oneself in relation to the other*—not oneself as a known entity, but oneself in process, unfolding or folding up, being done or undone, in relation to the other, again and again. (p. 436)

This fluid and emergent sense of self comes as the result "of incorporating [the] reassembled past, seeming present, and anticipated future into an internalized dynamically changing story of self" (Lyle, 2017, p. 3). Looking inward and seeing that we embody our histories, knowledges, and experiences will allow us to recognize that we are continually and mutually co-impacting each other.

The top-down impacts of positivist and absolutist paradigms still permeate the knowledge economies of the Western Canadian world and its education systems. As a result, the demands on teachers to be accountable for their impacts on students' knowledge and understandings of taken-as-prescriptive curricular outcomes can supersede the social and emotional well-being of the whole child. Hard data from formal summative and formative assessments drive the ways in which teachers are expected to address problematic individual and collective knowledge deficits. Objective measurement indicators of learning that can be quantified and proven to be commensurable through the scientific method are chosen as addressable and therefore important because there is an "unblinking assumption that science has cornered the market on truth" (Kimmerer, 2014, p. 160). What is potentially misunderstood is the social and affective conditions that cannot be universal and therefore unsettle the objectivist's paradigm. As Bourdieu (2017) elegantly suggests:

> the practical privilege in which all scientific activity arises never more subtly governs that activity (insofar as science presupposes not only an epistemological break but also a *social* separation) than when, unrecognised as privilege, it leads to an implicit theory of practice which is the corollary of neglect of the social conditions in which science is possible. (p. 1)

An unfortunate consequence of the impacts of a knowledge economy is the increased fragmentation of what society perceives as the teacher's role relative to what teachers perceive as

their role. Additionally, in this context Davies (2006) suggests, "students work very hard to embody themselves as appropriate and appropriated subjects" (p. 433)—automatons without agency. Accountability to commensurable indicators of student success is now part of the profession's responsibility, but so too are the incommensurable measures. So how can educators and school leaders ethically and consciously negotiate the spaces of professional learning given the pressures to meet the needs of students and stakeholder perceptions of what education should be?

As systems, we have begun to address the social and emotional well-being of students in addition to their academics while being ill-prepared to do so. While supporting the social and emotional needs of students has always been understood as important by many effective and caring educators and scholars, these needs are only now becoming part of the district and provincial mandates. In a dynamic, social, helping profession such as teaching—envisioned through the objective and rational lenses—not being able to fix systemic problems, such as social and emotional traumas, or the ineffectiveness of taking up curricula in a prescriptive manner, has a negative impact on educators. Solutions associated with these issues can no longer be, in good conscience, reduced to positivistic cause-effect relations, nor can students be assumed to be homogenous groups of mutually exclusive individuals. Therefore, the safety and essential distancing by educators to afford for the objectivity of curricula is no longer adequate. What students need and deserve is a curriculum that affords for enactments of pedagogies of love.

Evolution of Leadership

Bedard and Mombourquette (2015) suggest that there have been several major evolutions in the expectations and roles of leadership within Alberta schools (see Table 1). These evolutions are reflected within the changes of language and focus of the new TQS and LQS. An openness to

emergent possibility is ever more obvious through reading these documents whereby one can possibly envision the competencies as affordances to support increased conceptual understandings (Stern et al., 2017). Whether they will be enacted in ways that afford for divergence is yet to be determined, but perhaps pedagogies of love are the key to divergent enactments.

According to Leithwood (2012), "as our conception of district purposes shift from efficient administration of schools to key structures for facilitating school improvement, our understanding of the qualities of 'successful' districts has to change accordingly" (p. viii). The roles of school leaders have shifted drastically over the past decades from a role primarily focused on management towards one which now includes management but also includes instructional leadership (Fullan, 2012), community engagement (Knapp et al., 2010), and administrative mentorship (Honig, et al., 2010; Fullan, 2014). Table 1 illustrates how the roles of leadership have changed and continue to change for educational leaders.

Table 1.
Shifts in Educational Leadership

From	Towards
Compliance based	- Building on shared commitment and dignity - Capacity building - Focus on mission and vision
Administrative matters and managerial work	- Instructional Leadership - Leveraging relationships - Culture building
Loosely connected divisional elements	- Tight alignment with articulated intention - Denser professional networks
Traditional, top-down decision making	More permeable boundaries between district and schools

	● Sharing and collaborating of ideas
Narrow data collection	● Broader means and acceptance of data collection
	● Wider array of data used to support district and school initiatives
Leadership succession	● Focused, standards-based identification and selection
Outside, expert-based professional learning	● Embedded professional learning
	● Professional Learning Communities (PLC) Increased leadership autonomy over school professional learning
Passive engagement of stakeholders	● Building productive stakeholder relationships
	● Consulting with stakeholders
	● Building relational trust (Robinson, 2011)
	● Increasing transparency

Note: Table 1. Shifts in Educational Leadership Through Time as Adapted from Bedard and Mombourquette (2015).

The prominent changes that stand out in the righthand column in Table 1 allude to the understandings that engagement of community and collectivity are recognized to be drastically more important than they were in the past. Considerations of stakeholder input, consultation, and trust are recognized as a priority (Honig et al, 2010). Additionally, there is a new understanding that education and school social responsibilities no longer end when the school day finishes or where the school property ends (Province of Alberta, 2018). Definitions of leadership in the context of schools have broadened to include alignment with district policy, mentorship of new and upcoming inductees, and in high schools seamlessly incorporating the Foundational Principles of High School Redesign. Ultimately, school leadership is now, more than ever, about pedagogical

responsibility and relationality—the art and science of modelling effective practice in relation to teachers and learners.

The Leadership Quality Standard (LQS) (Alberta Education, 2017a), the new standard by which administrators' competency is evaluated relative to, in Alberta and its related indicators have been constructed with language which is divergent from the previous iteration. The competencies indicate a tendency towards a recognition and openness towards the importance of relationality and social accountability. Additionally, there seems to be an implicit revisioning of educational leadership to construct/nurture/foster/draw-out teacher realizations and awareness' to a multiplicity of epistemologies, metaphors, and pedagogies—the emergently possible. It appears that within the constraints of the LQS, generative and critical learning experiences can be afforded whereby "supportive, dialogical and interactive social relations in critical learning situations can promote cooperation, democracy, and positive social values, as well as fulfill needs for communication, esteem and poeticized learning" (Kahn & Keller, 2008, p. 29).

The vision of absolutist and reductionist teaching paradigms are no longer adequate to support students as they move into uncertain futures—futures that are not yet solidified. As Doll (1993) suggests, education "is a process—not of transmitting what is known but exploring what is unknown" (p. 155). It is therefore the responsibility of an ethical education to be both dependent and accountable for the unknown (Britzman, 2013). Doll (1993) also states that "a constructive curriculum is one that emerges through the actions and interactions of its participants" (p. 162). The divergent possibilities of the not-yet-imagined ecological sensibilities may allow for students to consider schools as places—no longer disconnected from life outside of school (Dewey, 1915)—where vivid memories of community, complexity, and collectivity facilitate long-term connections to the process of learning (Kimmerer, 2014). Through the embodiment of ethical

relationality Donald (2016) posits that "people face each other as relatives and build trusting relationships by connecting with others in respectful ways. In doing so, we demonstrate that we recognize one another as fellow human beings and work hard to put respect and love at the forefront of our interactions" (p. 10). By (re)imagining schools and schooling as place, educators and learners may embody the transformative pedagogies of love.

Instructional leadership may be able to disrupt stagnant education and leadership pedagogies. Through ethical and engaged learning opportunities teachers may be able to enact a more inclusive, divergent, and hopeful curriculum that considers the complexities associated with ecological sensibilities and relationality. Through this reconsideration we may understand "that the purpose of education is to enable students to become critical thinkers and good human beings, [by] rejecting the notion that the primary purpose of education is economic growth and immediate financial success for students" (Robertson, 2013, p. 22). Perhaps teachers may begin to recognize that "teaching like learning is not about convergence onto a pre-established truth, but about divergence—about broadening what can be known and done" (Davis & Sumara, 2007, p. 64). An (inter/intra)-connectivity whereby all aspects of schooling are better understood as intimately connected—enmeshed in the confluence of collective understandings. As Weber (2017) suggests, "this world is not populated by singular, autonomous, sovereign being. It comprises a constantly oscillating network of dynamic interactions in which one thing changes through the change of another" (p. 14). It is precisely these connections fostered by effective educators and educational leaders enacting pedagogies of love—incommensurable and co-evolutionary—that may challenge the commonplace positivist paradigms that have been normalized within schools.

Teacher Evaluation and Supervision as An Enactment of Pedagogies of Love

I have discussed some of the history and possible inadequacies of previous iterations of teaching and leadership qualifications and have suggested that enacting pedagogies of love may be a way forward that acknowledges the ever-evolving nature of humanity and education. I believe that it may be possible for educators to consider the new LQS, and TQS as possible "enabling constraints" (Davis et al., 2008, p. 193) for practicing educators and administrators. As mentioned previously, we can no longer treat the TQS competency indicators as a checklist nor can we see them as siloed which makes assessment and evaluation of the attainment more challenging. However, reframing attainment of competencies as growth or movement on a continuum will possibly provide for greater engagement, autonomy, and efficacy by teachers.

The supportive work of school leaders must recognize that all teachers are in a state of becoming whereby Jardine et al. (2014) claim, "teachers and students alike are each *becoming someone* because of what they have learned and remembered" (p. 38). Perhaps it is supporting a continuation of dialogue rather than a closure onto a predetermined optimal practice by pushing back against hegemonic teaching norms that is a new means to assess teacher growth relative to the TQS. Seidel (2014) suggests, "to understand that the person we are becoming is also being shaped by these institutions might propel us into action, trying to change the institution's identity and character, to make it more humane and generous" (pp. 145-146). By opening and continuing dialogues with teachers throughout the supervision and evaluation process, we also help afford these relational beliefs and practices within classrooms. In a careful, kind, and committed manner, we embody pedagogies of love by fostering teacher growth. As part of teacher professional learning communities and negotiated through individual and collective understandings, teachers will continually grow, evolve, and (re)negotiate their identity and pedagogy.

Starting evaluation opportunities with reflexive activities by having teachers identify areas of strength and areas for growth in a safe and growth-focused manner will provide opportunities for generative and disruptive dialogues that become coaching opportunities rather than checklist attainment. Providing entrance points where teacher qualitative narratives may serve to give context to their understandings will also help to provide evidence in final evaluation reporting. Additionally, engaging in dialogues around focuses and pathways to growth, envisioned through understandings of curriculum and mediated by what teachers know about their students may allow for deeper self-awareness.

Conclusion

When the new TQS and LQS are considered as enabling constraints and school leaders consider the growth opportunities associated with a conceptual framework of complexity or ecological sensibilities where relationality and connection are the priorities, they are enacting pedagogies of love. By recognizing that perceived silos of competencies are artificial and understanding that teacher personal professional growth is enmeshed within school collective growth, school leaders may afford for ongoing dialogues. These ongoing critical dialogues with teachers will help to nurture relationality and support for the removal of falsely objective negative feedback-focused checklist attainment in evaluations. Utilizing teacher reflexivity and qualitative evidence relative to the TQS may help school leaders better understand and support teacher personal growth along a continuum—a continuum which negates possible closure due to reaching perceived endpoints or optimization of learning.

Pedagogies of love are relational. When school leaders engage in the evaluation process with teachers through a reframing of growth by incorporating pedagogies of love, care, commitment, knowledge, responsibility, respect, and trust become paramount. Relationships that

were kindled in this manner allow for challenging critical dialogues, personal heartfelt conversations about failures and successes, growth and opportunity, personal history and understandings. Pedagogies of love can allow for true dialogue that "offers the space for change, invention, spontaneous shifts, that can serve as a catalyst" (hooks, 1994, p. 11)—a catalyst for hope, opportunity, and a reimagination of the possible. Evaluation can become about growth and opportunity. Clingan (2015) claims that "when we act from love the results transform for the good. With love our laws can change, our systems can change, and we can in fact begin to heal the world" (n.p.).

References

Adams, P. (2017). Enacting Alberta school leaders' professional practice competencies: A toolkit by Bedard, G. J., & Mombourquette, C. A. *Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy*, (182).

Alberta Education. (2017a). *Leadership quality standard.* https://education.alberta.ca/media/3739621/standardsdoc-lqs-_fa-web-2018-01-17.pdf

Alberta Education. (2017b). *Teaching quality standard.* Retrieved from https://education.alberta.ca/media/3739620/standardsdoc-tqs-_fa-web-2018-01-17.pdf

Battiste, M. (2013). *Decolonizing education: Nourishing the learning spirit.* Purich.

Bedard, G. J., & Mombourquette, C. P. (2015). Conceptualizing Alberta district leadership practices: A cross-case analysis. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, *14*(2), 233-255. https://doi.org/10.1080/15700763.2014.997936

Biesta, G. J. J. (2013). *The beautiful risk of education*. Paradigm.

Bourdieu, P. (2017). *Outline a theory of practice.* Cambridge University Press. (Original work published in 1977)

Britzman, D. P. (2003). *Practice makes practice: A critical study of learning to teach.* Suny Press.

Britzman, D. (2013). Between psychoanalysis and pedagogy: Scenes of rapprochement and alienation. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *43*(1), 95-117. https://doi.org/10.1111/curi.12007

Clingan, J. (2010). A pedagogy of love. *Journal of Sustainability Education*, 9.

College of Alberta School Superintendents. (2018). *Executive summary of supports for implementation of the professional practice standard(s).* https://cassalberta.ca/wp-

content/uploads/2018/11/Supports-for-Implementation-Executive-Summary-.docx

Davies, B. (2006). Subjectification: The relevance of Butler's analysis for education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *27*(4), 245-438. [Special Issue: Troubling Identities: Reflections on Judith Butler's Philosophy for the Sociology of Education]

Davis, B., & Sumara, D. (2007). Complexity science and education: Reconceptualizing the teacher's role in learning. *Interchange, 38*(1), 53–67. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10780-007-9012-5

Davis, B., Sumara, D., & Luce-Kapler, R. (2008). *Engaging minds: Changing teaching in complex times.* Routledge.

Davis, B., Sumara, D., & Luce-Kapler, R. (2015). *Engaging minds: Cultures of education and practices of teaching* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

Dewey, J. (1915). *The school and society.* University of Chicago Press.

Doll, W. (1993). *A post-modern perspective on curriculum.* Teachers College Press.

Donald, D. (2009). Forts, curriculum and Indigenous Métissage: Imagining decolonization of Aboriginal-Canadian relations in educational contexts. *First Nations Perspectives, 2*(1), 1-24.

Fullan, M. (2011). *Choosing the wrong drivers for whole system reform.* http://education.qld.gov.au/projects/educationviews/news-views/2011/nov/talking-point-fullan-101117.html

Fullan, M. (2014). *The principal: Three keys to maximizing impact.* John Wiley & Sons.

Hargreaves, A. (2003). *Teaching in the knowledge society: Education in the age of insecurity.* Teachers College Press.

Honig, M., Copland, M., Rainey, L., Lorton, J., & Newton, M. (2010). *Central office transformation for district-wide teaching and learning improvement* (Vol. 46). Professional Media Group, LLC.

hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom.* Routledge.

hooks, b. (2001). all about love: New visions. Harper Collins.

hooks, b. (2003). *Teaching community: A pedagogy of hope.* Routledge.

hooks, b. (2010). *Teaching critical thinking: Practical wisdom.* Routledge.

Kahn, R., & Kellner, D. (2008). Paulo Freire and Ivan Illich: Technology, politics and the reconstruction of education. In C.A. Torres & P. Noguera (Eds.), *Social justice education for teachers* (pp. 13-34). Sense Publishers.

Kimmerer, R. W. (2013). *Braiding sweetgrass: Indigenous wisdom, scientific knowledge, and the teachings of plants.* Milkweed Editions.

Kovach, M. (2017). Doing Indigenous methodologies: A letter to a research class. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (5th ed., pp. 214-234). Sage.

Knapp, M. S., Copland, M., Honig, M., Plecki, M. L., & Portin, B. S. (2010). Learning-focused leadership and leadership support: Meaning and practice in urban systems. Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy, University of Washington.

Leithwood, K. (2012). *The Ontario leadership framework 2012.* The Institute for Education Leadership.

Lyle, E. (2017). Autoethnographic approaches to an identity conscious curriculum. In E. Lyle (Ed.), *At the intersection of selves and subject: Exploring the curricular landscape of identity* (pp. 1-8). Sense.

Markides, D., & Miller, S. (2018). Sharing stories: Duoethnographically evoking mathematics teacher identities through narratives. In E. Lyle (Ed.), *The negotiated self: Employing reflexive inquiry to explore teacher identity* (pp. 149-161). Brill Sense.

Province of Alberta. (2018). *School act.* Alberta Queen's Printer.

Robinson, V. (2011). *Student-centered leadership.* Jossey-Bass.

Seidel, J. (2014). Losing wonder: Thoughts on nature, mortality, education. In J. Seidel & D. W. Jardine (Eds.), *Ecological pedagogy, Buddhist pedagogy, hermeneutic pedagogy: Curriculum for miracles* (pp. 133-152). Peter Lang.

Wagamese, R. (2016). *Embers: One Ojibway's meditations*. D & M Publishers.

Wagamese, R. (2019). *One drum: Stories and ceremonies for a planet.* D & M Publishers.

Weber, A. (2017). *Matter and desire: An erotic ecology*. Chelsea Green.

Derek Markides is Principal with the Foothills School Division in Alberta, Canada, he is a father, husband, and educator. He is interested in complexity science, mathematics and science education, ecological sensibilities, and the entailments associated with collective and community-based knowledges. Research interests include educational leadership, self-study, critical pedagogies, teacher reflexivity, pedagogies of love, and radical love as methodology. Derek Markides - derekmarkides@gmail.com