

**Review and Redirection Task Force (January 28, 2004)  
Educational Administration & Policy Studies Report**

**Report from the Subcommittee on Quality and Centrality of Instruction**

**Quality of Instruction**

The data that we have acquired here are very scanty.

1. **Number of Applicants, etc.:** No information available
2. **GPA and GRE Scores.** Although we were given a list of “GRE Profiles by Program Area,” we were urged by the program members to ignore the profiles because of their limited usefulness in predicting success in this program. Here, however, is a summary of the information that we were provided. Please note that these figures represent the means for 7 years of data. (Also note that we have not verified these figures)

<b>Program</b>	<b>GRE Verbal</b>	<b>GRE Quantitative</b>	<b>GRE Analytical</b>
CSP	459.6	516.4	571.4
Ed Admin & Superv	483.7	500.4	477.1
Higher Ed	486.7	508.4	524.7

3. **Grad student funding.** The unit has only one GTA. In their presentation, it was brought to our attention that it is difficult to recruit nationally without having funding for the students admitted.
  - a. Professors Brewer and Petty hire students from their grants, but it was not made clear where these students came from (which program).
  - b. Some percentage of the students work full time and take classes as they can.
  - c. All or a large percentage of the students in CSP work on campus as part of their training.
4. **Grad student research:** Two graduate students will give presentations at an important meeting in the spring. In its new strategic plan, the unit proposes to increase the “professionalization” of graduate students by placing greater emphasis on research, presentation, and publications.

**Centrality of Instruction**

1. **Relation to other programs and units:** It was the opinion of the task force that this unit was isolated not only from other units within the university but also from other units within its college.
2. **Loss to university.** According to the figures provided by the unit, the university would lose tuition and fees and suffer a net decline in the number of graduate degrees conferred if this program were to be eliminated.
  - a. It is worth noting that under the unit’s own new strategic plan, there would be also be a loss of tuition and a decrease in degrees offered as the unit eliminates the Ed.D. and raises its admissions standards. The unit did not provide a comparative impact statement for the new strategic plan.
3. **Effect on community:** If many of those currently enrolled in the Ed Admin and Supervision program are local educators seeking a practicum-based terminal degree (Ed.D.), then the elimination of that program would end their opportunity to get the degree here. The same will be true with the elimination of the Ed.D. and Ph.D. in the Higher Education Administration Program.

## Importance of Program

1. We have no evidence from which to judge whether this unit has a national reputation. We received two letters – the same that everyone received – praising the program. We were also given a list of prominent people who have received doctorates from the program. (Many of those prominent alumni, however, received their degrees from the Higher Education Administration program, which is to be discontinued under the unit's own new strategic plan.)
2. If this unit were to be eliminated as an administrative department, it is not clear what kinds of losses to the coherence of the program would be sustained. If the programs were eliminated, however, there is no question that we would no longer be able to provide degrees in what seems to be an important area.
  - a. Because of the scarcity of data, however, it was impossible for us to gauge what the doctoral students in this program are working on (administration, policy studies, etc.)

## Summary

1. The revised strategic plan submitted by the department proposes a streamlined unit, one that offers a 'seamless' M.A. / Ph.D. in Educational Administration and Policy Studies. At the public hearing, however, it was not made clear whether this plan was the result of a consensus. Moreover, the strategic plan leaves unanswered the following questions:
  - a. The new Ph.D. requires 81 hours as projected. The old doctorate required 48. How will this change affect applications to the program?
  - b. According to the plan, the program will go from having about 40 doctoral students to about 6 to 12. How will this change in enrollment affect the staffing needs and assignments in the department?
2. The proposed elimination of the Higher Education concentration by the present department suggests that the unit as it is now comprised is not unified conceptually. The rubric *Leadership* seems to be unable to band together Higher Ed and Ed Admin. To what degree the elimination of the Higher Ed concentration fixes this apparent problem is also not clear because no plans have been made for hiring priorities in the years ahead.
3. The unit did not explain why it should continue to exist as a unit (rather than be absorbed into other units.)

## Report from the Sub-Committee on the Quality and Centrality of Research

1. The Department has proposed educational administration in K-12 as its focus for the future. Research in this area shows promise for continuing enhancement and growth. Anfara is establishing a research program, with a publication record and national visibility, in middle school administration. Ubben's work with Bill Sanders' data and performance assessment model is another plus. Sanders' work is well known and access to the database at UT can provide a rich source for research in the future.
2. The faculty acknowledge that, in general, they have not done a good job of incorporating externally funded research projects into teaching and student research. Brewer's grants, while substantial, are service/practice, and have only been peripherally connected to the academic program. There is opportunity to strengthen the connection and the research component by concentrating on assessment of the success of the pre-college preparation that is the focus of these grants. This, and Brewer's grant-writing expertise, could complement the emphasis on educational administration.
3. Our committee feels that the faculty, with their new direction, could benefit from a closer association with the Institute for Assessment and Evaluation (IAE). The Institute has a record of funding and research in the area of evaluation that fits neatly with the accountability focus within the proposed program.

4. The higher ed piece is more problematic, and perhaps the source of some division and confusion - whether abandoning this component is due to pressure or whether the majority of the faculty feel the new focus without higher ed administration is a wise and prudent course. The loss of doctoral students should the higher ed concentration be eliminated should be considered. Of consideration too however is the scholarship productivity in this area. As Bogue stated, he is the only active scholar in higher ed administration (the loss of 2 faculty lines is of course a factor here - but it should be remembered that 2 lines, identified at the time as higher ed administration, were acquired from HRD when Education and Human Ecology merged).
5. The College Student Personnel degree seems to be a needed (only one in the state) and quality program. It is however a practice program with no formal research component.
6. The Department has made a case for a "program" in educational administration. They appear to be committed to this new focus and there is sufficient faculty power to achieve some prominence. The thought given to stressing accountability, social justice, and moral/ethical leadership is notable and this emphasis should give the program a measure of distinction. It also opens up possibilities of collaboration with researchers looking at these issues through other disciplinary lenses.
7. The Department acknowledges that ed administration in K-12 should be closely tied to teacher education and licensure. This might argue for the faculty engaged in educational administration to become part of Theory and Practice in Teacher Education. The issue of a Ph.D. vs. an Ed.D. should be considered, with a realization of the research demands of the former.

### **Report from the Sub-Committee on the Quality, Centrality and Importance of Service and the Role in meeting Societal Needs**

1. Service Record Outlined according to the UT Academic Program Review Self Study Document (Appendix A):
  - a. Centrality of the program to university (service) mission (p.10)
    - i. Nature and Quality of service to the university, discipline, region and nation.  
The College Student Personnel Master's Degree Program provides service to the university as an apprenticeship opportunity in service areas of the university (admissions, advising, development, etc.) Whether this program belongs in EAPS is open for consideration.
    - ii. Interrelationship of public service with research and other aspects of the program.  
The presentation document distributed on January 8, 2004 makes the case that the EAPS Department has a century-long history at UT that has resulted in "the range of school./college leaders and faculty across the state and nation." Public benefit from research is not manifested in the work of all the faculty members in the department. The service benefit from instruction may be harder to measure, as it would be reflected in the work of public school administrators who are graduates of the program. Commissioner Sievers of the Dept. of Education is the only person we received a letter from that made a case for the value of the program in relation to K-12 education.
  - b. Quality of Outreach and (Community) Service (p.11)  
A limited number of faculty vitas show a strong relationship between research and outreach/service. In most cases the relationship between research or teaching and service to

the state is not fully manifested. The November 25, 2003 Strategic Plan Addendum proposed very limited service benefits for the department. The only tangible benchmarks they propose are to host a Summer Institute for Middle School Administrators within the next 30 months (p. 9).

2. Accreditation Standards for National Associations or Professional Organizations in the Discipline and the extent to which the program fulfills these.

From our inquiry, neither the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education ([www.ncate.org](http://www.ncate.org)) nor the University Council for Educational Administration ([www.ucea.org](http://www.ucea.org)) do not appear to have a set of standards for service. The emphasis of these organizations is on curriculum and research, with service outcomes being intrinsic to both of these activities.

3. Service Record as Measured by Public Sector or non-Profit Clients commenting on the contributions of the program.

The Task Force only received letters from Nissa Dahlin-Brown of the Baker Center for Public Policy and Sharon Tanner, an administrator at Roane State Community College. Both letters defended the EAPS curriculum rather than the public service benefit value of the program.

4. Service Record as evidenced by Faculty Vitas

Faculty Vitas provided for review show levels and areas of service vary widely among the faculty. On the whole, there appears to be the greatest level of service activity to the profession with a few faculty serving on advisory and editorial boards. Levels of public and university service vary significantly among the faculty. On the whole, levels of activity over the past five years are limited for a faculty of this size.

5. Additional Data on Service to the nation, state, region and university.

No additional data were provided by the department other than materials described above.