The substantive review presented to the faculty of the School of Leadership and Policy Studies on May 3, 2005 by the Internal Review Committee represents an affirmation of the work being accomplished within the three Divisions that currently make up the School. In addition, the External Reviewers’ Report was laudatory of the efforts being made within each academic program represented within the School as well as the service components used by the College of Education and Human Development.

The following response focuses on the “Recommendations” provided by the Program Review Committee in its review of the individual components of the School. At the end of this response, comments will be offered concerning the structural issues of the School as a whole.

**Response to Recommendations for EALS**

There is no question that the faculty of EALS needs to be expanded if the recommendations made by the Program Review Committee are to be addressed. It is acknowledged that the challenge of meeting off-campus demands at the master’s level and on-campus demands at the doctoral level involves the strategic allocation of existing and future resources.

With regard to the recommendation that an assessment program needs to put into place, it not only is accepted that such a program should be an inherent part of the accountability of the programs housed within EALS, but asserted that such assessment would prove to be beneficial in demonstrating the positive impact these programs are having in Northwest Ohio. The corollary to this recommendation must be the
acknowledgement that such an assessment program requires an allocation of human resources not currently available with EALS.

The final recommendation concerns the need to review “whether or not increased selectivity to, and curricular changes in, the master’s program are in order.” Although it is recognized that admissions selectivity has always been used as a primary indicator of program quality in higher education, it should also be recognized that the provision of professional development and licensure opportunities in the area of educational administration is among the primary missions of EALS. The curriculum itself is largely dictated by the State Department of Education licensure requirements. In short, the University must appreciate that the convenience created through the PCLA cohort programs that has resulted in their growth and popularity with the clientele to be served and the selectivity and curricular changes suggested by the Program Review Committee are not easily reconciled. In addition, high placement rates of EALS graduates further indicate that the program quality and curricular integrity are on par with state requirements, local demand, and University academic standards.

**Response to Recommendations to EDFI**

The faculty of EDFI is pleased by the affirmation of the overall program quality and is greatly encouraged by the reception the Masters of Arts in Cross-Cultural and International Education has received through the review processes conducted so far. It is anticipated that the course of action regarding submission to the Board of Regents will be met before the suggested date of January 2006.

Regarding the recommendation for fair and equitable resolutions to the secretarial and incentive money issues within the School, authorization for the recruitment of a full-
time secretary has been granted and arrangements for sharing of incentive money has progressed in line with the August 2005 recommended completion date. Plans are for there to be a consolidation of budget management within the School of Leadership and Policy Studies during the 2005-2006 fiscal year.

The need for ongoing efforts in the area of faculty grant activity is acknowledged and is anticipated to remain a focal point of sponsored programs and research among faculty within EDFI in the coming years. The implementation of the new master’s program is viewed as integral to such efforts.

**Response to Recommendations to HESA**

The faculty of HESA is gratified by the positive commendations to come out from both the external review team and the Program Review Committee. The faculty members of the current Division accept the challenge of maintaining the viability of the nationally renown graduate programs housed within the Division, but wish to remind any reviewer that such a status has not been easily earned nor will it be easily maintained.

The recommendation to continue the efforts to recruit full-time doctoral students has been taken seriously. Over this past year, more high quality applicants were invited in for Interview Days than in any time in the history of the HIED program. Unfortunately, the competition for these students also appears to have been at an all-time high. The program lost students to Harvard, University of Michigan, University of Maryland, Michigan State, Ohio State and the University of Iowa. In each instance, there is evidence that the program faculty was not only competing against renown Research I universities, but against financial packages in excess of what the program currently offers.
At the same time, it has been recommended that recruiting “more and more part-time students in the event that the anticipated full-time enrollments do not materialize.” Among the eight new doctoral students entering the program this fall, three are doing so on a part-time basis. The challenge remains one of meeting the program quality demands of the full-time students while providing the program convenience desired by the part-time students. Continued efforts will be made to strike the proper balance within the limitations of offering a single program for both constituencies.

The recommendation to “develop a plan for dramatically increasing the number of external grant submissions over the next three years” remains to be accomplished. The need for more external funding is acknowledged and the Division has taken steps to better position itself to seek such funding. The reality is that the Masters of Arts in College Student Personnel aimed at the professional preparation of students entering the field is the dominant program rather than the Higher Education Administration doctoral program that seeks to development of leadership and research capabilities of students wishing to advance the field. The result is difficulty competing against more research-oriented universities for the extremely limited funding in this field. Despite such a context, the need to continue to explore possibilities and the potential of creating partnerships with other universities as well as linking with other departments such as sociology and psychology at this university is acknowledged.

**Response to Recommendations on School Structure**

There is the clear recommendation that “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.” In this spirit, the Acting Director of the
School charged the LPS Resource Planning Team with the task of addressing questions that had been raised through the self-study process and the external review visit. This team was tasked with suggesting an administrative structure that achieves a combination of efficiency and effectiveness, while seeking to achieve support service equity for all components of the School. In addition, it was to review implications of resource allocation scenarios that could impact the University over the next biennial budget. This review was conducted in the spirit of good will and open-mindedness. The result was an illumination of the various functional needs of each division. Nine different structural options were discussed with respect to centralization of administration, distribution of administrative responsibilities, unit structure and cost.

The conclusion was that a departmental structure with three separate units would be most efficient and effective. However, the reality is that such a change would have serious implications for the entire College that were more provocative than the Dean wished to pursue at this time. The idea of recreating a department of Higher Education and Students Affairs while maintaining the School of Leadership and Policy Studies is a compromise designed to help HESA meet the accountabilities inherent to such a designation while attempting to build a sense of cohesion between EDFI and EALS that can lead to a sharing of faculty and administrative resources. HESA has submitted the necessary materials for consideration as a separate department that is projected to be decided during the fall semester. Interim appointments have been named at the School and Division level with the stipulation that efficient and effective administrative processes will be developed over this academic year.
The primary recommendation regarding structure of the School by the Program Planning Committee was “to seek an evaluation of the current organizational system by reputable organizational systems analysts.” This recommendation has been dismissed as being too little, too late. If such a comprehensive study was to be conducted, the time to have done it was within two years after the implementation of the original School reconfiguration as part of an evaluation stipulated by then Provost Middleton and President Ribeau upon their initial approval of the plan. Such an evaluation has never taken place, which helps explain the current level of discontentment within the School of Leadership and Policy Studies. Aside from the timing issue, the need to bring in outside consultants after the Program Review Process has been completed and the Resource Management Team has completed its work seems less than promising.

The leadership of the College of Education and Human Development, the School of Leadership and Policy Studies and the proposed Department of Higher Education and Student Affairs is prepared to move forward in meeting their accountabilities to this University.