

External Review Report
Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies
Iowa State University
April, 2009

Marilyn J. Amey
Lenoar “Len” Foster
Susan R. Komives
Jeffrey F. Milem (chair)
Laura W. Perna
Michelle D. Young

Michigan State University
Washington State University
University of Maryland
University of Arizona
University of Pennsylvania
University of Texas

The external review team for the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at Iowa State University visited the campus on April 22nd, 23rd, and 24th of 2009. Materials from the Self-Study and from the previous departmental review were available to the committee well in advance of its visit and the committee held one conference call prior to the committee’s visit. This report is based on our review of the self-study materials and of the departmental, college, and university web sites, interviews with the provost and/or members of her staff, an interview with the dean of the College of Human Sciences, faculty group interviews, an interview with members of the departmental advisory board, and an interview with master’s and doctoral students (all of whom were in the student affairs and higher education programs). The members of the committee would like to offer the chair, her faculty, staff, and students our sincere thanks for their helpfulness and professionalism throughout the review process.

The Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at Iowa State University is a strong academic department that warrants the support of senior administrators at the college and university level. ELPS has a distinguished group of faculty at all ranks. They are highly productive scholars, outstanding teachers and advisors, and excellent public servants. The department receives strong and visionary leadership from its chair, Dr. Laura Rendon. The work of the faculty and staff of the Department enhances the ability of the college and the university to achieve its missions of research, teaching, and service. This is an outstanding collection of faculty who have developed strong and noteworthy academic programs. The higher education program in the department is ranked among the best by *U.S. News and World Report* and the community college program has been identified by the American Association of Community Colleges as one of the most innovative programs in the country. The department has made significant changes to the Research and Evaluation program that have strengthened it and made it more responsive to students. Through the hard work and commitment of the program director in the

Educational Leadership program and his cadre of tenure line and clinical faculty, the principal and superintendent preparation programs at Iowa State are once again respected among the practitioners in the state program.

In the pages that follow, we provide a review of the each of the programs in the department in which we offer our commendations and recommendations for that program—educational leadership, higher education, community college leadership, and research and evaluation. We also review the status of sponsored research in the department and provide a review of RISE. We conclude our report with a series of recommendations for the department that build on the individual program reviews.

Educational Administration Program

Context

The Educational Administration program is in a period of rebuilding. A decade ago, this program was well known and respected in both practitioner and scholarly circles; as recently as two years ago, this was not the case. The retirements of several key individuals in the late 1990s and serious faculty turnover since that time placed the program in a challenging if not precarious position. Through the hard work and commitment of the new program coordinator and his cadre of primarily clinical faculty, the principal and superintendent preparation programs at Iowa State are once again respected among the practitioners in the state and the program director is thinking strategically about how to garner the additional resources necessary to move the program back into a successful model for an AAU institution.

Commendations: Practitioners and state level leaders have high opinions of the programs, which are standards based, delivered in the field through a variety of delivery methods, and appear to be of high quality. However, it is not merely the quality of the programs that have improved the program’s image among state and local stakeholders; rather, the program director has worked diligently to be present in the field, to serve as a resource, and to build relationships with districts and professional associations.

The growing expertise among the leadership faculty around school technology leadership and the UCEA Center for School Technology Leadership (CASTL) is also a real asset. Professors McLeod and Nash are currently working to create a “technology certificate” as a means for further program expansion. This is an emerging area within the field of educational administration and currently there are no programs that claim technology leadership as an area of expertise, making the Iowa State program a pioneer in this area.

The Program Coordinator for the Educational Administration program, Scott McLeod, is a huge asset to the program, department, college and university. It is obvious that he is working hard to support his faculty while building strong programs

Potential Challenges: The rapid expansion of the Educational Administration program has enabled this area to increase its visibility in and service to the state, but has also provided opportunities and challenges that must be addressed. There is a belief, based upon ideas about the new budget system at Iowa State, that growing enrollments in the program will provide additional resources to the college and department. The program director believes that in order to bring additional resources to the program, the program must continue to expand enrollments and grant revenue. However, program expansion presents difficult challenges because increased student numbers have required the program to increase the number of adjunct professors that they use to teach classes in the program. The essential problem presented by increased use of adjunct professors is one of quality control. It can be very difficult to select highly capable adjunct instructors, just as it can be difficult to ensure that such instructors understand and support the program's goals. Additionally, increased numbers of graduate students mean increased advising loads, which have real consequences for faculty, like those in ELPS, who are extensively involved in graduate education.

Additionally, the educational administration programs do not seem well connected to the rest of the department. There appears to be little or no collaboration among faculty in educational administration and other programs. Furthermore, all of the educational administration courses are delivered away from the Iowa State campus, which may make it difficult for faculty to engage in the department and university community or for other ELPS faculty to provide support through student committee membership or advising support. These are critical issues to consider in light of the striking history of turnover among educational administration faculty at Iowa State over the past decade.

The new faculty members in educational administration are untenured. In fact, of the faculty who contribute to the program, 4 are clinical professors, 2 are untenured assistant professors (one of which is in a different country until next year), one is an untenured associate professor and one is a tenured associate professor. For a field-based set of graduate programs that requires internship supervision at both levels, spending a great deal of time spent “on the road,” going to and from teaching and supervision responsibilities, and advising dissertations at the doctoral level, this is problematic.

The only senior faculty member in the program is an associate professor who has been at Iowa State for less than two years. He has worked hard to protect the junior faculty in this area from heavy advising and teaching loads; however, their loads are still high and his program administration and advising loads are extreme. Under current conditions, it will be difficult for him to sustain a productive program of research and publication.

Recommendations: A short-term, but immediate way to address the difficulties presented by advising loads would be to have faculty from other programs assist with

doctoral advising; however, the program requires at least one more tenured senior faculty member.

Hiring an additional senior professor would provide needed assistance with doctoral advising, program delivery and junior faculty mentoring that the program sorely needs. Moreover, if strategically selected, that person could assist the program, department and institution in other important ways. For example, a senior scholar of national prominence could assist the program in redeveloping its national reputation for strong scholarship, grants acquisition, and national service. Finally, a senior scholar with expertise in leadership and policy could serve as a “bridge person” for the department, linking educational administration to the department’s desired focus on educational policy.

Other strategies for developing a stronger connection between the educational administration faculty and the rest of the department (e.g., themed discussions around research or teaching, collaborative research projects, and social events) should be developed for building a stronger connection between the educational administration faculty and the rest of the department. Given the similarities in program emphasis and delivery, it seems that a natural connection could be made between the Educational Administration and Community College Leadership programs in the Department.

With regard to the increased utilization of adjunct professors, it is important to develop a formalized screening and faculty development program for adjuncts, through which adjunct professors are selected, introduced to critical features of the program, and provided professional development on adult teaching and learning. Moreover, it is important to ensure that all faculty teaching a particular course are teaching it in a similar manner and that similar content and experiences are provided to students in the different cohorts.

Finally, faculty should take into consideration the findings of recent research on effective leadership preparation programs, which emphasizes the importance of program coherence, learning-focused program content, active, student-centered instructional practice, competent faculty and intensive internship experiences.

Higher Education Program¹

Faculty members in the broader higher education program (e.g., student affairs) are nationally known and are productive scholars. Faculty members provide scholarly leadership to the field of student affairs with their editorial roles in the *Journal of College Student Development* (a top tier journal) and in their professional service (e.g., presidency and other officer roles in such groups as the American College Personnel Association). These professional service and leadership roles contribute substantially to the visibility of the programs in the higher education unit and attract strong students with an interest in student affairs to Iowa State. Although not noted as such in the self-study, we found that the faculty supports the scholar-practitioner model with their students, particularly through their engagement in practitioner-based associations and scholarly associations.

Programs in the higher education unit include three masters programs (community colleges, student affairs, and leadership and learning) and two doctoral programs (higher education and community college leadership) with active discussion occurring regarding the development of a new social justice concentration. The curriculum for these programs seems appropriate. The programs have clearly stated learning outcomes. The student affairs curriculum is in compliance with the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education—with a notable strength in student development theory. The new leadership and learning masters was described as capturing “a market that needed a home” with plans for growth and expansion. This program of study seems to be similar to the program in Organizational Learning and Human Resource Development that was closed after the last departmental review in 2001. The program in Community College Leadership is discussed in the next section of this report.

Commendations: There are several things to commend about the higher education program. First, faculty members are actively involved in advancing their profession. The faculty members are quality teachers, mentors, program administrators, scholars, and provide substantial professional service to Iowa State, the state, and the nation. Evans,

¹ The external review team was divided into three groups that met with specific programs. Regarding the higher education program within the department, one team was asked to meet with student affairs and leadership and learning faculty and one with the community college faculty. Later in the day, all members of the review team met with faculty who are working to create the social justice education program. While the higher education program is a single program that is comprised of four concentrations (student affairs, leadership and learning, community college leadership, and social justice education), the members of the review committee felt as if the concentrations tended to behave more as separate programs—especially when it came to the higher education/student affairs faculty and the community college faculty—than as a single integrated program area. This is important when you consider that ELPS has the largest number of faculty members (15 by our count when you include faculty from the Research and Evaluation Program) whose research and teaching interests fall within the field of higher education of any higher education program in the country.

Hamrick, Patton, and Schuh have sustained leadership roles in professional journals and associations have established their programs and ISU as a place of quality graduate scholarship.

Second, faculty members are student-centered. Faculty members are very committed to their students and devote a substantial amount of time to advising and mentoring students. Students report that they have “collaborative experiences” with faculty and report them to be exceptionally “accessible”.

Third, the higher education program’s commitment to diversity and social justice is exemplary. The innovation of the new social justice component should be a “point of pride” for the department, college, and entire university. This commitment is clearly attracting fine students to Iowa State that otherwise would not consider Iowa as a location for a program of this emphasis. The courses in the social justice curriculum reflect a focus, depth, and breadth that is noteworthy.

Finally, students in the student affairs and on campus higher education programs are of high quality. The students in the student affairs and higher education program are drawn selectively from a strong national pool of applicants. The enrollment of students of color in these programs is an asset to the program, department, and university. The student affairs program is particularly visible at national practitioner association conferences (including participating in various graduate fairs that focus on student recruitment) and is one of a small group of nationally-regarded programs in this field. Although students report that “being in Iowa was a downside” their ability to come to campus as part of the visitation program (Interview Days) was critically important in influencing their decisions to attend the university. Students appear to be happy in their programs in this unit. They appreciate that faculty have respect for administrative work (i.e., the scholar-practitioner model). Several students report that they came to ELPS because of the social justice emphasis of the program (both what was already in student affairs as well as in the new concentration) and valued being “around a group having those conversations.”

Recommendations: This is a strong unit that is not in need of a great deal of reform. There are always areas that can be explored in the continuing quest for excellence. This is especially true given that ELPS is beginning a new strategic planning process and with the appointment of a permanent dean in the college.

First, the program should explore ways to further integrate across the different programs in the college. As we stated earlier, when we look at the department as a whole, ELPS has the highest concentration of faculty members whose work falls within the field of higher education of any department in the country. However, given the evolution of highly differentiated programs in ELPS, there does not appear to be a lot of integration and collaboration across these areas.

Second, clarification regarding the implementation and impact of the Resource Management Model (RMM) is urgent. Ambiguities regarding the impact and implementation of RMM have left the department and this faculty in a confused mode as they try to figure out how to establish new or more solid revenue streams, how to explore options that are central to their core but financially sound, and how to strategically plan within this context. It is not clear to the higher education faculty what size program is optimal to ensure its continuity. Moreover, there is a great deal of confusion regarding the amount of money in indirect costs that is returned to the department. Faculty need to know more about RMM so that they can make informed decisions that can ensure the continued strength of their graduate programs. The faculty in student affairs observed that, because of the nature of tuition waivers that are given to masters' graduate assistants, "tuition remission doesn't count as revenue." This is a serious problem for the masters program in student affairs because they require placement of GAs in an administrative assistantship for enrollment yet the faculty believe that they do not get "credit" for that as part of the tuition revenue stream.

Third, we encourage faculty in the student affairs masters program to consider what an optimal size for their entering cohorts is. However, in order to do this, the issues raised above must be resolved. In the current program, dual sections of the same course are offered in the same term. We are concerned that this produces an unnecessary duplication of effort that seriously limits the ability of faculty members to develop other courses related to their academic interests and that would provide students additional elective choices.

Fourth, faculty must find ways to reduce the amount of time that they spend in the process of advising students. Currently, time demands for advising are excessive. Faculty members are rightfully proud of their personal relationship and mentoring roles with students and students value and appreciate that contact. However, the committee strongly believes that university requirements need to be examined and reformed so that faculty members are able to keep abreast of student progress but that do not create a labor-intensive process like the one currently in place. The current university requirements do not seem to account for faculty members who have appointments in graduate only departments. Clearly faculty advising roles can be streamlined without undermining the faculty-student relationship. Nowhere is this more apparent than in the current program of study committees that faculty on which faculty are required to serve. Students perceive the process of selecting committees as being quite frantic, leading one to suggest a "speed dating" approach as a solution. Clearly this is not the way in which students should seek academic advisement. Other problem areas regarding time allocation identified by the faculty included the program capstone, oral exams, the teaching of social justice classes and PhD seminars, and the failure to provide credit for program coordination activities.

Fifth, the higher educational doctoral program curriculum should be reviewed. Although we did not focus specifically in this area, students did raise some concerns about the lack of policy course work available in the curriculum. Moreover, doctoral students indicated that they would like to have greater flexibility in choosing courses. In addition faculty in the Research and Evaluation area could also be invited to teach selected courses in the higher education area and to serve as advisors for higher education doctoral students.

Community College Leadership²

The community college leadership program at Iowa State is the only graduate program of its type in the state of Iowa. The program offers professional development opportunities, certificates, and degree programs (M.S., M.Ed., and Ph.D.). The Office of Community College Research and Policy supports research efforts of the faculty and is point of contact for external constituents and collaborations. The program is recognized by the American Association of Community Colleges as one of the six most innovative programs in the country for preparing future leaders to work in community colleges.

Commendations: The Community College Leadership Initiative Consortium (CLIC) and Leadership Institute for a New Century (LINC) are strong programs which are self-sustaining in terms of on-going enrollments. Moreover, they provide a regular pool of students who transition into the master's and Ph.D. programs in Community College Leadership.

The faculty members in this area are nationally recognized. Ebbers, Hagedorn, and Laanan are widely viewed as being top senior scholars in the field and Starobin and Eggleston are recognized as part of the next generation of scholars. The faculty members publish in top higher education and community college journals, and collectively, are very effective at grants acquisition.

The Iowa Math and Science Education Partnership (IMSEP) was created by the state to address math and science community college instruction. It includes a community college teaching certificate and interdisciplinary graduate studies. Courses are intended to be offered on-line in the future and some already are.

The doctoral program is quite innovative with courses offered on Thursdays, Fridays and Saturdays. Faculty use webinars, web conferencing, and other strategies to connect with students, support student learning, and create peer learning networks.

² Because we did not talk with any CCLP students, it is not clear to us what concerns, if any, that they have.

CCLP has areas that are likely to directly benefit the department in terms of additional resources that may accrue from the new Resource Management Model. CLIC and LINC are revenue generating and self-supporting; and, as mentioned above, they provide a stream of students into the graduate programs. There is also opportunity to continue expanding on-line instruction in this program to reach different areas of the state, for professional development, and certificate programs.

There are very strong advocates of the program on the Department Advisory Group who want to support and work on behalf of CCLP. They believe strongly in the feasibility of Pre-K-16 collaborations within the department and across the state. This group could serve as liaisons to prospective constituent groups if the department decides to move in this direction.

CCLP connects directly to the important university goal to be the #1 institutional choice for undergraduate transfers. The program is one of the key ways the department ties to the university's strategic plan in terms of transfer and STEM.

Recommendations: There are opportunities for continued growth in CCLP, but without planning and *strategic enrollment management*, there is a potential for faculty to become extremely over-extended. This is especially problematic for pre-tenure faculty. They have a strong contingent of practitioner-scholars serving as adjuncts, who are important to retain and engage, but the tenure line faculty need to watch the balance between part-time and full-time faculty if certificate programs and on-line offerings continue to expand.

The Iowa Math and Science Education Partnership (IMSEP) creates additional instructional responsibilities for the faculty. This means that it is important to find economies of scale in course offerings so that faculty members do not become over committed since an important part of the responsibilities of faculty at an AAU institution include leading the grant and providing assessment. As mentioned earlier in the discussion of the Educational Administration program, the committee sees possible areas of collaboration between the Educational Administration program and the Community College Leadership program.

The current program structure works well for students regarding course taking, but does not allow for shared course taking with other students in the higher education program or students in other programs. Moreover, it does not allow CCLP students to take courses offered in social justice and research methods. Hence this creates the need for redundant courses in the community college content area. Students are highly dependent on the core faculty in this area because they do not have the opportunity to interact with other faculty. As a result, this requires CCLP faculty members to chair and to serve on numerous dissertation committees.

In the upcoming strategic planning process of ELPS, it would be worth considering whether or not CCLP needs to offer master's degrees and the Ph.D. in addition to the certificates, etc. that they currently offer. The continued expansion of degree offerings and formal curricular arrangements [e.g., certificates] can result in too many student demands, course offerings, and completion requirements that are less well recognized and that are very like to detract from the time faculty have to devote to research and publication.

Linda Serra Hagedorn has a strong national reputation as a community college scholar who could play a key role in succession planning in this area. However, the fragmented nature of the different programs (she is technically assigned to Research and Evaluation) and her responsibilities for RISE may not allow her to make contributions in the area for which she has received great acclaim without difficulty. A succession plan is particularly important in this area given the near-future retirement of Larry Ebbers and the untenured status of Professors Starobin and Eggleston.

External Grants and Contracts/RISE

As stated in the Self-Study, one of ELPS' three aims is to "conduct and disseminate basic and applied research for the advancement of educational theory and practice." This attention to research is consistent with the stated missions of the College of Human Services and Iowa State University. Like other land-grant institutions, the mission statements of all three organizational units emphasize teaching, research, and service.

Even in education, conducting research requires external grants and contracts to secure the necessary faculty time, graduate students, and other resources. External funding is also commonly used as an indicator of "quality" of educational programs, as indicated by the use of both total research funding and research dollars per faculty in the *U.S. News and World Report* graduate school rankings.

Commendations: ELPS has several strengths with regard to external grants and contracts. First, as noted in the Self-Study report, between FY05 and FY08, external grant funding for ELPS faculty and RISE staff increased from \$1.5 million to \$6 million. Members of the advisory committee perceive that faculty expertise in research is a competitive advantage for ELPS programs.

Second, ELPS faculty members are receiving external funding to support research on important problems, including the participation of women and students of color in STEM fields. This strength is suggested in part by the research grants received by Frankie Laanan and Florence Hamrick from the National Science Foundation.

Third, data collected from the Self-Study report and interviews conducted during the site visit suggest that ELPS recognizes the importance of obtaining external grants and contracts.

Fourth, many ELPS faculty have strong scholarly records, suggesting their potential for generating additional external research dollars.

Fifth, ELPS regularly seeks opportunities for graduate students to gain research experience. The Self-Study reports that 70% of ELPS full-time doctoral students work with ELPS faculty as research and teaching assistants (n=19). The missions of both RISE and ELPS also include attention to preparing the next generation of educational researchers.

Finally, RISE is well-positioned not only to generate additional external grants and contracts for RISE staff but also to assist ELPS faculty in the acquisition of external grants and contracts. Linda Serra Hagedorn was hired in August 2008 to serve as the director of RISE. RISE staff members have expertise in research, qualitative and quantitative methodologies, and evaluation. Past clients include faculty; other campus units; federal, state, and local agencies; foundations; K-12 school districts; other universities; and community colleges. In 2007 RISE was restructured and is now a unit within ELPS. In FY2008, RISE had 28 grants totaling \$534,465, supporting 7 undergraduates and 10 graduate assistants. Over the past 5 fiscal years, the total amount of funding received by RISE ranged from a high of \$708,325 in FY06 to a low of \$454,731 in FY04.

Recommendations: Despite these many strengths, ELPS faces several challenges with regard to external grants and contracts. In particular, total funding from external grants and contracts for ELPS is relatively low and is concentrated among a very small number of ELPS faculty.

To address these challenges, we offer the following recommendations. First, ELPS should reconsider the role of research relative to the many other activities in which it is engaged and relative to the missions of the Department, College, and University. Currently, departmental activities suggest greater emphasis on the teaching and service components of its mission than on research. Given that time and faculty resources are limited, we suggest that, in its upcoming strategic planning process, ELPS define the appropriate level of emphasis on research activities relative to these other activities. Such planning should also consider the implications of allotting more or less effort to research given the new Resource Management Model (RMM). Clarifying the relative importance of the role of research may also clarify the identity of ELPS and ensure that junior faculty engage in the types of activities that will be rewarded in tenure and promotion processes.

Second, to generate and support additional external research funds, ELPS faculty require additional infrastructure support from the College and the Department. Identifying resources to hire additional staff is not easy, particularly in the current economic climate. Nonetheless, additional infrastructure support for external grants and contracts is imperative. Currently, ELPS faculty who obtain external grants and contracts appear to be “rewarded” with the burden of handling the budgeting and financial reporting of these grants themselves. This practice not only reduces the time that these research-productive faculty members have available to execute the grants and contracts and secure additional external funding, but also increases institutional liability. External grants and contracts come with strict provisions about the allocation of the funds. Faculty are trained in conducting research but generally not trained in these legal and fiscal responsibilities. While the dean’s office employs an individual to support grant activity, this support appears to be insufficient to meet the needs of pre- and post-award needs of ELPS faculty. ELPS should consider the relative benefits of housing such an expert within the department generally or within RISE in particular.

Third, ELPS should explore ways to use the expertise of RISE staff to benefit ELPS faculty more generally. In the Self-Study, RISE requests support to hire an additional permanent staff member to help identify new project opportunities, write proposals, and develop new projects. This appears to be a reasonable request, given the nature of the external funding cycle and the need to invest resources to realize additional resources. But, faculty in ELPS more generally would also benefit from the availability of this type of assistance. With its exceptional leadership and well-qualified staff, RISE should be viewed as a vehicle for enhancing external grant and contract funding for all ELPS faculty, not just RISE staff. ELPS faculty members seem to recognize this potential, as the Self-Study raises the question: “How can RISE assist ELPS programs with ... involvement of faculty in research projects and policy analysis?”

Fourth, ELPS should consider ways to reduce the time that faculty spend on non-research activities so as to increase the availability of time for securing and fulfilling external grants and contracts. Faculty time on administrative tasks may be reduced by identifying tasks that may be centralized and completed by administrative staff. Faculty time on teaching may be reduced by reducing the number of “required” classes (thereby reducing the perceived need for standing faculty to regularly offer particular courses) and reducing overlap and redundancy in course offerings across programs. While requiring an upfront investment, designing and delivering some courses online may reduce time spent teaching (and traveling to off-campus sites) in the long-term. Faculty time on advising may be reduced by reconsidering the roles and activities of the Plan of Study (POS) committees (especially for master’s degree students) and more evenly distributing dissertation advising demands.

Fifth, ELPS should identify ways to support assistant and associate professors in writing and administering external grants and contracts. External grants and contracts are one criterion considered in tenure and promotion decisions. But, as in other institutions, assistant professors often struggle to develop the skills required to identify and obtain external funding, while associate professors struggle to find time for research in the context of greater administrative responsibilities.

Sixth, ELPS should consider how to obtain the space necessary to enable RISE to expand. Space is a perennial issue on many campuses. Nonetheless, as argued in the Self-Study, the availability of space constrains the ability of RISE to take on additional externally-funded projects, particularly those that may support additional graduate students.

Budget System

Context: Iowa State University is moving forward with a new budgeting model: the Resource Management Model (RMM).

Commendations: ELPS faculty members clearly believe that RMM rewards entrepreneurial activities and are eager to engage in activities that they believe that RMM will reward. For example, despite the current magnitude of off-campus courses, the Self-Study raises the question: “How can ELPS become more entrepreneurial in terms of generating additional tuition dollars from off-campus courses?”

Recommendations: Given the newness of RMM, it is not surprising that many ELPS faculty are uncertain about the implications of the new budgeting model. Nonetheless, based on our review of the Self-Study and on-campus visit, we are concerned that, without a more complete understanding of RMM, faculty may be engaging in behaviors that are not consistent with the missions of department, College, and University, or, that may not actually produce the type of “return on investment” that faculty assume. For example, some ELPS faculty members believe that, if they simply substantially increase the number of credits generated through off-campus instruction, their particular program will be rewarded with an additional faculty line. Based on other information collected during our visit as well as the current economic context, this understanding does not seem accurate.

In this context, we offer the following recommendations. First, the University and the College should engage in additional efforts to communicate with ELPS faculty about RMM and its implications for the department generally and programs within the department, including RISE. These communications should be tailored to recognize the current characteristics of ELPS, particularly its status as a unit that provides only

graduate-level instruction, and include attention to such issues as the distribution of indirect cost recovery dollars.

Second, with a more complete understanding of RMM, ELPS should engage in a strategic planning process that identifies the relative costs and benefits of allocating (finite) time and other resources to various entrepreneurial activities, including off-campus outreach activities, undergraduate instruction, and external grants and contracts. This planning process should consider the possibility of having ELPS faculty focusing strategically on the types of entrepreneurial activities that best match individual strengths and interests as well as department needs.

Research and Evaluation Program

Faculty in the Research and Evaluation program offer introductory and advanced research methodology courses primarily to students in the College of Human Sciences. The program offers a redesigned M.S. degree in Research and Evaluation, and the Ph.D. degree in Educational Administration. A 12 graduate credit certificate in education research and evaluation is currently being developed.

There has been a complete turnover of faculty in this program and the current program faculty members have less than five years of experience in teaching the curriculum, much of which has been redesigned under their leadership and direction. There has also been a heavy dependence on adjunct faculty that has tended to fragment the delivery and quality of the program prior to the current faculty. The current faculty is composed of 3.5 full time tenured/tenure track members. The director of the Research Institute for Studies in Education (RISE) serves as the half-time faculty member in the program. Members of the current faculty have received funding from a variety of sources, including the Ford Foundation, U.S. Department of Education, and the Lumina Foundation. Faculty members are also widely published and serve on the editorial boards of several highly selective peer reviewed journals.

Commendations: Despite faculty turnover, the current faculty (Porter, Gildersleeve, and Smith) has been dedicated to revitalizing the curriculum of the program through new sequencing of courses, course redesign, and infusion of advanced and newer methodologies and pedagogies. Courses in quantitative and qualitative platforms of research expose students to the latest and state of the art software and applications. Two definitive outcomes for the quantitative and qualitative sequences have been established by the faculty: “students will have the necessary training to conduct research of sufficient quality to be funded by grant agencies or published in top education journals.” The

efforts of the faculty and the programmatic initiatives they have introduced have had a positive effect on the quality of courses offered in the program.

Recommendations: Despite the extensive and varied training of the faculty in areas of research methodology, few of the full time faculty members serve consistently as methodologists on student dissertation committees. This may be so, in part, because some of the constituent units (Educational Administration and Community College) within ELPS teach their own research-focused courses from which such faculty are drawn for student committees. Efforts should be made to connect these faculty members to appropriate programs in the college. Clearly, they are being underutilized as dissertation chairs and committee members.

Second, beside Linda Serra Hagedorn, faculty members in this program appear to have no natural connection, linkage, or partnership with the work of RISE. While it is important for faculty in all programs to work more closely with RISE, this seems to be especially appropriate for faculty in the Research and Evaluation program.

Third, although courses in the program have increasingly been used as service courses by students in areas such as Agriculture & Biosystems, Engineering, and Linguistics, there is a need for a more focused and concerted recruitment plan for students in the program that was not evident during conversations with faculty. In the upcoming strategic planning process, considerable thought should be given to a recruitment plan for students in this area. Redesign of the master's degree program in Research and Evaluation and development of a 12 graduate credit certificate in educational research and evaluation are also important steps that could be taken by program faculty to address low student numbers. Moreover, thought should be given as to whether both of these initiatives could be developed as on line programs.

Finally, faculty should work to create partnerships with other academic departments on campus whereby basic courses in research methodology offered in ELPS could be shared with these departments to create a greater economy of scale for everyone involved.

ELPS Department

Commendations: The Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at Iowa State University has a distinguished group of faculty (at all ranks). They are highly productive scholars, outstanding teachers and advisors, and excellent public servants. The department receives strong and visionary leadership by its chair, Dr. Laura Rendon. The work of the faculty and staff of the Department enhances the ability of the college and the university to achieve its missions of research, teaching, and service. This is an outstanding collection of faculty who have developed strong and noteworthy academic

programs. The higher education program in the department is ranked among the best by *U.S. News and World Report* and the community college program has been identified by the American Association of Community Colleges as one of the most innovative programs in the country. The department has made significant changes to the Research and Evaluation program that have strengthened it and made it more responsive to students. Through the hard work and commitment of the program director in the Educational Administration program and his cadre of tenure line and clinical faculty, the principal and superintendent preparation programs at Iowa are once again respected among the practitioners in the state program.

Recommendations:

There needs to be greater recognition of and appreciation for the significant role that the ELPS department plays in furthering the mission of the College and the University.

There needs to be an acknowledgment by central administrators of the important contributions that the department and its faculty make to the university, local, statewide, and national communities through their scholarship, teaching, and outreach. As part of this process, it is important that the central administration recognize and respond to the additional time demands that are placed on faculty who teach in a graduate only academic department that prepares both educational researchers *and* educational practitioner/leaders.

ELPS faculty members need greater clarity regarding the new budgeting system and its impact on the department and its programs. It is difficult for the department to do strategic planning when faculty members are not clear about how the new budgeting system will impact the different options that they consider. Clearly, there is a great deal of confusion regarding how the RMM system works. Key to the department's success is the ability to find an appropriate balance of development in the areas of outreach programs, undergraduate initiatives, and research grant proposals. Moreover, faculty should strategically focus on these different areas based upon their individual strengths, program needs, and departmental needs.

Greater infrastructure support should be provided to the faculty. This is especially true regarding support for faculty research activities. We recommend that a grants manager be hired within the department (or within RISE) to assume the administrative tasks that require a great deal of faculty time and for which many are not prepared to handle—especially as they relate to the budget and reporting requirements that exist with most grants. Moreover, RISE should work to provide more direct support to ELPS faculty as they seek sources of support for their scholarly activities.

ELPS faculty members should work together to develop a formal plan of mentoring to support junior faculty through the promotion and tenure process. This plan should find

ways to lessen the administrative demands place on junior faculty and should provide support for junior faculty in the writing and administration of grants and external funds. Moreover, thoughtful mentoring should be provided to Associate Professors in the department to ensure that they are making appropriate progress toward promotion to full professor.

ELPS faculty members should view the strategic planning process as an opportunity for “transformative planning.” We suggest that the department work to develop a common vision and mission across that links and unifies each of the programs in the department. Our assessment is that there are at least three common themes that could be used to link the department:

- Equity/Access/Social Justice
- Educational Policy
- Preparing Future Educational Leaders and Scholars

As part of this strategic planning process, ELPS faculty should develop a plan for the hiring of new and/or vacant position within the department. In framing this plan, the faculty should insure that any new hires they make are linked to the transformative plan that department develops. Moreover, any additional hires should be linked to departmental goals and mission and can also serve as boundary spanners within the department, the college, or the university.

ELPS faculty should work together to find more economies of scale within the department so that they can more efficiently use their time. This should include a process by which faculty find ways to collaborate more with colleagues within the department. One of the questions posed to the review team by the dean asked us to determine whether ELPS should expand collaborations externally with the Department of Curriculum and Instruction and/or other campus offices. While this may be an important thing to consider in the future, the review team felt that it was most important that the ELPS faculty use the upcoming strategic planning process to find opportunities to expand their collaborations *across programs within the department*. At the present time, there appears to be redundancy and duplication of effort that could be reduced if faculty in the different programs did more “boundary spanning” within the department. In the long term, this could ease the tremendous time demands place on many faculty members in the department. Other areas that the committee recommends further consideration include:

- As a first step, explore greater program linkages between the Educational Administration program and the Community College Leadership program.
- Lessen the time demands placed on faculty as part of their service on the POS Committees.
- Provide greater infrastructure support for faculty (see item number 3 below).

- Reduce the number of “required” classes in programs (especially in the doctoral program) or provide more flexibility and better allocation of faculty expertise and resources.
- Reduce the overlap and/or redundancy in courses offered within and across programs.
- Find ways to more evenly distribute the advising of doctoral students and dissertation chairing loads.

ELPS should cautiously consider expanding its academic programs. During the review team’s visit, we heard a great deal of talk about expanding existing program offerings (via outreach and on-line distance education) and developing new program offerings (i.e., a new concentration in social justice education) within the department. While the review team sees potential value in these discussions, we think that they should be done with caution until faculty have greater clarity regarding the relative costs and benefits—within the context of RMM—of these actions. In regard to this, we offer the following suggestions:

- Further expansion of the Educational Administration program should not move forward until the recommendations offered above are considered and addressed—especially related to hiring another senior faculty member and understanding the impact that growth will have in the context of RMM. Faculty in this program are already over-extended.
- Some strategic attention to the future role of the Social Justice program is warranted. For example, expanding into undergraduate education with a certificate in social justice would serve the ISU student body and provide doctoral student teaching experience. However, this should be thoughtfully considered in the context of what the costs and benefits of this expansion would be given the new budgeting system. It would be wise to explore how affiliate faculty (such as professional educators in the student affairs division) might be able to support these efforts.
- ELPS strategic planning should consider a transformation toward a social justice orientation across all program units and not just exist as a program within the department. We applaud the goal to develop “contemplative activists” and in light of RMM encourage the department to consider whether a certificate is more sustainable than the development of a new concentration within the higher education program. Consideration should be given to find ways to encourage faculty involvement from other programs and departments. This may provide a strategic opportunity for ELPS to be at the center of an effort to create an important interdisciplinary intellectual community across the Iowa State campus.