

# INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL



**Volume 1 Number 2**  
**January - December 1997**



COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

*Department of Educational Foundations,  
Leadership, and Technology*

Department of Educational Foundations,  
Leadership, and Technology  
College of Education  
Auburn University  
Auburn, Alabama 36849  
334.844.4460

J. R. Llanes, Auburn University

# Evolution, Revolution and Collaboration: Creating New Programs and Paradigms in Doctoral Studies for Educational Leaders

Authors: [Nadyne Guzmán](#) and [Rodney Muth](#)

[University of Colorado at Colorado Springs](#)

---

©Copyright University of Texas–Pan American, 1997.

All rights are reserved by copyright, except that authors retain intellectual property rights to their articles and may re-publish their articles in other publications. The Continuous Improvement Monitor may be reproduced in whole or in part for non-profit use for the purposes of education, research, library reference, or stored or distributed as a public service by any networked computer. Any commercial use of this journal in whole or in part by any means is strictly prohibited without written permission. Any use of this journal in whole or in part, including by authors, should include customary bibliographic citation, including author attribution, date, article title, edition, and electronic retrieval instructions.

Reference as (APA style): Guzman, Nadyne, & and Muth, Rodney. (1997, January-December). Evolution, revolution and collaboration: Creating new programs and paradigms in doctoral studies for educational leaders. *International Journal: Continuous Improvement Monitor*, 1, 2. Edinburg, TX: The University of Texas-Pan American.

Available on the web: <http://lanes.auburn.edu/cimjournal/Vol1/No2/guzman.pdf>

**Editorial Comment:** This article came to our attention at the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration conference in Vail, Colorado. It is about a collaborative doctoral program between two Colorado higher education institutions and a school district. What was interesting to us about the paper was that the program's design provided their student clients an opportunity to significantly alter the method and curricula of the doctoral program and as such represents an excellent example of how the client-led aspects of continuous improvement processes can be made part of the design and re-design of the program of studies at the doctoral level.

---

## Abstract

The competitive history of Colorado's educational leadership programs in institutions of higher education has precluded the development of collaborative programs and created barriers to the acquisition of doctoral degrees. In 1994, that history was altered significantly when an alliance was developed between the Schools of Education at the University of Colorado at Denver (UCD) and the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs (UCCS). This paper describes the evolution of a collaborative Ph.D. program in Educational Leadership in which students from K-12 and higher education institutions came together in a program of studies based upon a problem-based learning process. The program was designed to engage students in a series of research-based activities to develop a foundation of knowledge.

## **Introduction**

In 1991, the University of Colorado at Denver (UCD) began a significantly revised doctoral program for senior school administrators. It was underwritten by a Danforth Foundation grant and developed in conjunction with senior executives in the Jefferson County Public Schools (Jeffco) and was structured as a cohort- and problem-based program in which a group of students would start and continue through the program and focus on "improving problems of practice" (Martin, Murphy, & Muth, 1993; Muth, Murphy, & Martin, 1994). The curriculum was structured into domains—an umbrella instructional delivery unit, similar to a "course" but constructed to provide more than the typical time allotted to three-credit-hour courses and often connected directly to field applications and other program expectations. This program was designed to be different from conventional "seat-time" programs in which students by themselves must integrate content and relate it to problems of practice because the "program" is a series of "loosely coupled" pieces that, while purportedly adding to some whole, does so only through the efforts of the students.

Since 1991, the Ph.D. program has progressed through several stages, leading to the development of a school-wide program, the professional Ph.D. in Educational Leadership and Innovation. This new program has evolved from dissatisfaction with conventional Ph.D. programming and has developed through experimental programming conducted with the support of the Danforth Foundation and Jeffco and a subsequent senior school administrator cohort also co-sponsored by Jeffco. It reflects the growing desire of non-administration faculty at UCD to have access to doctoral programming when new degrees are very hard to justify to university and system administrations and the state-wide, higher education governing body. This new program prepares students for increasingly important leadership positions in education and related fields in Colorado. It supports three emphasis areas, including one in Educational Policy and Administration (EPA), which focus on student accomplishments, measured by knowledge and skill outcomes as specified in portfolios. EPA specifically focuses on preparing highly qualified candidates for senior-level leadership positions in education. As part of this preparation, high quality scholarship and research skills are developed and applied to problems of practice.

## **Nature of the Program**

The EPA emphasis area requires 70 credit hours, 40 credit hours of course work and 30 credit hours of dissertation research (see Figure 1), beyond the MA. The degree is appropriate for a variety of leadership positions, including state-level administrators, superintendents, district-level administrators, educational leaders in local schools and institutions of higher education, and policy positions in school systems and other educational agencies. Additionally, some Ph.D. students may work toward a Master Certificate through their electives and the preparation of a portfolio that demonstrates expertise beyond the state's professional licensing requirements.

Several aspects of this program's design are unique. First, students meet for extended periods, usually five hours one night per week, to permit more extensive concentration on subject matter and its application to problems of practice. Second, "labs"—action-research oriented, field-based research activities—are connected to each content area to facilitate successively more sophisticated research opportunities for teams of students to increase their research expertise. Third, from the first semester the students focus on developing dissertation topics, progressively gaining confidence with articulating research problems and methods to study them. Finally, each course and lab activity is designed to help students build toward completion of portfolio products that demonstrate depth and breadth of

knowledge in three topic foci (concentrations), the application of knowledge to problems of practice, and competence with at least two means of conducting research.

The program reported here, the third off-campus cohort in educational leadership, has benefited greatly from what has been learned about the timely introduction of doctoral-level research methods, exposure to applied research projects to increase dissertation-related research skills, and development of authentic portfolios products (see Figure 2) that reflect the skills needed by Ph.D. graduates who expect to be leaders in the field.

### **Structural Accommodations**

Because of classroom shortages on the Colorado Springs campus, a local district with several students in the program offered its professional development center—far more spacious and better equipped than most university facilities—for the one-night-per-week (and some Saturdays), five-hour sessions which incorporated academic instruction, lab activities, and opportunities for portfolio and dissertation preparation. The credit hours for academic courses varied somewhat from those outlined in Figure 1 because no integrative Pro Seminar was needed to link labs and course work and to provide opportunities to develop portfolios and dissertation topics.

Based on experience with two cohorts in which a seminar on research for doctoral studies came toward the end of the program, the Colorado Springs cohort had a more timely introduction to doctoral-level research methods. Their overview course came in their second semester, following an initial attempt to develop a dissertation topic, and supplied them perspectives on how students might think methodologically about dissertation research. The research projects developed for each semester's lab experience provided exposure to applied research projects and gave students opportunities to build on what they learned. In this way, the program increased their dissertation-related research skills in generally benign circumstances so that students could learn from their mistakes.

These lab activities and their associated content-area projects and products helped students evolve authentic portfolios products that would address the skills and knowledge they need to complete their portfolio requirements. Each semester contained “building blocks” that successively led to the development of the specific products outlined in Figure 2.

Because of the importance of continuity of instruction in a cohort—so that classes are connected to one another and to their labs, repetition is minimized, and the program's sequential nature is maintained—classes offered in Colorado Springs have been taught by a team of faculty from both institutions. Students were advised by the program's co-directors, one from each institution, also to ensure continuity.

### **Problem-Based Learning**

Proponents of problem-based learning offer the process as a solution for retention and transfer of knowledge problems in the educational process (Murphy, Martin, Ford, & Muth, 1996). Beginning with problems of practice, this model enables the learner to construct knowledge through reflection on action and reflection in action (Argyris & Schön, 1975; Schön, 1983, 1987).

Problem-based learning in this program focuses on “learning that results from designing solutions to significant problems by collaboratively applying relevant knowledge through the

use of intellectual tasks [emphasis in the original] (Martin et al., 1997, p. 389). This means that learning focuses on problems of practice (labs) to which relevant knowledge is applied as the problem becomes “known” and for which approximate solutions might be designed and developed; engages both students and faculty in collaborative and mutually beneficial learning activities, demonstrated for students in portfolio products; and develops students’ analytical and critical thinking skills that lead eventually to self-confidence with research.

### **A Brief Regional History**

The competition for scarce resources in Colorado’s educational leadership programs has generally precluded the development of inter-institutional, collaborative programs and has even created barriers to the development of intra-institutional programming within systems. The acquisition of new doctoral degrees has been limited by governing boards, and some degrees have been terminated or modified to maintain inter-system and intra-institutional missions and status. These limitations have kept the degree-granting capacity in the Denver metropolitan area, making it difficult—often impossible—for students outside the area to obtain degrees, unless they were willing to drive great distances, change jobs, or accept other, significant sacrifices. While all of the doctoral granting institutions are in the “metropolitan area” (Colorado State University and the University of Northern Colorado are an hour to an hour and one-half north of Denver), UCD offers the only public Ph.D. in educational leadership in the state. In addition, state resource allocations have protected the degree “rights” of institutions, although not necessarily the location of those programs.

### **Political and Structural Dilemmas**

In 1994, this history changed (somewhat) when an alliance was developed between the Schools of Education at UCD and the University of Colorado at Colorado Springs (UCCS). While UCD is the sole public institution in the state authorized by the Colorado Commission of Higher Education (CCHE) to grant a Ph.D. in educational leadership, a growing need for program availability had emerged in the southern regions of the state. The clear need was also present for UCCS to provide access to advanced programming for its administration program graduates. For too many students, particularly those south of Colorado Springs, the hours—and safety issues—involved in commuting precluded realization of this goal. Thus, it became clear to university faculty and administration at both UCD and UCCS that a collaborative effort was needed.

### **Inter-institutional Barriers**

Even so, the barriers to intra-system cooperation were immense, primarily because the system's bureaucrats could not find a convenient pigeon hole for a friendly and desired “invasion” of a sister institution's turf. It took six months, for example, to get a memorandum of understanding approved by CCHE, one which simply said that the program is UCD’s, that it would be offered in Colorado Springs, and that some of the program credits would go to UCCS. This hold-up meant delays in admitting students, finalizing curriculum and instructors, and finding a workable meeting site.

While full collaboration within organizations is generally fraught with barriers, those that emerge from sources across organizations can include role conflicts, communication gaps, power inequalities, and self-interest (Cooper & Muth, 1994; Muth, 1995). Further complications can arise from various perspectives on what actually constitutes the “common good” within a given community (Guzmán, 1995). This was the case throughout the development and implementation of this program.

One issue confronting the program developers, which surfaced clearly during “negotiations” with CCHE, was program ownership. That is, which institution “owns” the program? This was clearly a Deans’ issue, but also one which troubled CCHE. The UCCS Dean, understandably, wanted a strong symbolic and programmatic role in the program so that he could tell his constituents that UCCS was delivering on its promises to facilitate access to the doctoral degree in the local area. Associating UCCS with the program was particularly important in this regard. CCHE, too, inquired about, and pushed discussions toward, building a “cooperative” program which would be governed, according to CCHE policy, by a body spanning both institutions. The UCD Dean, also understandably, was not about to give up any authoritative control of the program, particularly since it had just been approved for a name change that broadened its scope and made it a school-wide program with three emphasis areas. The struggle for this approval had been a long one and included assurances of non-encroachment to another campus, and he was not about to let his faculty's control of the degree be diluted. Off-campus programming also creates additional tuition revenues that come directly to the sponsoring college or school, so the financial impact of a shared program structure could be costly.

Another issue was one that faces many off-campus programs: travel to a remote site. While UCD faculty were pleased to have a program in Colorado Springs because of the state-supported additional funding for off-campus, “access” programs and the “good will” it creates, they were reluctant to commit to the once-a-week drive required to deliver the program. While several faculty participated in portfolio reviews during the course of the program (one or two trips) and one faculty member gave a guest lecture, only two faculty committed to full-semester’s participation (12 to 16 trips). This meant that the program’s co-directors, one from UCCS and one from UCD, delivered the majority of academic portion of the program for four of the six semesters.

The low level of faculty participation has important implications for portfolio reviews and dissertation advising. Because the students in Colorado Springs have not met most of the UCD faculty—and the faculty has not met them—it is more difficult for students to make matches with faculty for these essential program requirements. The program’s co-directors have worked hard to facilitate such matches by sharing dissertation topic papers with faculty likely to be interested in a student's research interests.

### **Some Faculty Concerns**

Generally, faculty are concerned about meeting their load requirements. They also want to be “recognized” for any overload they incur, preferring not to have extra duties simply considered as another “contribution” to the welfare of the organization. An off-campus program that requires travel time and consumes far more hours of faculty time for planning and preparation than do convenient, disconnected, on-campus classes, strains faculty goodwill.

Load is a significant issue in Colorado since most operating funds are contingent upon enrollments, and if course enrollments are light or classes do not “make,” deans get concerned—which concerns faculty. The converse of this, of course, is the willingness of deans to exploit faculty through overloads, either by paying them overload pay (far less than regular pay) or by providing them less costly “perks”—such as a part-time graduate assistants or some travel money. This problem confronted this program because, although UCCS promised to “support” the program, budget austerity made it very difficult. Often, the UCCS co-director had to contribute time to the program simply to keep a hand in. Some overload support was made available from UCD, however, to make the commitment more

palatable, and some credit hours were transferred to UCCS to make the programmatic—and fiscal—connections stronger.

### **Ph.D. Committee**

When the new, school-wide Ph.D. program at UCD was approved, a school-wide faculty committee was developed to govern the program, significantly diminishing the educational leadership faculty's authority and flexibility. While "ownership" issues never overtly surfaced in the school, the UCD co-director's faculty had to devote considerable energy to protecting the integrity of the programming for the Colorado Springs cohort, as the program had been designed and guaranteed before the new program was entirely in effect. From time to time, members of the committee have needed assurance that the cohort program in Colorado Springs has conformed generally with the overall school program. Assurances have been sufficient, it seems, because the committee has authorized a new cohort for Colorado Springs for Fall 1998. The new cohort structure will conform to the school-wide program requirements.

As curricular control now is lodged within the Ph.D. Committee, future cohorts will be approved by that body. The ongoing issues will be the conservative views of many on the Ph.D. committee, which grow both out of their conventional doctoral training experiences and their protectionistic orientation toward the "integrity" and "quality" of their new program as well as some basic philosophical and experiential differences. For example, being traditionally trained, it is difficult for many of the committee to accept recent views on adult learning (Brookfield, 1986; Merriam & Caffarella, 1991), the constructivist paradigm (Brooks & Brooks, 1993; Lambert et al., 1995), or action-oriented research (Schón, 1991; Stringer, 1996).

On a more positive note, the Ph.D. Committee has changed the portfolio process and requirements significantly, and these changes are very beneficial. Because the original requirements were not as well conceptualized as they might have been, the new model should serve the students and faculty better. These changes will be instituted with the Fall 1998 cohort as well as students starting the on-campus program Fall 1997.

### **Emergent Cross-Cultural Challenges**

Today's leaders are urged to develop environments in which all participants are continually growing and developing as part of the progression of the organization (Senge, 1990). Beyond that, the expectation that a sense of community should be developed—that vastly different individuals should unite and focus together on the highest good for the organizational mission—has added another dimension to leadership responsibilities. The evolution of the learning community (Sergiovanni, 1990; Guzmán, 1995) is a very real part of today's organizational paradigm and has emerged as an important aspect of the development of this program.

The creation of and agreement upon a common purpose (Guzmán, 1995) is considered to be essential to the cohesion and success of any group. This task becomes especially difficult when the members of the group—such as those in a Ph.D. cohort—are highly competitive, tremendously successful, and intensely focused individuals. The history of these students in educational institutions is based primarily on their ability to compete with others and emerge successfully from that competition.

In addition to individual differences, cultures assume many forms (Denison, 1990), and trying to combine several of these simultaneously can lead to some interesting outcomes. As UCCS and UCD combined to develop and implement the Ph.D. program, they brought together students from multiple K-12 school districts—each with its own cultural perspective—and two institutions of higher education.

Institutional visions—especially within institutions whose mission is primarily educational—have been expanded in recent years to encompass a broader constituency and more inclusive philosophy (Guzmán, 1996). However, individuals may unconsciously adopt and support the cultural assumptions of their institutions, accepting them as normative influences when they leave their home institutions and enter new environments. It becomes, then, a programmatic imperative to guide students toward the reconciliation of conflicting, culturally based values. Reconciliation becomes one piece of each student's personal process of development, creates a stronger foundation of self-knowledge, and, perhaps, a cleaner "critical eye" with which to engage in the process of research.

As these values have become clearer within the context of the cohort dialogue and as their dissonance or consonance has emerged, students were invited to examine them individually and collectively in an effort to weave them into the fabric of the cohort experience. Ultimately, this new gestalt has been integrated into the knowledge and skill set of students as they move back into their disparate worlds.

### **Instructional and Curricular Issues**

Collaborative instruction, team teaching, instructional team building, and integrated programming are difficult to achieve within a single program or school where the ethos continues to support separate courses for separate instructors. Trying to change institutional practices cross-institutionally is even more difficult, as deans—and faculty—tend to like neat structures with few complications.

### **Integrated Curriculum**

This collaborative, UCD-UCCS Ph.D. program was designed to engage students in a series of research-based activities that develop the knowledge and skills necessary to completion of their dissertations. Thus, program structures were developed to ensure that students would be enabled to do so. The Program Syllabus is outlined in Figure 3, and it depicts the integration across "domains" (knowledge "umbrellas" disguised as courses), for labs, the dissertation focus, annual reviews, portfolio products, and reflective practice journalizing.

### **Collaborative Instruction**

Developing the curriculum was a collaborative—often painful—process that involved the faculty originating the Danforth/Jeffco cohort design, senior staffers at the Education Commission of the States, and faculty at UCD who joined the process after much of the infrastructure had been developed. Then, the collaboration began between UCD and UCCS. One, clear preference on both sides at the faculty level was collaborative, team teaching not serial instruction.

Often, team teaching is viewed as "You do it next week, and I'll do the following week." True team teaching is a collaborative process in which the structures and events for learning are collectively created and implemented. While one faculty member's strengths or



preferences may be dominant in one class session (or a continuing set of class sessions) or for a particular activity such as a field project, both are present to work with and off of one another and with students. Their collaboration enhances both the learning process for the students and provides students the opportunity to interact with differing and often divergent perspectives. The interplay of ideas often illustrates clearly that most issues—even orientations—have more than one legitimate perspective and that the challenge is to harness competing perspectives to the task at hand.

Given some of the issues cited already, this collaboration created too much dependence on one instructional team, and the program—and students—would have profited from more varied instructors and their perspectives. Another problem is that the involved universities are loathe to give full credit for the extended sessions to each faculty member (although policies on this are being developed). Rather, each team member gets partial load credit for participating, but generally spends full-time preparing, teaching, observing, interacting, and reviewing all student work; thus, each virtually receives half credit for the work involved.

On the other hand, teaming is an excellent way of facilitating faculty growth and development through mutual learning, providing mentoring opportunities for “junior” faculty, balancing instructional abilities and orientations, ensuring instructional continuity throughout a cohort program, capitalizing on the serendipity created by synergy, and maintaining an on-site, knowledgeable presence that assures students that they can get their problems solved locally.

### **Group Lab Projects**

One of the main features of the program is the “lab,” an opportunity for students to work on research-related projects. The lab asks students to conceptualize research problems, go into the field to collect data, and become familiar with ways of asking questions, developing hypotheses, and analyzing data. Over the course of this program, the students engaged in at least one group project each semester and three groups remained together for long-term projects that lasted five semesters. These projects resulted in reports on leadership and power in non-educational organizations (an organizational analysis designed to get them into literature on organizational behavior and performance outcomes), papers presented at national meetings on policies affecting educational processes in Colorado, and case studies of various schools.

Developmentally, each semester's lab experience was designed both to complement the course work that semester and to assist students in becoming conversant with—and appreciative of—some aspect of research. For example, the leadership and power study gave them the opportunity to learn the complexities of item construction and survey development and data analysis, while the policy studies helped them apply policy analysis models to problems of practice with which they were contending in their work lives.

### **Structures for Individual Development**

Throughout the program, the domains were organized to provide students with access to the foundational knowledge the program feels essential for a Ph.D. (see Figure 2). For the cohort, these experiences were arranged over six semesters (see Figure 3) in a rather lock-step fashion because of logistics. Each domain had a connected lab and a dissertation hour to facilitate research activities and growth in the development of dissertation topics. Semester and annual reviews were used to evaluate portfolio products and assess progress toward program completion. Reflective practice journalizing was encouraged both as a

means of connecting individuals more explicitly to their learning and as a way for students to keep track of their developing expertise and clarify the linkages between portfolio products and topic foci.

In each semester, activities were developed that both provided practice in skills Ph.D. graduates need and led sequentially to higher-level skills. For example, much of the first semester was spent on "academic" writing, reconnecting active professionals to the writing genre that they would need to master to complete a dissertation. Also in the first semester, they worked on problem conceptualization in their lab projects, their initial dissertation topic papers, and aspects of future literature reviews through book summaries, comparisons, and critiques. Each semester, these building blocks were designed to improve conceptual skills, increase understanding of research issues and processes, develop critical thinking and analysis, and enhance writing abilities.

### **Student and Program Evaluation**

An essential ingredient in any program development process is evaluation (Berk & Rossi, 1990; Brinkerhoff, Brethower, Nowakowski, & Hluchyj, 1983; Cooley & Bickel, 1986). Generally, other than course evaluations, little is done by many programs to assess progress and outcomes. Through outside funding, UCD has been able to evaluate its licensing programs (Martin et al., 1997). Funds and faculty time have not generally been available to evaluate the Ph.D., although UCD's school of education has an annual program review process that develops comparative enrollment and other data. To rectify this deficiency and to learn directly from students about what worked for them and what did not, several strategies were developed, including interviews with students by members of the program's Advisory Board, review of portfolios as assessments of student progress, and a "search process" (Bunker & Alban, 1997; Rehm, 1997a; Rehm & Cebula, 1997; Weisbord, 1987) designed to develop a contextual approach to program improvement.

#### **Program Evaluation**

Although students provide ongoing feedback through semester-end faculty course questionnaires (FCQ's) as well as individual and group discussions with instructors, it was determined that additional evaluation data would be beneficial to ongoing program improvement. During the fifth semester of the program, community members from the program's Advisory Board interviewed individual cohort members and the data were compiled by an independent evaluator. Due to scheduling difficulties, two students provided their responses in writing, and three of the seventeen were not interviewed. Students were assured that their identities would remain confidential. Responses were compiled into a summative report.

This evaluation was designed to answer the following four open-ended questions:

1. Whether or not students believed that the program was helping them meet their individual goals and objectives
2. Any recommendations for structural or content changes within the program that would align it better with individual needs
3. Students' perceptions of the cohort environment and of their relationships with the teaching faculty
4. Suggestions for improving the cohort concept

Strengths of the program were listed as (a) its flexibility to address the needs of a diverse group of students, (b) the breadth of the curriculum, (c) student skill development toward successful completion of the dissertation, (d) field-based research opportunities, (e) location in Colorado Springs, and (f) faculty who demonstrate flexibility and respect for adult learners. Areas suggested for improvement include the following: (a) a broader range of instructional or guest faculty, (b) clearer criteria and more guidance for the portfolios, (c) more structure to class time, (d) timely and consistent discussion of required readings, (e) stronger control by instructors of students who do not honor commitments to small group projects, and (f) clearer criteria for assignments. Overall, the students indicated a high level of satisfaction with the program and saw it as superior to a traditional program structure.

### **Student Portfolios as Instruments of Student Evaluation and Program Evaluation**

In lieu of a traditional written or oral comprehensive examination, students are required to complete and defend (to a team of program faculty) a portfolio with prescribed products (see Figure 2). Portfolio products are primarily developed as class assignments, although students are expected to revise them according to faculty feedback before including them in the portfolio (e.g., research article critiques, topic papers, etc.). Those products that do not directly relate to the course work (e.g., training/consultation events) are included to allow students to demonstrate skill in professional communication in a setting that differs from their daily work sites.

The utility of the portfolio is that it allows faculty to evaluate student progress in knowledge and skill development and to assess their growing ability to complete the dissertation. Benchmarks include facility in scholarly writing, development of research foci, skill in critical analysis of research, application of research skills to problems of practice, scholarly depth and breadth, theory development, and integration of the curriculum. This, then, is not only an assessment of individual student success but of instructional and curricular effectiveness as well. Several students found the relative ambiguity of portfolio criteria to be frustrating and asked that the criteria be reviewed and clarified. This created a forum for program improvement, and students provided input into the revision of the portfolio requirements. (See "evaluation criteria" in Figure 2.) While a debate continues as to whether or not portfolio criteria should be defined narrowly, the portfolio requirements have been revised for future cohorts to allow greater student flexibility. Portfolio reviews scheduled for this fall will be candidacy reviews and include the student's dissertation prospectus, approved by a dissertation committee of three.

### **Program Development: Global Search Process**

As part of the curriculum during the program's last full semester, students studied large-group interventions for creating change for the improvement of systems (Bunker & Alban, 1997; Weisbord, 1987). Students were guided through a global search process (Rehm & Cebula, 1997), based upon a participative design process (Rehm, 1997) that creates a democratic design for a system. One piece of this process involved students in redesigning the cohort experience, and that procedure became, in effect, another evaluation of the program. However, this process was structured and facilitated by a visiting faculty member, permitting greater depth than was achieved by the Advisory Board's external evaluation.

The same strengths and weaknesses of the program were highlighted during this process; however, faculty were included in the dialogue, and the group process revealed ambiguities and disagreements relative to the effectiveness of certain aspects of the curriculum. For instance, some students did not experience difficulty with the portfolio requirements and

defended its structure. Another point of disagreement was whether or not faculty should take a stronger hand in controlling cohort processes, particularly work-group problems.

A clear consensus emerged during the search process. According to the participants, the following eight points characterize or should guide future cohort programs:

1. The cohort structure is far superior to traditional course-based programs.
2. The problem-based learning model allows for a natural evolution of learning—even though it is fraught with ambiguities.
3. Diversity of program faculty adds depth and breadth to the program.
4. Assignments, feedback, and additional course work strengthened students' skills in scholarly writing.
5. The K-16 perspective provided by the cross-section of students enriched the experience.
6. Norms should be established early in the program and clarified periodically.
7. A balance of lecture, dialogue, and small group activities is desirable.
8. Learning style differences and individual expectations created diverse experiences within the cohort.

These and other insights gleaned from all the evaluative data will be used to structure the next cohort. A high probability is that students will be involved in a search process at the beginning and end of the cohort to help design and assess aspects of the program.

### **Recommendations for Reform in Higher Education**

Based on the experiences to date with this third cohort, several lessons emerge. First, in the usual rush to put programs in place to secure enrollments, faculty and administrators often forget that students, particularly successful adults who have active and productive work lives, have much to add to a cohort's collective learning experience. While doctoral work should broaden and deepen student perspectives, the students themselves bring with them extensive experience that should be used as part of the learning process. This is particularly the case for the development of the curriculum structures.

Such students are also very busy and somewhat utilitarian in their perspectives. Thus, greater attention needs to be paid to structure and process and their implications for practical as well as intellectual payoffs—both have import for student retention and success. In the same vein, expecting largely part-time students to be “full-time” students and perform the knowledge “integrating functions” that full-time students might be expected to achieve may be unrealistic. Structures need to be developed that facilitate the integration process and the development of the skills needed to complete the doctorate successfully. One reason many students do not complete their programs is that they are not confident researchers. Activities need to be developed which lay the foundation for later individual research projects.

On the faculty side, incentives need to be structured which support off-campus programming and encourage faculty to commit to more time-consuming and personally costly instructional activities. Incentives can also drive creative program design and implementation. Finally, all faculty who work with adults need to develop current knowledge and practices that place high value on adult learning theory and its implications for successful adult programming. Like any other students, doctoral students want to be engaged in their learning. For them, however, being respected intellectually, having learning opportunities that are self-managed, seeing practical applications of new knowledge to their everyday world, and learning the skills needed to accomplish important tasks are essential to their effective engagement and program completion.

**Figure 1:**

**EPA Emphasis Area in Educational Leadership and Innovation Ph.D. Program**

**Ph.D. Program Course Work (40 hours minimum)**

*A. School-wide Core (9 hours minimum)*

EDUC 7100-3, Leadership and Innovation in Education

REM 7000-3, Doctoral Seminar in Research Methods

REM 6100-3, Methods of Qualitative Inquiry, or

REM 7110-3, Intermediate Statistics

*B. EPA Ph.D. Course Work (9 hours minimum)*

EDUC 7200-3, Administrative Leadership and Values Appraisal

EDUC 7210-3, Educational Policy Making for a Democratic Society (required)

EDUC 7220-3, Leadership, Power, and Authority

EDUC 7230-3, Organizational Performance in Schools

EDUC 7250-3, Nature of Work in Schools (required)

*C. EPA Lab Requirements (9 hours minimum; must be continuously enrolled in 1 or more lab credits through completion of the 40 hours of course work).*

EDUC 7600-1, ST: Laboratory in Educational Leadership and Innovation

EDUC 7700-1, Doctoral Pro Seminar

EDUC 8994-1, Doctoral Dissertation, Ph.D.

*D. Doctoral Level Cognate Seminars, Independent Study, and Directed Readings (3 to 12 hours; tailored to student needs in consultation with an advisor).*

- E. *School of Education Electives in Master's Level Graduate Course Work* (0 to 9 hours; with approval of a student's program committee)

### **Dissertation Research (30 hours minimum)**

EDUC 8994, Doctoral Dissertation, focuses students on a dissertation research agenda, helping to define and develop a dissertation research problem, a proposal related to the Ph.D. in Educational Leadership and Innovation, EPA emphasis, and the dissertation itself; hours toward the completion of this requirement are included under "C. EPA Lab Requirements"; a maximum of 10 hours of 8994 may be taken before admission to candidacy.

### **Figure 2:**

#### **Portfolio Entries**

#### **Ph.D. in Educational Leadership and Innovation**

#### ***Educational Policy and Administration Emphasis Area***

#### ***COLORADO SPRINGS COHORT***

The portfolio requirements are intended as vehicles to demonstrate depth and breadth of knowledge in three topic foci as well the application of knowledge and skills to the improvement of practice. These products also must exhibit knowledge and skill in two research "tools."

General Criteria: All documents in the portfolio must (a) be well written and organized; (b) be free of typos, serious grammatical errors, or syntactical problems; (c) use APA style as appropriate; (d) include all appropriate references; (e) be covered by an explanation of the purpose of the product and its relation, if any, to topic focus areas and, where appropriate, the candidate's role in and contribution to the product's development.

#### **School-wide Requirements**

<b>PRODUCTS</b>	<b>SPECIFICATION</b>	<b>WHERE DEVELOPED</b>
<i>Goals and Philosophy Statement</i>	The candidate will prepare a written <u>statement of professional goals and philosophy, giving a rationale for selection of the three content foci in relation to career and academic goals. For EPA students, this includes a statement of personal and professional leadership.</u>	Developed for 1st Annual Review; leadership statement developed throughout (may be combined with reflective essay)  <u>Evaluation Criteria:</u> Clear, well integrated, connects topic foci and portfolio products, reflects growth, and articulates a leadership stance

<i>Research Review/ Synthesis Paper</i>	The candidate will prepare a written paper that reviews research in a topic area in a way that <u>adds to the knowledge and application in the field.</u>	Research review for 7220 (Fall 1996) or critical essay/ analysis for (Spring 1997)  <u>Evaluation Criteria:</u> An integrated essay that flows from one idea to the next (not a book report) and synthesizes cross-cutting themes into a broader framework; concepts and terms clearly defined
<i>Research Reviews</i>	The candidate will review and provide a <u>written critique of at least five articles</u> published or submitted for publication in scholarly journals.	Initially developed in 7100/7240 (Spring 1996) and 7210 (Summer 1996)  <u>Evaluation Criteria:</u> (a) recognizes/identifies strengths/weaknesses of the article, (b) covers major points, (c) summarizes salient points, and (d) flows logically
<i>Funding Proposal or Application Paper</i>	The candidate will prepare a <u>detailed proposal for application of current knowledge and theory to an applied policy, service or research program, complete with strategies for implementation and management of the program.</u>	Independently developed; alternatives include project proposal and/or management plan  <u>Evaluation Criteria:</u> (a) clearly states the problem, (b) clarifies a theoretical framework, (c) outlines a step-by-step research process, and (d) specifies the "value added" to the body of knowledge in the area
<i>Research Proposal</i>	The candidate will design at least one research proposal prior to the dissertation. <u>Each proposal should</u> at least: (a) <u>present a rationale for the study,</u> (b) <u>review pertinent</u>	Revision of proposal for 7000/7240 or other research proposal (see Prospectus)

	research, (c) <u>describe the design and methodology</u> , (d) <u>describe data analysis</u> , and (e) <u>discuss possible outcomes and their significance</u> .	<u>Evaluation Criteria</u> : All components are clearly present; sections well connected; thoughts clearly expressed
<i>Research Report</i>	The candidate will <u>plan and conduct at least one research study prior to the dissertation</u> . The study may be done in collaboration with other students or faculty, and must be <u>documented in a paper suitable for publication in a professional journal</u> .	Lab reports, AERA papers (must include clarification of role and contribution); 7220 (Fall 1996) study report  <u>Evaluation Criteria</u> : The research focus must be clearly stated and the methodology—fully articulated—match the problem statement; findings clearly derived from data collected; conclusions—logically presented as an outcome of the flow from findings and recommendations flow from the conclusions
<i>Inservice/Consultation/Teaching</i>	The candidate will plan and conduct at least <u>three different training/ consultation events</u> . A <u>planning document</u> must be submitted <u>for each that includes</u> : (a) <u>the target audience</u> , (b) <u>the teaching objectives</u> , (c) <u>the materials</u> , (d) <u>the agenda</u> , and (e) <u>plans for evaluation</u> .	Individually developed  <u>Evaluation Criteria</u> : All tasks completed and easily understood
<i>Public Information Writing</i>	The candidate will prepare and submit for publication <u>at least three products written for the general public to inform and/or persuade about educational issues</u> (e.g., op. ed. pieces; newsletter articles, news releases about current research).	Developed individually  <u>Evaluation Criteria</u> : Understandable by general public; APA not required
<i>Research Management Product</i>	The candidate will <u>develop a method for organizing scholarly information</u> in the topic areas selected <u>that summarizes critical</u>	Developed individually  <u>Evaluation Criteria</u> : System used explained



	<u>information for useful retrieval.</u>	clearly and evidence provided as to how information/research can be retrieved quickly and easily
<i>Professional/Community Participation</i>	The candidate will <u>participate as a member of a public committee, task force, or other group working to improve the quality of educational services and prepare a written, analytic description of the activity.</u> <b>The activity must be outside the candidate's normal job responsibilities.</b>	Developed individually  <u>Evaluation Criteria:</u> provides thorough description of individual role and responsibilities and nature/purpose/impact of group

### **EPA Requirements**

<i>Background and Briefing Materials</i>	The candidate will prepare <u>three background papers or policy briefings</u> (e.g., speech drafts, talking points, testimony drafts, sound bites, memos that distill critical policy issues).	Individually developed; could be based on critiques, critical essay/analysis, or other research  <u>Evaluation Criteria:</u> Clear synopsis, well written, understandable by target audience
<i>Group Project Reports</i>	The candidate will prepare <u>complete versions of all group projects developed during the program</u> , clarifying the candidate's role in and contribution to the project.	Lab, other group reports  <u>Evaluation Criteria:</u> Final versions only; strengths/weaknesses of research identified
<i>Reflective Essay</i>	The candidate will prepare an essay that reflectively examines program activities and experiences. This essay should <u>integrate across all formal learning experiences, summarizing what has been learned—and not learned—in the program.</u>	Developed solely for final portfolio review (could be combined with goal/philosophy/leadership statement)  <u>Evaluation Criteria:</u> Highlights learning experiences, focusing on important learning and gaps; organized according

		to individual perspectives and preferences
<i>Organizational Analysis</i>	The candidate will prepare a written analysis of an organization that <u>demonstrates application of theory to practice and makes specific recommendations for improving organizational performance.</u>	Lab reports; 7220 (Fall 1996) study  <u>Evaluation Criteria:</u> Clear identification and connection of problem, theory, methodology, findings, and recommendations for improved organizational practices
<i>Case Study</i>	The candidate will submit a <u>case study of an educational situation that describes the situation in detail, analyzes a key issue within the situation from at least one theoretical perspective, and outlines needed interventions.</u>	Lab reports, 7220 (Fall 1996) study, 7210 (Summer 1996) paper, or AERA paper  <u>Evaluation Criteria:</u> Clear identification and connection of problem, theory, methodology, findings, and conclusions
<i>Dissertation Prospectus</i>	The candidate will prepare a prospectus that <u>clearly articulates a dissertation topic, relevant research related to the topic, and one method of conducting research on the topic.</u>	Developed from 7200 (Fall 1995; topic paper) through 7250 (Spring 1997; topic paper); 1st draft in 7230 (Summer 1997)  <u>Evaluation Criteria:</u> All components are clearly present; signed by three-member committee

**Figure 3:**  
**PROGRAM OUTLINE FOR COLORADO SPRINGS Ph.D. COHORT, 1995-1998**

<b>Domains</b> (see syllabi for expectations)	<b>Fall 1995</b>	<b>Spring 1996</b>	<b>Summer 1996</b>	<b>Fall 1996</b>	<b>Spring 1997</b>	<b>Summer 1997</b>	<b>Fall 1997</b>
<b>Lab Activities</b> (research and knowledge applications)	AEDU 7200-4  AEDU 7005-1	AREM 7500-3  AREM 7240-1	AEDU 7210-4  LEAD 750-1	AEDU 7220-4  LEAD 750-1	AEDU 7250-3  AEDU 7000-1	AEDU 7230-4  LEAD 750-1	
<b>Dissertation Focus</b> (emphasizing step-by-step preparation for dissertation proposal)	-3 to 4 group projects and reports  AEDU 8994-1	LEAD 750-1  -3 to 4 group projects and reports	-3 to 4 group projects and reports  AEDU 8994-1	-3 to 4 group projects and reports  AEDU 8994-1	LEAD 750-1  -3 to 4 group projects and reports	-3 to 4 group projects and reports  AEDU 8994-1	AEDU 8994-3
<b>Annual Reviews</b> (regular quality program reviews)	-topics and groups; topic paper	AEDU 8994-1  -groups; methods paper	-groups; revised topic paper  1st Annual Review: 3 topic foci; <i>vita</i> ; goals; program plan; GRE scores; course work; portfolio entries; oral	-groups; review of literature	AEDU 8994-1  -groups; revised topic paper/review of literature; diss. comm. selection	-groups; pre-proposal (topic, review, methods)  2nd Annual Review: 3 topic foci; <i>vita</i> ; goals; plan; course-work; port-folio entries; oral	-groups; prospectus  Comprehensive Review: paper work; 3 topic foci; <i>vita</i> ; goals; prospectus; course work; portfolio entries; oral
<b>Portfolio Products</b> (demonstrations of knowledge and skills)	see specifications in <u>Student Portfolio Entries</u>	see specifications in <u>Student Portfolio Entries</u>	see specifications in <u>Student Portfolio Entries</u> and Domain assignments	see specifications in <u>Student Portfolio Entries</u> and Domain assignments	see specifications in <u>Student Portfolio Entries</u> and Domain assignments	see specifications in <u>Student Portfolio Entries</u> and Domain assignments	see specifications in <u>Student Portfolio Entries</u> and Domain assignments
<b>Reflective Practice Journal</b> (focused deliberation)	personal and ongoing	personal and ongoing	personal and ongoing	personal and ongoing	personal and ongoing	personal and ongoing	personal and ongoing

Dissertation studies commence Spring 1998 and for most will end Fall 1998 or Spring 1999.

## REFERENCES

- Argyris, C., & Schön, D. A. (1974). *Theory in practice: Increasing professional effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Berk, R. A., & Rossi, P. H. (1990). *Thinking about program evaluation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

- Brookfield, S. (1986). *Understanding and facilitating adult learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Brooks, J. G., & Brooks, M. G. (1993). *In search of understanding: The case for constructivist classrooms*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Brinkerhoff, R. O., Brethower, D. M., Nowakowski, J. R., & Hluchyj, T. (1983). *Program evaluation: A practitioner's guide for trainers and educators*. Hingham, MA: Kluwer Nijhoff.
- Bunker, B. B., & Alban, B. T. (1997). *Large group interventions: Engaging the whole system for rapid change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cooley, W. W., & Bickel, W. E. (1986). *Decision-oriented educational research*. Evaluation in Education and Human Services Series. Hingham, MA: Kluwer-Nijhoff.
- Cooper, B. S., & Muth, R. (1994). Internal and external barriers to change in departments of educational administration. In T. Mulkeen, N. Cambron-McCabe, & B. Anderson (Eds.), *Democratic leadership: The changing context of administrative preparation* (pp. 61-81). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Guzmán, N. (1995). The leadership covenant: Essential factors for developing co-creative relationships within a learning community. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 2(4), 151-160.
- Guzmán, N. (1996). Preparing leaders to build a learning community: A reconciliation of conflicting values. In J. L. Burdin, & J. S. Yoon (Eds.), *Prioritizing instruction*. Fourth Yearbook of the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration. Lancaster, PA: Technomic.
- Lambert, L., Walker, D., Zimmerman, D. P., Cooper, J. E., Lambert, M. D., Gardner, M. E., & Ford Slack, P. J. (1995). The constructivist leader. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Martin, W. M., Ford, S., Murphy, M., Rehm, R. G., & Muth, R. (1997). Linking instructional delivery with diverse learning settings. *Journal of School Leadership*, 7, 386-408.
- Martin, W. M., Murphy, M. J., & Muth, R. (1993). Problem-based Learning: A new approach to preparing school leaders. In J. Hoyle & D. Estes (Eds.), *NCPEA: In a new voice* (pp. 141-154). Lancaster, PA: Technomic.
- Merriam, S. B., & Caffarella, R. S. (1991). *Learning in adulthood: A comprehensive guide*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Murphy, M. J., Martin, W. M., Ford, S., & Muth, R. (1996, October). *Problem-based learning: An idea whose time has come*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Louisville, KY.
- Muth, R., Murphy, M. J., & Martin, W. M. (1994). Problem-based learning at the University Of Colorado at Denver. *Journal of School Leadership*, 4, 432-450.

- Muth, R. (1995). Craft knowledge and institutional constraints. In R. Donmoyer, J. Scheurich, & M. Imber (Eds.), *The knowledge base in educational administration: Multiple perspectives* (pp. 96-112). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Rehm, R. (1997a, February). *Democratic workplace design*. Unpublished Manuscript.
- Rehm, R. (1997b, February). *Participative design*. Unpublished Manuscript.
- Rehm, R., & Cebula, N. (1997, February). *Search conferences*. Unpublished Manuscript.
- Schön, D. A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner: Toward a new design for teaching and learning in the professions*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York: Basic Books.
- Schön, D. A. (Ed.). (1991). *The reflective turn: Case studies in and on educational practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Senge, P. A. (1990). *The fifth discipline*. New York: Doubleday.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1990). *Value-added leadership: How to get extraordinary performance in schools*. HBJ Leadership. San Diego, CA: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Stringer, E. T. (1996). *Action research: A handbook for practitioners*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Weisbord, M. R. (1987). *Productive workplaces: Organizing and managing for dignity, meaning, and community*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.