

**Council on Postsecondary Education
February 11, 2010**

**Doctorate in Educational Leadership
Morehead State University**

ACTION: The staff recommends the approval of the proposal from Morehead State University to offer an Ed.D. in Educational Leadership contingent upon the same conditions as previously approved Ed.D.s at comprehensive universities:

- (1) Successful annual review of progress conducted by an external review committee and a full review at the end of three years to ensure the viability, sustainability, and effectiveness of the program.
- (2) Evidence in the annual review that the program is on track to be financially self-sufficient by the time it is fully implemented.
- (3) The Council directs each institution granting an Ed.D. to collect and to report to the Council staff information on the placement of all its graduates. The Council also directs each institution awarding an Ed.D. to evaluate whether these educational leaders have helped to improve student achievement in Kentucky. Finally, the Council directs the Council staff to incorporate information from these institutional reports in reports to the Council (e.g., the High School Feedback Report) and to the legislature (e.g., the annual accountability report).

On July 16, 2007, the Council approved a set of comprehensive and rigorous criteria for the review of proposals for doctoral degrees in educational leadership at Kentucky's comprehensive universities (Attachment A). These criteria were the culmination of two years of reflection and study on how the comprehensive universities could expand their offerings in the area of educational leadership to have a positive impact on P-12 student achievement and the economy in their regions.

As directed in that action, the Council staff formed an external review committee to evaluate the proposal from Morehead State University, as it did for previous universities, in three areas: program design, program content, and capacity. The review committee conducted an interview with representatives from the campus and found that the proposed program stresses regional stewardship and focuses on improving student achievement and the economy in their area of geographic responsibility. It also focuses on the long-term strengthening of the workforce through improvements in the educational system at all levels. The initial resources invested in this program are an investment in the future of the region.

A review committee evaluated the MoSU proposal during December 2009 and January 2010 and interviewed representatives from the university on January 22, 2010. The review committee was comprised of:

- Elaine Farris, superintendent, Clark County Public Schools
- Phillip Rogers, executive director, Education Professional Standards Board
- Karen Carey, assessment consultant, Council on Postsecondary Education
- Orin Simmerman, leadership and school improvement, Kentucky Department of Education

The committee asked that MoSU respond to the following concerns:

- Describe (and show) the agreements with local school districts and participating programs within the university for the delivery of this program.
- Complete and forward the transfer/collaboration Memorandum of Agreement with Northern Kentucky University, Western Kentucky University, and Eastern Kentucky University.
- Describe how the program will address cultural competency and achievement gap issues.
- Clarify the capstone project in detail, showing a detailed mechanism for collaboration, a protocol for approving the capstone that ensures the quality of the student's work, specific criteria for what makes up a capstone, and a rubric for evaluating the capstone.
- Submit a detailed plan for professional development of faculty for the advising of doctoral students.
- Submit a plan for a detailed handbook for students, with planned continuous assessment of their progress included.
- Describe the contingency plan for cohort size fluctuations.
- Describe the partnerships with districts and the expectations of partners.

MoSU has amended its original proposal to include this information, and the CPE staff recommends the program for approval. The intensive and rigorous process has resulted in a program that addresses the needs of MoSU's region, as well as the needs of Kentucky as a whole. While the program will be expected to show progress in transferability and sustainability, the institution has made a diligent and committed effort to address the issues of concern expressed by the Council throughout the process. The institution has indicated that given the priority they have placed on this program they can, even in the current difficult financial climate, support its launch. Working together, the Council and MoSU have created a program that will benefit the Commonwealth.

**Council on Postsecondary Education
Quality and Accountability Policy Group
July 16, 2007**

Review of Ed.D. Proposals and Programs

ACTION: The staff recommends that proposals to create new Ed.D. programs or initiatives to redesign current doctoral programs at the University of Kentucky and the University of Louisville be reviewed pursuant to the criteria and process described below.

Background

Ed.D. programs have been the subject of numerous criticisms in recent years. They have been described as “Ph.D.-lite,” as “severely lacking,” and as “inappropriate to the needs of today’s schools and school leaders.” It is widely believed that a new form of educational leadership training is required to meet the challenges of a global economy. The 2006 session of the Kentucky General Assembly addressed educational leadership programs in House Joint Resolution 14 (HJR 14) (attached). The resolution required the Education Professional Standards Board (EPSB) to organize an interagency task force to collaborate with colleges and universities to redesign administrator preparation programs and professional development programs, and to align doctoral programs in education with redesigned master’s and other leadership programs to ensure rigor and relevance. The resolution requires a progress report to the Interim Joint Committee on Education by October 1, 2007.

Five comprehensive institutions have posted or pre-posted proposals for an Ed.D. program in the Kentucky Postsecondary Program Proposal System (KPPPS). In addition, the University of Kentucky and the University of Louisville have been selected to participate in a Carnegie Foundation initiative to redesign the education doctorate. They were two of 20 programs nationally selected to participate in the initiative.

The University of Kentucky, the University of Louisville, and Spalding University are currently the only Kentucky institutions offering an education doctorate. Together these programs have averaged an enrollment of approximately 600 students. Over the past five years, they have produced approximately 90 graduates annually. Kentucky ranks 14th of the 16 Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) states in production of education doctorates, and 35th nationally.

These activities provide the Council and the institutions with an opportunity to meet a real need within the context of the Council’s “Double the Numbers” initiative. The challenges of the global economy and of meeting HB 1 goals require a coordinated and systematic

approach to proposals to create or redesign education doctorates. Such proposals must be reviewed with a focus on Kentucky's needs and on best practices nationally.

Alignment and Structure

The Council has set aggressive goals for the postsecondary and adult education system to double the number of baccalaureate degree holders in the state. Meeting these goals will require considerable reallocation and new investment in programs that improve undergraduate retention and graduation rates. The structure of any new or redesigned educational leadership program should be highly collaborative and interdisciplinary. This will ensure quality, effectiveness, and efficiency.

Any proposals for new or redesigned programs must be aligned with the work of the HJR 14 task force. The task force has developed a standard set of criteria for review and redesign of both the master's and doctorate in education. The criteria are designed to ensure a consistent and coordinated approach while providing an opportunity for institutions to develop individual emphases. The task force's criteria and methodology also can be supported by the Council's authority to identify academic degree programs as standardized degree programs (KRS 164.037).

A survey of potential applicants to Ed.D. programs and of employers of educational leaders by the HJR 14 task force produced a modest response. The survey was based on perceptions of the Ed.D. as traditionally offered.

The need to redesign Ed.D. programs must be separated from the need or demand for programs as currently structured in Kentucky. Both new and current programs must be designed or redesigned to meet today's needs. Restructuring the way in which educational leadership programs are designed and delivered may well increase demand for such programs. The primary market for the programs will be the P-12 community.

Criteria and Process

The Council staff has articulated five general questions that will guide review of proposals to offer new doctorates in educational leadership.

- Is the proposal consistent with Kentucky's Public Agenda for Postsecondary and Adult Education?
- Is there a need for new doctorates?
- Does the proposing institution have the programmatic and fiscal capacity to offer the program?
- Can the program be more effectively delivered by another institution?
- Can the program be offered in collaboration with another institution?

EPSB's Education Leadership Redesign Task Force has developed additional criteria that will be used to review Ed.D. program proposals. These criteria provide for certain standard features applicable to all programs that will ensure effective coordination of program delivery, maximum flexibility for students in scheduling and course-taking, and efficient use of resources.

1. Program Design

- A. Rigorous and relevant prerequisites for admission.
- B. Seamless transfer options for students, allowing them to take courses from any approved program and have them count toward the degree.
- C. Cohort or open model of registration, including minimum requirements for viability of program.
- D. A detailed program of study.
- E. Description of culminating experience or dissertation appropriate to the needs of the constituencies served.
- F. Demonstration of a fully aligned relationship between the redesigned master's and doctoral programs.
- G. Program tracks that acknowledge the diversity of applicants' background experiences and prior knowledge.
- H. Articulated agreements with local school districts, cooperatives, and other regional partners that ensure substantive field experience.

2. Program Content

- A. Be interdisciplinary and collaborative across institutions and agencies, calling on a wide variety of resources.
- B. Have rigorous curriculum standards, with identified competencies, and cohort-based instructional methods that motivate and engage students with a focus on dynamic instructional leadership, all with a flexible schedule to accommodate working professionals.
- C. Blend theoretical and research knowledge with applied analytical skills (research knowledge should be used to improve school practice).
- D. Focus on data-based decision making, the efficient use of technology for management and instruction, and the establishment of virtual learning communities.
- E. Help leaders work collaboratively and inclusively with teachers, parents, students, and the community to create productive learning environments.

3. Capacity

- A. Faculty
 - 1) Appropriate qualifications of present and pending faculty, including rank, degrees, experience, and relevant scholarship.
 - 2) Appropriate balance between full- and part-time faculty in the program, ensuring quality and consistency for the students.

- 3) Description of the support and resources that will be provided to aid in the inculcation of a doctoral education culture within the department and institution and the preparation of faculty to chair student committees.
- B. Resource Requirements
- 1) Demonstration of financial viability.
 - a) Total costs for students, including options for student financing.
 - b) Start-up costs.
 - c) Financial impact on institution.
 - d) Minimum number of students required to make program viable, accounting for attrition.
 - 2) Evidence of sufficient graduate student support, including availability of external funding.

4. Components Specific to Joint Programs

- A. Agreements must be clear regarding which entities have decision-making responsibilities in which areas and how differences will be resolved.
- B. A set of criteria for faculty participation in the program must be jointly developed.
- C. Admissions decisions must be made jointly and must be unified from a student perspective.
- D. Advisors must be located at all institutions.
- E. Residency must be clearly defined and may or may not involve physical presence at one or more institutions.
- F. Agreement must be clear on how tuition and fees are paid and allocated.
- G. Curricular requirements must be established jointly.
- H. Dissertation or culminating experience standards and procedures must be developed jointly, including the types of research deemed acceptable.
- I. Committee membership must be equitable, with procedures for exceptions.
- J. Memorandum of agreement must be completed to guide administration of the program.

The Council staff will request external consultants to assist them in the review of proposals for new and redesigned education doctorates to ensure alignment with the criteria described above.

Three years after implementation of any new educational leadership program, and upon completion of the Carnegie-led redesign of current programs, the Council staff will review the program to assess the degree to which it is meeting the purposes for which it was approved. The review will take into account any changes in circumstances that might warrant modification of the original approval. If deficiencies are found, the institution(s) will be requested to remedy them or risk revocation of the authority to offer the degree.