SCHOOL OF LEADERSHIP AND POLICY STUDIES
PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE REPORT

The School of Leadership and Policy Studies prepared a self study following program review guidelines. A three-person external review team visited the campus; reviewed the self-study documents; interviewed unit personnel, university administrators, undergraduate and graduate students; and submitted an external review report. The Program Review Committee (PRC) studied all written materials. The PRC liaison for the School discussed the self-study materials with the school director and faculty. The PRC discussed the School with the Dean of the College of Education and Human Development. This document reflects the PRC’s findings and recommendations.

The School of Leadership and Policy Studies in effect submitted three separate self-studies (one for each division) combined with an introduction and concluding section addressing issues pertaining to the unit as a whole. The PRC report focuses on each of the self-studies in turn and concludes with a discussion of the issues pertaining to the unit as a whole.

DIVISION OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION AND LEADERSHIP STUDIES (EALS)

SUMMARY OF THE SELF STUDY

Introduction

Mission. “The mission of EALS is to advance the understanding and practice of artistic, insightful, inventive and ethical management and leadership in educational settings and other human service organizations” (EALS, p.1).

History. As a result of a reconfiguration of the College of Education and Human Development approved in 1997-98, the departments of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, Educational Foundations and Inquiry, and Higher Education and Student Affairs were placed in the newly created School of Leadership and Policy Studies. Initially, the school functioned as five different program areas. In spring 2001 the school faculty voted overwhelming to disband the school and revert to three separate departments. This request was rejected by the Dean and in 2002-03 the current three division structure was established.

Description of the Unit

Program identification. EALS offers three graduate degrees–Master of Education (M.Ed.), Education Specialist (Ed.S), and Doctor of Education (Ed.D.)–as well as administrative licensure for principalships, administrative specialists, and
superintendents. (As a result of a state-wide review of doctoral programs by the Ohio Board of Regents, the mid-1990’s saw the conversion of a Ph.D. in Educational Administration and Supervision that had existed since 1967 to the Ed.D. in Leadership Studies.) The degrees do not in and of themselves lead to licensure. However, students in the M.Ed. and Ed.S. can plan their programs to include part of the requirements for licensure, and Ed.D. students can plan a part of their cognate to help qualify for licensure. Many students take courses for licensure purposes without enrolling in the degree programs.

Programmatic and curricular offerings. Students in the Ed.D. enroll in cohorts either on a three-year full-time basis or on a four-year part-time basis. In 1997 the division began offering the master’s level Principalship Leadership Cohort Academy (PCLA) at a variety of off-campus sites. EALS does not offer undergraduate programs although it offers one undergraduate course (EDAS 409).

Faculty resources. EALS has seven tenured or tenure-track faculty, one full-time instructor, and one part-time licensure officer/part-time instructor. The workload for regular faculty is six hours of teaching, three of research and three of advising per semester. Because of the part-time nature of the program, the need to advise licensure students who are not in a degree program, and the fact that many students enroll in the summer, there is a heavy advising load that is shared by all faculty.

Graduate assistant resources. The Division has seven graduate assistantships (six half-time and one quarter-time).

Staff resources. The Division has one full-time Secretary 2. A Licensure Officer is supported out of PCLA overhead funds.

Student credit hour production. Over the last two years SCH production averaged more than 1900 per semester during the academic year, and more that 950 in the summer. Depending on the term, between 20% and 30% of these are at off-campus sites.

Recruitment and retention efforts. Faculty hold evening information meetings for prospective students. Informational brochures are distributed at state conferences and meeting. For the PCLA cohorts, dinner meetings are held each semester for prospective students. Word of mouth, including referrals from current and former students, is the most prominent recruitment tool. A comprehensive recruitment plan is being developed.

Facilities and equipment. The facilities and equipment are adequate to meet programmatic needs.

Information resources and services. The Division publishes a semi-annual newsletter, holds two leadership luncheons for area superintendents, and sponsors an annual lecture.
Financial resources. The operating budget has remained constant throughout the review period. However, the Division receives 15% of the total funds collected for PCLA cohorts.

Self evaluation

Faculty quality and productivity. (See below under doctoral program.)

Student entry attributes. For the M.Ed. program the acceptance rate averages somewhere between 90% and 100%. For the licensure programs the rate approaches 100% because applicants are already licensed teachers who are taking courses in the quest for administrative or specialist licenses and do not apply to a degree program. When the Ed.D. program was initiated, the acceptance rate was quite high, probably about 90%. With the implementation of the cohort program, a significant increase in the number of applicants, and limitation of acceptances to the number that can be effectively handled by the faculty, the acceptance rates have varied between 40% and 50% for those applicants interviewed, and between 33% and 40% for those who apply to the program.

Assessment of student learning outcomes. The Division has identified four learning outcomes for recipients of its master’s and specialist degrees: (1) theoretical base and knowledge base, (2) research/scholarship consumption and synthesis, (3) balance between theory and practice, and (4) written and oral communication. It assesses the attainment of these learning outcomes through performance on course assignments, performance on its comprehensive exam and the Praxis II exam, course and program evaluations, internship performance, and job placement.

Curriculum, instruction, and support services. EALS is a partner member of the University Council of Educational Administration (UCEA). EALS master’s and specialist programs are strengthened by the inclusion of coursework in related fields such as curriculum instructional design, and educational foundations and inquiry. The EALS doctoral program is strengthened by its multidisciplinary nature which supports its goal of preparing individuals to exercise leadership that will transform the quality of schools and other human resources institutions. All programs leading to Ohio administrative licensure require two internships relating to the particular license being sought. The doctoral program also requires an internship.

Service. Service efforts within the Division, School, and University over the last seven years have focused on the modifications to the curriculum and membership on a wide array of school and university committees. Beyond the University, faculty participate (some hold leadership positions) in a number of professional organizations. Faculty members also serve the northwest and north central Ohio regions by conducting inservices and workshops for teachers and administrators, and interacting with principals and superintendents in a number of venues.

Comparative advantage and program distinctiveness. Licensure services are personalized, accessible, and time-effective for students. Moreover, the programs are
offered in flexible and convenient formats. Students can enroll on either a full time or part time basis. Moreover, courses are offered both on campus and a variety of off campus sites. It is also possible to earn a master’s degree by attending exclusively in the summer.

Demand. Employment demand for educational leaders is high in Ohio and the placement rate of graduates is high in the region and across the state.

Connection to the mission. EALS seeks to become a premier learning department within a premier learning community by focusing on intellectual engagement and active participation; having clear expectations; transforming its faculty and students both personally and professionally; and by transforming itself to meet the needs of the 21st century. The activities within the Division as they relate to teaching, research, and service are in line with the requirements for tenure and promotion.

Financial considerations and adequacy of resources. Given the directions in which the Division wishes to go (having regular faculty teach in the off-campus program and offering an on-campus cohort model for the M.Ed. program) additional faculty resources are needed. Moreover, given the significant dependence on PCLA revenue for professional development and other activities (the operating budget has remained constant over the review period), the Division is seeking a renegotiation of the PCLA revenue arrangement that would increase the percentage of funds that comes to the College and the Division.

Doctoral program.

Program Faculty. Faculty have published in Educational Administration Quarterly (the top journal in EDAD), and many other outlets. Overall, the tenure or tenure-track regular (seven) and affiliated faculty (three) who teach core courses have published nine books, 55 refereed articles, eight book chapters and have also received $25,000 in external funding.

Program Graduates. Between fall 2000 and summer 2004, 32 students (including five Ph.D. students from the old program) have graduated. All are employed in positions related to their degree program. Sixteen are principals or superintendents, 12 hold faculty positions at colleges or universities, three hold administrative positions at universities, and two hold vice presidential positions in business and industry.

Program Vitality. With the reconceptualization and restructuring of the doctoral program several years ago, the focus is now to advance the understanding and practice of leadership in educational and human resource organizations that provide educational and related services designed to enable students and professionals to contribute to, and share in, the benefits of a just and democratic society. Understanding and providing leadership in these settings requires a new and innovative perspective.
Program Demand. The demand for the doctoral program is high. For each of the last four years 20-30 applicants have been interviewed for 12-14 places in the incoming class.

Program Interactions. The multidisciplinary program covers many areas of leadership. The cognate area gives students the option of focusing on other disciplines as appropriate. Moreover, the internship requirement has given faculty and students the opportunity to form relationships not only with school districts, but also with the Dana Corporation, Educational Testing Service (ETS), AARP, and other organizations.

Program Access. From 1997 to fall 2004, 99 students have been admitted to the program. Of these, just under one third (32) have been white males and an equal number have been white females. The remaining one third include males and females from various minority groups, with African American females (14) and males (8) being the two largest groups represented.

Student Outcomes Assessment. As indicated above, the doctoral program has a 100% placement record between fall 2000 and summer 2004. EALS is in the process of preparing an exit assessment for graduating students to better determine the effectiveness of the program.

Program Revisions from Previous Reviews. This is the first time the unit is undergoing program review.

Unit planning (next 7 years)

The planning process. Both external (informal focus group sessions with educational administrators in northwest Ohio) and internal (a retreat and a SWOT [strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats] analysis) planning processes were completed in 2004 and serve as the source of the goals established.

Goals and strategies. The following goals, with attendant strategies, have been set by the Division.

- To be a nationally recognized department making significant contribution to the research base of the field.
- To recruit and retain students in the various programs.
- To design new programs in collaboration with other college divisions and state organizations.
- To determine the needs of its customers.
- To increase the scholarships available to students through fund-raising efforts.
- To more effectively meet the needs of its students.
- To restructure the internship courses.
- To interact with the larger community in the region.
The Division believes that becoming a department separate from the School of Leadership and Policy Studies is essential to accomplishing these goals. It also believes that it needs at least two more faculty lines and additional clinical teaching faculty to meet the needs of its students.

Timetable and implementation plan. The self study contains a well-developed time-table and implementation plan.

Relationship to the Academic Plan. The goals for EALS align with the Academic Plan. The Division seeks to become “a premier learning department by focusing on intellectual engagement and active participation; having clear expectations; transforming our faculty and students both personally and professionally; and by transforming our unit to meet the needs of the 21st century academy” (EALS, p. 25). There is an emphasis on enhancing the faculty, seeking more funding for the Division, and collaboration both within the college and with the broader community. The goals and strategies are directly linked to inquiry and engagement for students and faculty, and to achievement through the education of graduate students that opens new professional opportunities for them.

RESULTS OF PREVIOUS REVIEWS

This is the first time the unit is undergoing program review.

SUMMARY OF THE EXTERNAL REPORT

The external report offers numerous commendations for the EALS faculty and program graduates:

Commendations

• The faculty are highly respected by local, regional, and state practitioners and are situated to make solid contributions to school district leadership throughout the state. They regularly make exemplary contributions to this constituency.
• The faculty publish in a wide variety of outlets. The publication rate is average to above average when considering comparable disciplines and universities.
• The faculty have consistently presented the results of scholarly research at key academic and professional meetings.
• Several faculty members have achieved national recognition for excellence in research and pedagogy.
• Graduates serve in leadership positions in various public and private educational institutions as well as in for-profit and not-for-profit organizations.
• By admitting, retaining, and graduating a culturally diverse group of students EALS contributes to the cultural diversity of the Ohio workforce.

Issues and Observations

• Despite the state-mandated conversion of its Ph.D. to an Ed.D. in the mid-1990s, and the loss of virtually all its senior faculty, the program is thriving.
• The program is in the process of learning how to balance an on-campus program with a thriving off-campus program that features very different students and demands. This is never an easy thing to do.
• EALS lacks sufficient administrative infrastructure to properly consider the long and short term impacts of its activities. Of special concern are the pressures remote teaching exerts on scholarly productivity and collegiality; the heavy demands that a “hands on” area such as educational leadership, which requires lots of student contact and service, places on faculty; and the vulnerability of cash reserves in times of institutional financial need. An administrative division with a longer history would have developed mechanisms to handle these things. The question is, Will this administrative maturity come to EALS in time?
• Because of the program’s attractiveness to a wide audience, and the resulting diversity of the students, it will be easy to lose focus. Care must be taken to know who the clients are and what the markets are like on both ends (entry and exit) of the program. This will require strong administrative attention, probably in the form of a coordinator.
• The EALS faculty should take a hard look at the master’s degree curriculum in light of current conversations about school leadership in Ohio and nationally. Much guidance could be found in the EALS doctoral program with its emphasis on leadership, collaboration, community, diversity, and creativity.

PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Overall Program Quality

Findings. When, in the mid-1990s, the Ohio Board of Regents mandated replacing the educational administration and supervision doctoral program, which had been in operation for almost 30 years, with an Ed.D., the results could have been devastating. However, to the great credit of the program faculty at that time, as well as those who have replaced them (none of the current faculty were on staff then), this turning point was viewed as an opportunity rather than as a disaster. The program has been re-conceptualized, re-defined, and re-built and is today described as “thriving (relatively)” (External Report, p. 4) with an “average to above average” record of scholarship (p. 1) by the external consultants. Most striking is their observation that “many other places would take the problems [relating to the school structure] if they could have such good programs” (p. 11).

Recommendation. The Committee concurs with these judgments and congratulates the faculty on their accomplishments to date and especially their ability to see and seize on opportunity where others might see defeat. It encourages them to keep up and improve on their good work, and to attend to the findings and recommendations below, so that the program will be even stronger 5-7 years from now than it is today.
2. Faculty Size, Productivity, and Workload

Findings. The external consultants rate the scholarly productivity of the faculty as “average to above average when considering comparable disciplines and universities” (External Report, p. 1) and this seems about right to the Committee. The Committee also shares the concerns expressed by the consultants about the work-related pressures the faculty face. “For example, faculty engaging heavily in remote teaching will frequently fail to fully develop their scholarly productivity and may not have sufficient contact with colleagues. Also, educational leadership is a ‘hands on’ field requiring lots of faculty contact and service. This is tough on senior faculty and sometimes devastating for junior faculty” (External Report, p. 4). The Division seems to acknowledge these issues by including two additional faculty lines, as well additional clinical faculty, in its plans for the future (EALS, p. 25).

The Committee cannot judge how likely it is that the Division will receive additional faculty resources in light of other priorities established within the School and College and the extremely tight fiscal situation faced by all public universities in Ohio. However, the Committee is very concerned that the faculty (especially the junior faculty) have the opportunity to build on the significant scholarly accomplishments to date and meet the high scholarly expectations that play a central role in determining the quality of a doctoral program. In other words, “average to above average” is a good starting point; the goal should be to raise this profile even higher. This may mean that, in the absence of additional faculty lines and teaching support, hard choices will have to be made with regard to curtailing the department’s programmatic efforts in some area or areas.

Recommendation. The Division should reach an understanding with the Dean concerning the likely projected faculty size for the immediate (2-3 year) future. Based on this understanding the Division should prepare and submit to the Dean for review and approval its plan for enabling the faculty to meet on an on-going basis the high scholarly expectations for a quality doctoral program. This would involve prioritizing existing instructional and service efforts, making realistic projections concerning how much instruction the faculty can do while increasing its scholarly productivity, and constructing a plan of action that will enable it to raise its scholarly profile to a higher level. The recommended completion date for the creation and approval of this plan is May 2006.

3. External Funding

Findings. External funding is also an important quality indicator for most doctoral programs. It is a source of external review and validation of submitted projects. It provides additional resources to support scholarly efforts. Moreover, in an area such as EALS, where the scholarship of engagement often plays a central role, it also can support faculty efforts in this area. No external funding is reported in the self study.

Recommendations. The Division should work with the Director of Sponsored Programs and Research to develop a plan designed to secure a level of external funding appropriate for a quality doctoral program. This plan should be part of the plan for
enabling the faculty to meet on an on-going basis the high scholarly expectations for a quality doctoral program described above.

4. Assessment

*Findings.* The Division has identified four learning outcomes and indicates that it assesses the attainment of these outcomes in a variety of ways. However, there is no indication that there is an assessment program in place. Assessment is most valuable when it is used as vehicle for program improvement on an on-going basis. That is, one must continually look at the assessment results and ask, to what extent are our students mastering the learning outcomes? Where there are shortfalls, something needs to be done. This could range from changes in pedagogy and/or curriculum, to strengthening of admission standards, to revisions in the learning outcomes. Where there are no shortfalls and the learning outcomes are being mastered, it is important to consider whether or not the bar is set high enough. That is, are the learning outcomes appropriate or should we be expecting more of our students?

*Recommendation.* The Division should create an assessment program based upon its learning outcomes and report its findings annually to the Student Achievement Assessment Committee.

5. M. Ed. Program

*Findings.* There are two issues here. The first is that raised by the external consultants who suggest that a re-examination of the master’s program is in order. In their view, modeling the M.Ed. after the doctoral program, “with its emphasis upon leadership, collaboration, community diversity and creativity” (External Report, p. 4) could make the master’s a national leader. Some members of the department have indicated to the Committee liaison that the master’s program was recently reviewed and that they do not share the recommendation of the external review team on this matter.

The second issue is that of admissions. All else being equal, the more selective a program is in admissions, the stronger it is. Although the doctoral program, to its great credit, has become increasingly selective over the past several years, the same is not true of the master’s program. The self study indicates that the acceptance rate to the M.Ed. is somewhere between 90% and 100%. There is no doubt in the Committee’s mind that selectivity in admissions is an important indicator of program quality.

The Committee also recognizes that there is a connection between these two issues. That is, student abilities (which are to a large extent a function of admission selectivity) play a significant role in determining the appropriate structure and curriculum for the program. At the same time, the purpose and curriculum of a graduate degree program play an important role in determining the size of the applicant pool and the degree of selectivity that is possible.
Recommendation. The Division should develop and execute a plan for
determining whether or not increased admission selectivity to, and curricular changes in,
the master’s program are in order. The results of this investigation should be submitted to
the Director of the School, the Dean of Education and Human Development, and the
Graduate Dean for review and approval. The recommended completion date for this
effort is May, 2007.

6. School Configuration

This issue is discussed at the conclusion of the Committee’s report.

The Division of Educational Administration and Leadership should report annually to the
Director of the School and the Dean of the College of Education and Human
Development, with a copy to the Provost, on the implementation of these
recommendations.
DIVISION OF EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATIONS AND INQUIRY

Summary of the Self Study

Introduction

Mission. EDFI’s primary mission is to provide interdisciplinary instruction (in the areas of educational psychology; history, philosophy and comparative education; and assessment, research and statistics) that facilitates the development of a common set of intellectual inquiry skills and professional and ethical dispositions among pre-service and in-service educators.

History. As a result of a reconfiguration of the College of Education and Human Development approved in 1997-98, the departments of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, Educational Foundations and Inquiry, and Higher Education and Student Affairs were placed in the newly created School of Leadership and Policy Studies. Initially, the school functioned as five different program areas. In spring 2001 the school faculty voted overwhelming to disband the school and revert to three separate departments. This request was rejected by the Dean and in 2002-03 the current three division structure was established.

The EDFI faculty has undergone dramatic changes in recent years. None of the 18 faculty on staff in 1995 is in the Division today. The number of tenured and tenure-track faculty dropped to four in 1997, and today stands at 12.

Description of the Unit

Program identification. EDFI does not offer any degree programs. However, it is involved in two developing proposals: an interdisciplinary master’s program in educational foundations and a Ph.D. in teaching and learning. The latter is a collaborative effort between the College of Arts and Sciences and the College of Education and Human Development.

Programmatic and curricular offerings. The Division offers courses in several foundational areas (educational psychology; history, philosophy and comparative education; and assessment, research and statistics) that support undergraduate and graduate degree programs in the College. Overall, it offers 49 different courses. Three of these are core courses for most teacher education programs: Educational Psychology (EDFI 420), Education in a Pluralistic Society (EDFI 408), and Assessment in Education (EDFI 402). In addition, EDFI faculty have begun serving as advisors for students in degree programs in the College.

Faculty resources. EDFI has 12 tenured or tenure-track faculty, and one other regular faculty member. It also uses between four and six supplemental faculty FTE. The teaching load for tenured and tenure-track faculty is three courses per semester.
Graduate assistant resources. EDFI has not received any graduate assistant resources in the past two years.

Staff resources. EDFI had a Secretary 2 during review period. However, that position was recently eliminated.

Student credit hour production. The Division typically generates 4,200-4,400 SCH in the fall semester and 3,600-3,900 in the spring semester. This amounts to approximately 220 SCH per faculty FTE in the fall semester, and 210 in the spring.

Recruitment and retention efforts. Because it does not have any degree programs, EDFI is not involved in recruitment and retention activities.

Facilities and equipment. The Division currently has adequate faculty office and support space.

Information resources and services. EDFI contributes to the School and College web pages.

Financial resources. Annual total direct expenditures for the division averaged $1.05 M over the last two years of the review period. Ninety-one percent of the tenured or tenure-track faculty received external funding. The total funding for the 15 funded projects for which the PI or Co-PI is in the Division is over $900,000.

Self evaluation

Faculty quality and productivity. A total of 78 work products were published by tenured and tenure-track faculty over the last two years. This amounts to an average of 3.25 scholarly works per year. Faculty articles have appeared in 27 different journals during this period. Fifteen of these journals report acceptance rates of less than 15%.

Given the diversity within EDFI, faculty scholarship and publications range over a wide area, and much of it is within a cross-cultural or international context. In addition, faculty partnerships exist with several educational institutions in northwest Ohio, as well as with one in Kenya and another in Russia.

Student entry attributes. In the absence of a degree program, this is not applicable to the Division.

Assessment of student learning outcomes. Absent a degree program, the assessment program focuses on five courses central to other programs (EDFI 302, 303, 402, 408, and 641). Learning outcomes and ways of assessing them have been developed and are used. The data collected are reviewed by the faculty each semester and revisions are made to either the assessment mechanisms or instruction as deemed appropriate.

Curriculum, instruction, and support services. Courses have been structured in line with National Education Technology Standards for Teachers (NETS-T) and the Ohio
Teacher Performance Standards. In addition, in recent years, meetings have been initiated with the degree programs served by EDFI courses to explore the appropriateness of the course content. Student achievement is assessed.

Service. EDFI faculty members serve on 14 of the 17 college-wide committees and chair four of them. In addition, faculty members are involved with more than 100 different professional organizations.

Comparative advantage and program distinctiveness. In the absence of a degree program, this is not applicable to the Division.

Demand. Over the last two years EDFI has offered an average of 37 undergraduate course sections per term with an average of 27 students per section. At the graduate level, 13 course sections have been offered per term with an average of 15-17 students per section. Summer and off-campus enrollments are also strong. Demand for foundations courses in off-campus cohort programs has grown; 15 graduate course sections, many of which are offered in an online environment, are now offered.

Connection to the mission. EDFI is committed to the university’s core values and seeks to incorporate them in their courses as appropriate. Faculty members strive to exemplify the interdependence of teaching, learning, scholarship, and service through endeavors of the highest quality. Many conduct research focusing on their teaching experiences. In general, activities leading to tenure and promotion are consistent with the school, college, and university. However, the standard teaching load (3/3) is heavier than that of other school faculty (2/2).

Financial considerations and adequacy of resources. Resources are viewed as inadequate in four main areas: faculty, staff, revenue sharing, and graduate assistantships. (1) The number of full-time faculty has decreased from 18 to 13, while the part-time instruction allocation has remained constant. As a result, the part-time instruction budget is consistently overspent, class size has been increased, and elective courses significantly reduced. Nevertheless, every semester students are turned away because of full classes. (2) Although a temporary solution has been found (a part-time secretary plus a graduate assistant) to the secretarial support issue resulting from the elimination of the Division’s secretarial position, a permanent solution is needed. (3) Some of the revenues generated by off-campus cohort programs are distributed to the College and the unit offering the program. Although EDFI courses comprise 20-30 percent of the coursework for these programs, with the exception of a revenue sharing agreement with the School of Intervention Studies, the Division receives none of this revenue. (4) EDFI courses comprise nearly 30% of master’s students’ programs in the College. However, because it does not offer a degree, the Division receives no graduate assistantships.

Unit planning (next 7 years)

The planning process. (No description provided.)
Goals and strategies. The following goals have been set by the Division.

- The Division desires to retain the school structure. In the event that the other two divisions leave the school, EDFI would seek to be a school itself.
- Development of a Master of Arts in Cross-Cultural and International Education. This proposal is currently being reviewed at the state level.
- Continued improvement of the EDFI service curriculum.
- Expansion of resources to support curriculum, program, and scholarship initiatives.

Timetable and implementation plan. Because so much of the Division’s activities five to seven years from now depend on the results of the goals set by the Division over the next few years, the implementation time-table presented in the self study is limited to three years.

Relationship to the Academic Plan. The implementation of the Master of Arts in Cross-Cultural and International Education is in keeping with the theme of understanding cultures and nations. EDFI emphasizes leadership in learning through the development of on-line courses, assisting others with technology applications in teaching, and securing grants to promote the used of technology in classrooms throughout northwest Ohio. The Division’s history of working with other units within the College and University, as well as with local school districts, reflects its commitment to engagement and inquiry. The faculty look forward to continued significant participation in the Organizing for Engagement initiative.

RESULTS OF PREVIOUS REVIEWS

This is the first time the unit is undergoing program review.

SUMMARY OF THE EXTERNAL REPORT

The external report offers numerous commendations for the EDFI faculty and notes that they have accomplished much despite being systematically understaffed for a number of years.

Commendations

- EDFI faculty are productive, accomplished, and respected faculty members. They are very active scholars and their publications are of high quality. In the area of external funding they have been “moderately” successful.
- While already shouldering significant workloads, the faculty is voluntarily taking on advising (undergraduate teacher education students and thesis/dissertation work of graduate students) without additional compensation.
• EDFI faculty seek out collaborative relationships and have a good record of collaboration in teaching, research, and service.

• “Recognizing the ‘power of the program,’ EDFI has developed a proposal for a Master’s Degree in Cross-Cultural and International Education. . . . it is a well-crafted proposal, building on the strengths of the EDFI group, inviting to persons who work in schools, social service agencies and corporate environments where cross-cultural understanding matters, and incorporating appropriate practica. Given Ohio’s requirement that all teachers earn a master’s degree, it seems likely that this degree, once approved, will attract sufficient enrollment to flourish” (External Report, p.2).

• The work of the EDFI faculty appears to be very much in line with the “scholarship of engagement.”

Issues and Observations

• EDFI faculty members want to stay together as a unit, either in the School of Education and Policy Studies, in another school, or as a separate academic unit. This is very important for their individual and collective vitality. It is imperative that they have supportive relationships with others who share their direct interest in the use and development of theory as well as an interdisciplinary focus and sensibility. Also, EDFI faculty are any College of Education’s natural border crossers. It is important that they be housed in a department with others who value these “cross-cultural” efforts. It makes good sense that they would be allied with the HESA and EALS because the faculty in these programs share a penchant for sophisticated and wide-ranging organizational understanding and leadership. Also, there is no other school in the College where they manifestly “belong.”

• EDFI faculty teach courses that are required for bachelor’s, master’s and doctoral degrees in the College. However, (1) there is no apparent mechanism that tracks and documents these contributions to the other programs; (2) they regularly teach graduate cohort courses for other programs off campus but receive no portion of incentive dollars made available for these activities; (3) EDFI has not always been able to respond to programs that request courses and this results in that program securing an instructor who is formally approved by EDFI; and (4) there is a perception on the part of some individuals in other schools/programs that full-time EDFI faculty prefer not to leave campus for any kind of remote teaching. To the extent that these issues are perceptual, EDFI needs to do a better job of publicizing its activities. To the extent that they are real, they need to be addressed.

• “It is clear that College faculty view individual EDFI members positively. They value EDFI courses and instruction. However, other members of the College do not have a sense of EDFI as a unit. EDFI faculty should consider ways of altering this perception and enhancing their unit’s image with peers” (External Report, p. 6).

• EDFI should find a way to track and document advising done for other programs and regularly inform those programs of the magnitude of this service.
• EDFI faculty members should consider volunteering to assist the Dean in fund-raising efforts.

• Recently EDFI lost its full-time secretary and is covering the loss with a half-time secretary and graduate student help. This is problematic in light of the university paperwork demands and the clerical demands required by coordination of class scheduling with multiple departments.

PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Overall Program Quality

Findings. The faculty of EDFI are a very productive group in terms of their scholarship, teaching, grant procurement, and service. Their interdisciplinary focus makes essential contributions to the College and University in each of these areas. They are well-respected by their peers although these same colleagues do not seem to have a sense of the unit as a whole. They also exemplify good citizenship by volunteering to take on some of the advising of students in the degree programs their courses serve. What makes these accomplishments remarkable is that none of the 1995 faculty is in the Division today. Indeed, the number of tenured and tenure-track faculty dropped to four in 1997 and stands at 12 today.

Recommendation. The Committee congratulates the faculty on their accomplishments to date and especially their ability to emerge from the difficult staffing times as a strong and productive unit. Indeed, it is the Committee’s judgment that the Division is much stronger today than it has ever been. The Committee encourages the faculty to keep up and improve upon their good work, and to attend to the findings and recommendations below, so that the program will be even stronger 5-7 years from now than it is today.

2. Development of a Master of Arts in Cross-Cultural and International Education

Findings. The Committee believes that the faculty is strong enough to support a graduate program in general, and this program in particular. The Committee also acknowledges the external reviewers’ comments on the “power of the program,” and understands the Division’s desire to have its own graduate students to work with. However, the Committee is cognizant that there are other factors that must be considered as well. It is not clear that the College has the resources to meet the added instructional demands that would be created by this program. Even if the resources are available, it is not clear that given the configuration of programs in the College, the needs of the profession, and the strengths of the EDFI faculty, this the best program to propose. In other words, the Committee believes that there may well be another new program, or more effective ways of integrating the skills and abilities of EDFI into existing programs, that would meet the needs of EDFI faculty to work with graduate students, which would better serve students and the College. This being said, the Committee strongly believes that failure to provide additional outlets for EDFI faculty to work with graduate students
in their areas of expertise (i.e., beyond simply teaching core courses in various graduate programs), would represent a great loss for the institution, its students, and its faculty.

**Recommendation.** Working with the Director of the School, the Division should reach an understanding with the Dean of Education and Human Development and the Graduate Dean (who will in turn consult with the Provost) as to the best course of action in this area, and that course of action should then be vigorously pursued. It is recommended that this understanding be reached by January 2006.

3. Resources

**Findings.** Three resource issues surfaced during the course of the review: secretarial support, participation in the incentive program offered by Continuing and Extended Education for the offering of off-campus cohort programs, and graduate assistants. In the view of the Committee the first two have nothing to do with whether or not the Division has a graduate program, whereas the latter does.

- The Division has secretarial needs; these must be met by secretaries rather than graduate assistants. Moreover, meeting them should not depend on the “generosity” of the other Divisions. These needs should be met either by a genuine and equitable sharing of secretarial resources within the School, or by finding the resources for each Division to have its own secretarial support.
- One can understand why Continuing and Extended Education offers incentives for off-campus cohort programs and why these are program-based rather than course specific. This being said, the Committee does not see any justification for a unit making the kind of contributions to these programs that EDFI does while not receiving an appropriate share of the incentive funds. Revenue sharing could be accomplished through agreements such as the one that exists with the School of Intervention Studies, by a college policy, or by changes in the incentive program administered by Continuing and Extended Education. Whatever the solution, the Committee believes that it is an important issue that must be resolved at once.
- The Committee understands the desire for the Division to receive a graduate assistantship allocation. However, the primary purpose of graduate assistantships is to allow students to enroll in and complete high quality graduate programs. This is why assistantships are allocated to programs judged worthy of receiving them. This does not preclude collaborative working arrangements that result in degree programs sharing their graduate assistants with faculty in other units who make important contributions to their program. Nor does it preclude writing graduate research assistants into grant proposals whenever possible. Indeed, this is highly desirable regardless of whether the investigators are in units with graduate degree programs.

**Recommendation.** Fair and equitable resolutions to the secretarial and incentive money issues should be reached at the appropriate school or college level and implemented. Recommended completion date: August 2005.
With regard to graduate assistants, the Committee urges the Division (1) to build graduate assistantship support into grants whenever possible, (2) to negotiate with the degree programs to which their faculty make significant contributions for graduate assistantship support and (3) to negotiate with the Dean of Education and Human Development and the Graduate Dean for appropriate levels of graduate assistantship support to be included in any new degree program for which formal approval is sought.

4. External Support

Findings. The external consultants evaluate faculty grant productivity as “moderately successful” and this seems right to the Committee. Given the dramatic faculty turnover in recent years, this is a significant accomplishment. However, it is one that should be improved on in the years ahead.

Recommendation. The Division should work with the Director of Sponsored Programs and Research to prepare a plan for building on its significant accomplishments in this area, and submit it to the Dean of Education and Human Development and the Vice Provost for Research for review and approval. The plan should include goals for the coming years and should be monitored either annually or biennially by the Division and the Dean. Recommended approval date for the plan: January 2006.

The Division of Educational Foundations and Inquiry should report annually to the Director of the School and the Dean of the College of Education and Human Development, with a copy to the Provost, on the implementation of these recommendations.
DIVISION OF HIGHER EDUCATION AND STUDENT AFFAIRS

SUMMARY OF THE SELF STUDY

Introduction

Mission. The College Student Personnel (CSP) program seeks to prepare practitioners for positions in student affairs through an integration of theory-based course work emphasizing student development complemented by professional internships in college and university settings. The program focuses on the role graduates will play in enhancing learning environments for students during their collegiate experiences.

The Higher Education Administration (HIED) program emphasizes informed, ethical decision making in the administration of higher education. It is intended to launch its graduates into new areas and/or higher levels of leadership in colleges and universities.

History. The College Student Personnel master’s program began in 1964. Departmental status was achieved a few years later. During the 1970’s enrollment grew to 55-60 students. The Higher Education Administration doctoral program began in 1990 and in 1991 the name of the Department was changed from College Student Personnel to Higher Education and Student Affairs (HESA).

As a result of a reconfiguration of the College of Education and Human Development approved in 1997-98, the departments of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, Educational Foundations and Inquiry, and Higher Education and Student Affairs were placed in the newly created School of Leadership and Policy Studies. Initially, the school functioned as five different program areas with CSP and HIED being two of these. In spring 2001 the school faculty voted overwhelming to disband the school and revert to three separate departments. This request was rejected by the Dean and in 2002-03 the current three division structure was established.

Description of the Unit

Program identification. The Master of Arts in College Student Personnel program and the Ph.D. in Higher Education Administration are both offered by the Division of Higher Education and Student Affairs.

Programmatic and curricular offerings. The 45semester hour CSP master’s program includes a balance of classroom-based academic learning and field-based experiential learning. Students study and apply in their internships a variety of theoretical frameworks that provide a foundation for understanding many facets of the undergraduate learning experience. The 63 post master’s hour HEID doctoral program includes 15 hours of core courses, 12 hours of cognate courses, 12 hours of research courses, 6 hours of electives, and 18 dissertation-related hours. The core courses involve work in higher education foundations, administration, governance and organization, law, and the college student. There is also a global understanding requirement that is intended
to broaden and diversify the student’s conception of higher education and how it is influenced by culture and custom. HESA offers neither undergraduate programs nor undergraduate courses.

**Faculty resources.** There are eight tenured or tenure-track faculty in the Division. There is considerable overlap in the faculty of the two programs. The CSP faculty are supplemented by a number of adjunct faculty whose primary assignments are in the Division of Student Affairs (3) and Partnerships for Community Action (1). Although housed in HESA, the HIED program supplements it faculty with individuals drawn from the following academic and administrative units: Educational Foundations and Inquiry, College of Technology, and the Office of Institutional Research.

**Graduate assistant resources.** For each of the last two years the CSP program has had three graduate assistants (two of which are supplied to the College of Health and Human Services) and the HIED program two.

**Staff resources.** The Division has had a Secretary 2 during the review period. However, in recent years, part of that person’s time has been allocated to the work of the Director of the School of Leaderships and Policy Studies.

**Student information.** The vast majority (96.5%) of students enrolled in the CSP program during the review period have completed it in two years of full-time academic work. Many had prior full-time work experience. The ratio of women to men has averaged around 7:3 and the ratio of out-of-state to in-state students has been about 3:2. In terms of race/ethnicity, 83.8% have been Caucasian/white. African American (7.8%) and Hispanic (3.4%) and Asian American (3%) have been the three largest minority groups. In addition to having been exceptionally involved in student life as undergraduates, the students who matriculate performed well academically. The average undergraduate GPA is usually in the 3.4-3.5 range. GRE scores tend to be at or above the mean for students who matriculate to graduate programs in education.

All HIED doctoral students are required to have full-time post-master’s work experience (preferably in a higher education setting). Students admitted since fall 1997 have had a mean undergraduate GPA of 3.15 and a mean master’s/professional school GPA of 3.73. GRE mean scores were verbal 512, quantitative 521, and analytical 527. The majority have been white (65%) with African Americans constituting the largest (20%) minority group. Eight percent have been international students. Most (66%) are Ohio residents. However, these students earned their undergraduate degrees in 14 states (8 institutions in Ohio) and graduate/professional degrees in 15 states (6 institutions in Ohio). Eighty-seven percent of first-year students have been full-time. There has been a trend in recent years toward increasing percentages of part-time first-year students.

The faculty of the Division does all the advising for students in both programs. Typical annual advising loads per full-time faculty members are twelve master’s and five doctoral students (three at the dissertation stage).
**Student credit hour production.** Student credit hour production increased from 775 in fall 2002 to 945 in spring 2004. During that same period student credit hour production per faculty FTE increased from 88.6 to 113.

**Recruitment and retention efforts.** The primary modes of recruitment are brochures distributed at professional conferences and career fairs, the division website, and word of mouth. The latter is prominent because of the strong reputation and visibility of the programs and the number of alumni referrals. The CSP program receives 150-160 applications a year for 35 openings. The HIED program has not been as successful, especially in recent years. Mass mailings have been tried and some progress has been made. However, in light of the preference to admit students with at least three years of post-master’s full-time work experience who will leave their jobs and attend on a full-time basis, effective recruitment for the doctoral program presents a much greater challenge.

Retention efforts in both programs focus on advising and close contact with students. The average CSP graduation rate for the review period is in 94%. Retention of doctoral students is even higher in the first and second years of the program. Attrition does occur at the later stages primarily because of some students taking full-time jobs and not completing the dissertation within the allotted time. Of the 75 students who matriculated during the review period, 14 are still taking coursework, 27 are ABD, 7 have withdrawn or run out of time, 1 was dismissed, and 26 have graduated.

**Facilities and equipment.** HESA currently has adequate faculty and support service space.

**Information resources and services.** The programs in the Division have benefited greatly from the National Student Affairs Archives housed in the Jerome Library Center for Archival Collections. Now comprising the institutional papers of fourteen national, four regional, and six state (Ohio and Michigan) professional associations, and the private collections of four individuals who have been extremely active in the field, as well as a catalogued library of books and pamphlets, the National Student Affairs Archive is used extensively by faculty and graduate students.

**Financial resources.** Total direct expenditures for instruction were $840,000 in fiscal year 2002-03 and $823,000 for 2003-04. The Division awards two endowed scholarships (one to an undergraduate student and one to a CSP student) and a third that is jointly funded by HESA and several other offices on campus. All students enrolled in the CSP program must secure an approved internship prior to admission to the program. The University provides tuition scholarships for these students and stipends are funded by the Office of Residence Life, the Graduate College, and area cooperating colleges. During 2003-04, funding for internships from the nine area cooperating colleges totaled $175,417 in direct payments to students and $115,000 in in-kind payments (i.e., room, board, and benefits). The amounts for 2002-03 were slightly less. Full-time students in the doctoral program are supported through tuition scholarships and internship stipends funded by the University or external grants.
During the review period, three faculty members secured external funding totaling $71,404. A HESA faculty member was PI for $44,400 of this amount.

Self evaluation

Faculty quality and productivity. In surveys of student affairs practitioners, students, and faculty, as reported by scholars at the 2000 and 2004 meetings of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, the CSP master’s program was rated first in the nation. (For faculty productivity, see section on the doctoral program below.)

Student entry attributes. Students in both programs come from many different institutions and have considerable full- and part-time work experience in higher education and other employment areas. The self study evaluates the institutions from which they come as “excellent.” Their GPAs are also rated “excellent” (the CSP average is typically in the 3.4-3.5 range and the HIED average graduate GPA is 3.7). It rates the GRE scores as “solid.”

Assessment of student learning outcomes. HESA has outlined learning outcomes for both programs. Multiple assessment measures are used to evaluate progress in meeting identified outcomes; outcome assessment data are used to guide program planning.

Curriculum, instruction, and support services. (No evaluation provided.)

Service. (No evaluation provided.)

Comparative advantage and program distinctiveness. The two HESA graduate programs recruit from a national applicant pool and bring able students to the University. HESA’s close working relationship with the many offices on campus that provide experiential internship learning experiences results in a synergy that greatly benefits the Division, the areas, the graduate students interns, and the constituencies served by the offices in which they work.

Demand. Faculty resources are adequate for meeting instructional demand. With the exception of CSP 604 (average enrollment of 18), class size is kept small (average of 8-10 per seminar class.

Graduates of the CSP program are highly sought after by colleges and universities across the nation and internationally. For the years 2001 to 2004, 91% of all CSP graduates secured employment by the fall following graduation and 95% of these were employed in higher education.

Connection to the mission. HESA contributes to the goal of becoming a premier learning community by offering two nationally recognized graduate programs in which
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faculty engage in scholarship of the highest quality. Teaching and learning is intertwined with both research and service. Both programs strive with considerable success to develop a true community of scholars. HESA students serve the University directly through their internships as well as through many volunteer roles. Faculty also contribute through numerous activities and service roles.

Financial considerations and adequacy of resources. Faculty resources appear adequate in that the Division incurs little if any part-time teaching expenses. Where adjunct faculty members are used, they are mostly full-time university administrators who teach in the program as part of their administrative load.

In the past, graduate assistantships for the doctoral program have been adequate. However, over the last two years, because of a decline in the number of doctoral students, some assistantship funds have been claimed by the Graduate College and the College of Education and Human Development. The program seeks to rebuild its full-time enrollment; the availability of assistantship support will be an issue as progress is made in this direction.

Doctoral programs

Program Faculty. The self study reports that for the last two years, the HIED program consisted of eight faculty housed in HESA, plus five faculty who have their primary assignments in other areas (School of Teaching and Learning [1], Division of Educational Foundations and Inquiry [2], College of Technology [1], and Office of Institutional Research [1]).

A total of 48 work products (refereed journal articles, books, book chapters, and proceedings) were produced by the HESA tenured and tenure-track faculty over the last two years. This is an average of about three scholarly works per faculty member per year. During the same period 80 presentations were made at state, regional, national, and international venues. The focus of faculty scholarship is on college students; student learning, growth and development; and campus environments. There is a heavy emphasis on working with students outside the classroom. Faculty members are also heavily involved in service activities on campus and, most notably, in professional organizations.

In surveys of student affairs practitioners, students, and faculty, the HIED program was ranked second in the 2000 survey and third in 2004, as reported by scholars at the 2000 and 2004 meetings of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators,

Program Graduates. Program graduates do well in the job market and think highly of their experience at Bowling Green. Since its inception in 1990, 90 students have received the Ph.D. Eighty-five of these graduates have remained in contact with the program and all are successfully employed. Six are employed outside of academia, while the remaining 79 are work in higher education. The three largest employment areas are student affairs administration (30), academic affairs administration (21), and faculty (22).
Program Vitality. The program faculty meets regularly to review student service policies and curricular needs. Over the last two years the curriculum has been modified to provide students with more flexibility. The program is integrated with several themes in the University’s Academic Plan: Leadership in Learning, Critical Thinking About Values, and Understanding Cultures and Nations. In addition, both faculty and students contribute in many important ways to the life of the community. They serve on a wide variety of committees and, perhaps most significantly, work on many academic and student affairs initiatives. The relationship between HIED and Student Affairs is both collegial and mutually beneficial.

Program Demand. The focus on building a cohort of full-time students from around the nation makes recruitment especially challenging. This has resulted in some uneven numbers of students choosing to attend full-time over the last five years. In response to recommendations from a consultant, mass mailings to approximately 1500 prospects have been sent out each of the last two years. While these mailings did not immediately produce a significant increase in applications, it is hoped that they have sown the seeds of interest in a number of potential applicants. Although the program’s reputation with prospective students appears to be strong, the competition for good students, the [amount of] the graduate assistantship stipends available to them, and the [very limited] funded research opportunities afforded them, present significant challenges and remain a focus of planning efforts. The program remains committed to its emphasis on full-time study in the belief that this is the most effective way of educating future leaders.

Program Interactions. Several faculty members have engaged in collaborative scholarship with colleagues at other universities or with each other. Faculty members are also very active in professional associations and have made important contributions in these venues. They are equally active on campus. They serve in a number of administrative capacities and on important committees and task forces. However, it is the contributions of doctoral [and master’s students] that is most impressive. Many major events on the Bowling Green campus, and almost all graduate student organization and most undergraduate organizations are touched by HIED or CSP graduate students.

Program Access. Since its inception, the program has been quite successful in this regard. Twenty-seven percent of the students enrolled have been minorities, with African Americans constituting the largest (20% of the total). Eight percent have been international students although there has been a decline in this group since 9/11.

In 1995 all twelve members of the faculty were white and eight of the twelve were female. Since that time, as part of its efforts to diversify, three faculty members of color have been associated with the program. However, only one of these turned into a continuing relationship. For each of the last three years, the program has conducted a search targeted at recently-graduated African Americans. The most recent of these
searches was successful and an African-American female will be joining the faculty in fall 2005.

**Student Outcomes Assessment.** Eight learning outcomes have been established for the program. Multiple assessment measures are used to evaluate each student’s progress in meeting these outcomes; outcome assessment data are used to guide program planning.

**Program Revisions from Previous Reviews.** This is the first time the unit is undergoing program review.

**Unit planning (next 7 years)**

*The planning process.* On-going planning for HESA includes regular planning retreats (the last held in May 2003) and planning time incorporated in bi-weekly Division meetings. The faculty as a whole (both HESA core faculty and the HIED program faculty) are involved in all planning activities.

*Goals and strategies.* Goals and strategies have been established for the Division, and for each of its programs. The goals are as follows:

**HESA**

• Maintain faculty viability. Within the next seven years three to four members of the faculty could retire. A plan is needed to provide both the timely replacement of faculty and an orderly transition.
• Increase extramural funding.
• Explore the feasibility of developing a research center. It is projected that such an entity would support faculty research and help increase external funding.

**CSP**

• Meet the obligation to offer core courses while offering a rich array of electives. More effective use of higher education and student affairs administrators at BGSU and cooperating colleges could free up regular faculty to teach more elective courses.
• Internationalize professional development. This could occur both by expanding study/internship abroad opportunities for students and faculty as well as by expanding the CSP program to meet the needs of student affairs practitioners in other countries.
• Develop alternative delivery methods, particularly distance learning technologies.
• Maintain optimum enrollment levels while enhancing the diversity in the program (especially racial and ethnic diversity).
• Explore alternative assessment strategies.
• Revitalize the Adult Learner Focus program.

**HIED**

• Meet optimum enrollment levels (10 full-time and 3-5 part-time students per incoming class).
• Secure adequate assistantship support for scholarship. (All assistantship opportunities for students to date have been in office settings.) This goal is contingent on securing an increase in external funding.
• Explore alternative delivery methods. One possibility here would be an Executive HIED program employed professionals can complete while retaining their positions.

Timetable and implementation plan. The self study presents a very well-developed time-table and implementation plan for these goals.

Relationship to the Academic Plan. The CSP master’s program and HIED doctoral program are very much in line with the University’s goal of being a premier learning community. Their reputation and quality contribute to that of the University. Intellectual engagement and active participation lie at the heart of the learning process for students. The program and its faculty place a significant emphasis on values in their teaching, research, and service in keeping with the University’s emphasis on critical thinking about values. The HIED global understanding requirement, and the goal of internationalizing the professional development of students in the CSP program, reflect the importance of understanding cultures and nations. Finally, the goals of exploring alternative delivery systems, and the conversion of the comprehensive examination into an electronic portfolio to better assess students’ knowledge and competencies, reflects the importance of embracing new media and technologies. In addition, interaction of faculty and students within the University and among the nine cooperating colleges represents a significant economic labor impact on the institutions involved; it also is evidence that the scholarship of engagement, which is being advocated by the leadership of the University.

RESULTS OF PREVIOUS REVIEWS

This is the first time the unit is undergoing program review.

SUMMARY OF THE EXTERNAL REPORT

The external report offers high praise for the HESA faculty, students and programs.

Commendations

• HESA faculty are highly productive scholars whose work is widely used by others. Each has a strong institutional, regional, and national reputation. They maintain a good balance among teaching, scholarship, and service and provide leadership and service for many professional organizations and within the university community. There is an appropriate mix of junior and experienced faculty.
• The CSP program is at least one of the top three in the country if not the best. There is a lot of student contact justifying its reputation as being a “high touch” program. The quality and diversity of the students is excellent as one would expect from a program with such strong recruitment and placement records.
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- “The HIED doctoral program was on its way to a very good national image and reputation until it was somewhat derailed by the departure of two very prominent members within a short period” (External Report, p.3).
- The programs are held in the highest regard by the administrators interviewed.
- “The quality of the faculty effort in these two programs across the board, and the activity of the students that are attracted by the program, change the BGSU environment in campus for the better in dramatic ways” External Report, p.3).

Issues and Observations

- “The CSP program is an administrative and academic juggernaut. It sucks up enormous energy and resources, including clerical help and faculty time if it is done properly, which it manifestly is at BGSU. Of course, this is as it should be—quality does not come cheaply, in terms of dollars and other resources. On the other hand, the HIED program may not “recover” or perhaps even survive with the current level of administrative attention. There needs to be some funding for a Coordinator of that program to attend to recruiting and other details attendant to such an important effort. Being mindful of the fiscal climate, this could be a course release per semester, with less of the traditional summer release money entailed” (External Report, pp. 6-7).
- “The HIED doctoral program is bucking a powerful tide in attempting to maintain its configuration of mostly full time doctoral students. Most other programs, other than the preeminent research universities with major grant funding, enroll mostly part-time students. Recruiting full-time students requires significant and targeted efforts at marketing and recruiting. The recent decision to eliminate the program coordinator position is unlikely to help” (External Report, p. 7).
- “The HIED program would benefit from re-focusing its image and ethos to more of a student affairs administration and research orientation. However, it would be dangerous to tamper with the overall degree designation as a “higher education” doctorate, because that is where the rest of the market is nationally. Rather, they should bill themselves (and, indeed, be) a higher education administration program with renowned and acknowledged student affairs expertise and emphasis. This can be done, but will require marketing resources, time, travel, and energy” (External Report, p. 7).
- Students desire more opportunities to participate with faculty in research, conference presentations, and articles/chapters. Faculty are urged to give this serious consideration.
- “There is an eagerness to help the HESA programs (and those of the entire School) across the campus. Other offices outside of the College are willing to help with recruiting, actively prospecting for grants and contracts, and providing more assistantships and/or fellowships in creative ways. These kinds of partnerships will be crucial to the survival of the doctoral program but, again, require significant administrative attention” (External Report, p 7).
1. Overall Program Quality

Findings. The HESA faculty are highly productive scholars who make important contributions to their disciplines and effectively integrate teaching, research, and service. Their work is widely used by their peers. They spend a lot of time with their students and make important contributions to professional associations and the life of the university community. The CSP master’s program is arguably the best of its type in the country. Although the HIED doctoral program has encountered recent difficulties, it is still regarded as a very strong program as well.

Recommendation. The Committee congratulates the faculty on their accomplishments. Despite the challenges facing the doctoral program, the HESA track record is excellent. The Committee encourages the faculty to keep up and improve on their good work, and to attend to the findings and recommendations below, so that the Division and its programs will be even stronger 5-7 years from now than it is today.

2. The Future of the Higher Education Doctoral Program

Findings. The doctoral program has achieved remarkable success since its inception approximately 15 years ago. This is partly due to the excellence of the foundation (the CSP master’s program) upon which it was built and partly due to the inspired leadership of its faculty. However, recent years have seen the departure of two key faculty and a national movement away from full-time higher education programs. There has also been a reduction in the administrative time allocated to the program. These factors led the external consultants to conclude “the HIED program may not ‘recover’ or perhaps even survive with the current level of administrative attention” (External Report, p. 7). The Committee shares these concerns.

The Division’s commitment to a doctoral program enrolling more full-time than part-time students is laudable. However, the external consultants are not sure that it is practicable. The Division recognizes that securing external funds to support some research assistantships (see the point three below) would be an asset in the recruitment of full-time students. This seems right. Again, however, it does not guarantee success.

Recommendation. The HIED program should continue its efforts to recruit full-time doctoral students and report annually to the Dean of Education and Human Development and the Graduate Dean. In addition, the Division should prepare a back-up plan for maintaining strong enrollments by recruiting more and more part-time students in the event that the anticipated full-time enrollments do not materialize. This plan should be submitted to the two deans for review and approval no later than May 2006.
3. External Funding

Findings. Given the strength of the HESA faculty and its two programs, one would expect a significant level of external research support. This is not the case. The faculty seem to recognize this by making “increasing extramural funding” their second goal for the Division (HESA, p. 20). Correlative to this, the HIED program lists “secure adequate assistantship support for scholarship” as its second goal as well (HESA, p. 22). The latter should be contingent upon the former.

However, the discussion of HESA’s third goal (“explore the feasibility of developing a research center,” HESA, p. 21) appears to reflect a “build it and they will come” view. That is, a research center should be created and the external funding will follow. This is not the view of the Committee. Although it may be appropriate for a little seed money to be invested up front to get things going, the creation of a center should await the receipt of one or two major awards. With these in hand as a track record, a center could then be used to leverage additional awards. Given that what is now HESA had its origins with faculty trained in sociology and psychology, that there appear to be many connections between the work done in these disciplines and that of the HESA faculty, and that there are a good number of colleagues in sociology and psychology with strong records of external research support, joint proposals could be an excellent way for HESA to make the strides that would warrant the creation of a research center.

Recommendation. HESA should work with the Director of Sponsored Programs and Research to develop a plan for dramatically increasing the number of external grant submissions over the next three years. In the course of developing this plan, the possibility of joint submissions with faculty in other departments (e.g., sociology and psychology) should be vigorously explored. This plan should be submitted to the Dean of Education and Human Development and the Vice Provost for Research for review and approval no later than January 2006.

The Division of Higher Education and Student Affairs should report annually to the Director of the School and the Dean of the College of Education and Human Development, with a copy to the Provost, on the implementation of these recommendations.
SCHOOL OF LEADERSHIP AND POLICY STUDIES

SUMMARY OF THE SELF STUDY

The School was created as the result of a reconfiguration initiative in 1997-98. As originally implemented, one school and six departments were consolidated into four schools. What were previously three separate departments (EALS, HESA, and EDFI) were put together into the School of Leadership and Policy Studies. As things now stand, there are five schools with three of the schools representing former departments and the other school having the same configuration as before the initial reconfiguration. The only school that has had to combine previously free-standing departments and otherwise change its operations is the School of Leadership and Policy Studies.

Although the directorship has taken various forms, and there has been a change from program area to division status during this brief history, governance within the School has always been based on a decentralized approach that has respected the unique missions of the programs/divisions. In spring 2001, after the search for a director ended in failure, the School faculty voted 15-0 (with one abstention) to disband the School with each unit becoming a free-standing department. Action on this vote was delayed until the appointment of a new dean. After this appointment at the start of the 2003-04 fiscal year each of the three units in the School again voted to return to department status. After consulting individually with the faculty, the Dean determined that the School could be a viable academic unit. The five program areas were collapsed into three divisions with the same missions and names as the original three departments.

The mission of the School of Leadership and Policy Studies is to prepare educators to assume leadership roles in formulating administrative policy and improving practice at all levels of education and in agencies outside of formal educational settings. However, within this general framework the missions of the three divisions are distinct and diverse. EALS and HESA have sustained separate core curricula because of the importance of contextual learning to the professional preparation of both disciplines. Each has also taken on the responsibility for recruiting, admitting, orienting, and advising their graduate students. Vital to the educational quality of both programs are the formed partnerships that allow students to meet the very different field experience requirements of the programs.

The programs also attract very different students. EALS has a regional focus that is vital to developing administrative leadership in area schools, health agencies, and non-profit agencies. It must meet the licensure requirements in the certification of principals and superintendents in the state of Ohio. Most the students are from the region, enroll part-time and many are not degree seeking. In contrast, the HESA programs (CSP and HIED) focus on attracting degree seeking, full-time students from across the nation as well as from other countries. The focus is on developing administrative leaders in higher education in general, and the student affairs area in particular. EDFI currently has no degree program. It three foundational curricular areas of responsibility are educational psychology; history of education, philosophy of education, and comparative education;
and assessment, research, and statistics. Most of the credit hours generated (in 2003-04 85% of the 8300 SCHs) are at the undergraduate level.

This aspect of the self study concludes with a set of questions for the reviewers.

- What governance structure(s) can best address the distinctive requirements of mission found in the three divisions while meeting the need for administrative efficiency?
- Are there curricular requirements found within the separate graduate programs that can be shared in order to save instructional costs?
- What is the proper goal for revenue generation in doctoral programs at an institution such as Bowling Green State University?
- What percentage of unit funding should be expected to be generated through continuing education, grants and contracts, and fund raising activities?
- Can the curricular requirements to support undergraduate teacher education be sustained within the context of an increased emphasis on graduate programs?
- Should there be a differentiation across the disciplines with respect to workload expectations of teaching, research, and service within the School of Leadership and Policy Studies?
- Do the requirements of graduate programs, particularly at the doctoral level, warrant appropriation of administrative and secretarial support within EALS and HESA at a lower faculty-staff ratio than other academic units?
- What functions currently housed within the divisions can be more effectively and efficiently conducted at the school level?

**Summary of the External Report**

More than one third of the external consultants’ report (pp. 7-11) focuses on the issue of the viability of the School of Leadership and Policy Studies. Because of the contentious nature of both this issue and the consultants’ recommendations, this section of their report is reproduced verbatim (with some passages omitted) rather than summarized. In order to avoid the repetitious use of quotation marks, italic font is used to indicate this fact.

**LPS as a School**

1. The administrative structure issue should be dealt with, finally, fairly, and firmly, as soon as practicable. This has dragged on in some fashion or another for over six years and it is corrosive to morale and an energy sink of mammoth proportions. . . .

   Any solution must include provisions for reasonable autonomy for program faculty (all programs in the school) in admissions, student recruiting, faculty recruiting and hiring, tenure and promotion recommendations, and, of course, curriculum.

2. The Dean appears to be somewhat exasperated with the school faculty, especially the HESA faculty, and the feeling seems to be mutual. From the outside, it appears that this is quite simply due to a lack of communication, since all parties seem to want
approximately the same things—successful programs, good student experiences, quality scholarship, and good work climate. Curiously, all of these are present except the latter, which may threaten the others.

3. Given the structure of the College of Education and Human Development, it would seem likely that there is some strength in numbers, not to mention administrative economies of scale. This suggests that independent groupings of 7-12 faculty members would be sub-optimal. Specifically, such small units should not expect an equal seat at the table with other units of 40 or more, despite reputation or history.

4. There are commonalities among the three current units. Two of the EDFI faculty are HIED faculty officially and others teach research methods courses that are required for HESA students. EALS has a leadership program that has marked similarities in portions of the curriculum to the HIED program. The EALS program even admits part-time students with an aim toward higher education administration.

5. Team observations would suggest that each LPS unit desires to work for the overall effectiveness and efficiency of the Division programs. However, each division has been unable to relinquish embedded beliefs relative to organizational control and move on to mend fences for the larger good of the School and College. This has been slowed even more by a perception of a lack of effective dean-level leadership in this area. It seems that what is at issue is a lack of communication and trust.

6. It is clear from discussions with all involved that the School structure is going to exist for the foreseeable future. Given that, the current three divisions need to get on board with continuing as a unit. They will be seriously disadvantaged as Departments or if merged with other Schools. Each of the divisions will need a either an Associate Director or Coordinators for each academic program (and one for EDFI to handle scheduling, etc.) and all of the autonomy to which we earlier referred. However, other resources, including administrative assistants and operating budgets need to be consolidated for two reasons. First, only this level of merger will signal the end of the controversy and the need to go forward. Second, the resulting economies of scale and efficient centralization of things like clerical tracking of admissions and progress toward graduation, purchasing, travel, etc. will go far to dispel any lingering doubts about the efficacy of a true school. It won’t take long until faculty will understand that the School Director works for all, not just his or her program. The real decision-making about personnel, student, and curricular matters resides in the faculty at the program level. What happens at the School level should be more managerial and routinized. It may be that there is a need for faculty “oversight” committees early on, such as a School Budget Committee.

7. The School and each division need to collect and keep collecting more and better data. As stated above, such administrative tasks require resources and centralization.

8. There is a need for strong, trusted leadership among all three groups. Each division has its own history of being mistreated and misunderstood (from its own perspective).
Hence, each will need to be able to trust the integrity of the leader of a reconstituted and administratively stronger school. . . .

9. While the self-study procedure of separate reports for each division, with only a cursory (while illuminating) introduction and conclusion, was effective for the purposes of this review, it is clearly inadequate for strategic planning, since it does not allow true School goals and objectives that would benefit from economies of scale and other synergies. We find the division plans to be adequate, as far as they go. Each relies heavily on an assumption of independence of the units and this reliance colors the plans in large and small ways.

Recommendations

1. We recommend that LPS be retained as a School within the College of Education and Human Development, but with a consciously “federal” organizational structure. That is, the School should have a single director, a centralized budget process, a common (as far as possible and practical) faculty evaluation plan, common physical space, centrally-coordinated clerical assistance, and coordinated admissions and other administrative processes, while retaining the identity of individual programs, some compensated administrative attention for each doctoral program, and decentralized admissions, curricular decision-making, promotion/tenure recommendations, and hiring recommendations, administered by Associate Directors or by Coordinators of the various programs. This will enable the synergies that already exist among LPS programs to develop more fully and also allow the School to take advantage of various economies of scale.

There are two important caveats that accompany this recommendation. 1) The director of the school should be chosen in a way that is satisfactory to and reflective of input from each division and the Dean. . . . 2) While graduate program coordinators and/or Associate Directors should be compensated, we make no specific recommendation about the form or level of that compensation. Such compensation should be based on program size, complexity, etc. Summer contracts, travel funds and other compensation should be considered in addition to release time.

2. We recommend that the LPS faculty engage in a significant, explicit relationship-building effort that focuses on both a) communication within the school, and b) communication with the Office of the Dean. This effort should recognize and value the distinctive contributions and interests of each program and faculty member to the whole, as well as actively identify present common interests and potential synergies between and among programs. We further recommend that Dean Cruz both support and actively participate in this effort.

There are two potential approaches to such an effort. The first approach is to have School faculty take the lead in this effort. The second approach is simply to hire an outside consultant to lead a relationship building and conflict resolution effort. We strongly recommend the former (especially that the process be led internally), but we concede that a combination of both may be effective.
We note with some irony, that faculty members in EALS, EDFI and HESA are themselves expert in areas directly related to human and intra-institutional communication. . . . We recommend that Dean Cruz provide resources to compensate faculty coordinators of such an effort, to make possible one or more faculty retreats, and to provide incentives (such as professional development funds) to individual faculty members to participate fully in this effort.

3. We recommend that Dean Cruz exert positive, open, responsive leadership to help the School heal any real or perceived rift between and among its faculty and the administration of the College. We note that the faculty of the School seem to be on good terms with the other Schools in the College, with other aspects and offices of the University, and with external constituencies. This leads us to the conclusion that conflicts with the administration of the College are situation-specific and/or idiosyncratic and, as such, can be remedied relatively quickly in the presence of motivation and sincerity on all sides.

4. One of the challenges facing the School of LPS, EDHD, and the university in the short to intermediate term is locating and securing funds to support and supplement academic excellence, research, service, and training activities. These funds will increasingly need to come from sources external to the traditional state-oriented processes. LPS faculty, with their doctoral programs, their excellent reputations, and their high national profile and awareness, are critical to this effort. The sooner internecine problems are dealt with, the sooner this important work can take center stage.

Conclusion

We are impressed with the quality of the LPS programs and faculty. Simply put, while there are issues in the School, the College, and the University that are serious and vexing, many other places would gladly take the problems if they could have such good programs [emphasis added].

PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Future of the School of Leadership and Policy Studies

Findings. This is a complex issue because EALS and HESA, each with master’s and doctoral programs, want to be autonomous departments within the College, and EDFI, that has no degree program, wants to be housed within a school or to become a school. EALS, HESA, and EDFI have distinctively different missions, serve different student populations, have different core curricula, require different field experiences, and produce different research outcomes. The external consultants recommend retention of the current arrangement with a “federal” organizational structure, which they argued would allow for economies of scale and synergies while still retaining a high level of divisional identity and autonomy.
On the one hand, the units have each shown the ability to build strong academic programs with distinctly different missions, student populations, core curricula, field experiences, and research outcomes. These units have functioned effectively as autonomous departments, each with a finely honed identity and with a clearly articulated mission. Each of these programs makes a particular contribution to the University’s mission. Any administrative structure or approach to organizational management must protect, preserve, and support the existing academic successes of the students and faculty within these units.

On the other hand, the University may need to streamline its processes in order to conserve its resources. The school structure has been tried as a way of conserving resources by eliminating chairs and replacing them with division heads and by eliminating secretaries and consolidating job responsibilities such as management of the consolidated operational budget. Whereas the “federal” structure suggested by the external consultants may result in a streamlining of administrative processes, it would likely result in a decrease in power and authority within each of the academic units and special care would have to be taken to ensure that the significant contributions each division makes to the College and University is neither compromised nor diluted.

There are also administrative advantages to a college with a uniform rather than a mixed structure. A combination of large schools and small departments (as presumably would be the case if the School of Leadership and Policy Studies were replaced by three independent departments), presents the challenge of ensuring that the smaller units are neither unfairly advantaged nor disadvantaged in the allocation of resources and the service commitments to the College. However, there certainly are ways in which such arrangements can be made to work.

Because it has been festering so long, a constructive resolution of this issue will be harder to achieve than might normally be the case. It will require dynamic and creative leadership and as well as good will on all sides. A way must be found to get everyone on the same page (regardless of what that page is) and working for the betterment of all (students, faculty, and college) within the resultant framework. Moreover, time is of the essence because every month that passes is one filled with uncertainty and contentiousness that siphons off more and more energy from the tasks of furthering knowledge, educating students, and bettering the community.

**Recommendation.** Effective and constructive closure must be brought to this issue by the end of fall semester, 2005. One way of doing this would be to seek an evaluation of the current organizational system by reputable organizational systems analysts (i.e., organizational management specialists who have experience in academic settings). Following their analysis of the situation, the external consultants would propose an organizational structure that can achieve cost savings without jeopardizing academic excellence. Regardless of how it is done, the Dean and the faculty need to forge an effective working relationship within an organizational structure that is efficient and effective without jeopardizing program quality.
2. Questions the Reviewers Did Not Address

*Findings.* As indicated above, the self study contained the following questions of a school-wide nature for the external consultants:

- What governance structure(s) can best address the distinctive requirements of mission found in the three divisions while meeting the need for administrative efficiency?
- Are there curricular requirements found within the separate graduate programs that can be shared in order to save instructional costs?
- What is the proper goal for revenue generation in doctoral programs at an institution such as Bowling Green State University?
- What percentage of unit funding should be expected to be generated through continuing education, grants and contracts, and fund raising activities?
- Can the curricular requirements to support undergraduate teacher education be sustained within the context of an increased emphasis upon graduate programs?
- Should there be a differentiation across the disciplines with respect to workload expectations of teaching, research and service within the School of Leadership and Policy Studies?
- Do the requirements of graduate programs, particularly at the doctoral level, warrant appropriation of administrative and secretarial support within EALS and HESA at a lower faculty-staff ratio than other academic units?
- What functions currently housed within the divisions can be more effectively and efficiently conducted at the school level?

Given both the overall structure of the self study, and the contentiousness of the issue of school status, it is not surprising that the external consultants only addressed the first question in their report. However, the others are important issues that do need to be addressed.

*Recommendation.* Once closure is brought to the issue of school status, a mechanism should be created to get external input on the other questions as they apply within the structure that is in place. Recommended completion date: January 2007.