ACADEMIC AFFAIRS PORTFOLIO AND OPERATIONS REVIEW

DEPARTMENT/PROGRAM PHASE 1 TEMPLATE

Name of school/college: College of Education
Name of department/program: Educational Administration
Date: 5-3-16

Introduction

As the school/college reviews and builds out data sets provided by the university, it will also solicit, in a manner appropriate to the organization and culture of that school/college, the information needed from departments or programs for well-informed analysis and recommendations. Such material falls into two categories:

1. Workload and operations information that is held (or largely held) within the department/program rather than the school/college or central university data sources, such as faculty service performed within the department/program.
2. Information, perspectives, and concerns that the department/program believes should be considered as part of the broader review, such as challenges inherent to teaching within a particular discipline.

The questions below reflect the baseline information that meets the criteria above. Schools and colleges should feel free to add to these questions as appropriate. Please note that this template is part of the Workload and Operations phase; each department/program will have another opportunity to provide information relevant to the Portfolio Review.

Department/Program Review

Please address the questions below and add whatever information deemed relevant to this process.

To the extent that this information is not already available in the template for your school or college, advise regarding the parts of the workload for your faculty not captured by course load and credit generation measures. In particular, if there is any **research/scholarship/creative work or service** that distinguishes the contributions of the faculty in this department or program from others in the school/college and university, please describe it.

Response:

For the past two years, the Educational Administration (EDAD) program courses and program service have been provided by adjunct instructors under special supplementary contracts. That is especially critical to note since this program requires a Professional Education Advisory Board (mandated by the state), as well as external partnerships with schools and professional organizations that are not accounted for in workload. The program has currently submitted a program revision to the Academic Assembly, and this revision requires an even more robust external presence for the faculty member.

Is there information that needs to be considered as a part of an analysis of the "teaching productivity" of the department or program? Are there differentiators in the kinds of instruction taking place or the population of students being educated that impact the ability of faculty to generate credit hours?

Response: None. There are no external accreditation limitations or limitations internal to the programthat limit the ability of the faculty to generate credit hours.

What unrealized opportunities do you see? Are there ways that the contributions of the department/program to the mission and financial health of the university could be improved?

Response:

The college began its review of EDAD during the AY 15 year through a series of focus groups with groups that included adjunct faculty in the program and the program's advisory board, which includes representatives of key stakeholders (i.e., major and small public school districts, Catholic educators, state agencies, and the two professional organizations of school administrators in the state). The college also reviewed its annual surveys of graduates of the program over a five-year period. This survey is completed by the college's placement director who has been able to obtain a 90% response rate to the survey annually. The college finally conducted a review of current practices among leading school administrator training programs in the U.S.

All of these sources suggested a need to create a different model that could build on the existing strengths of the program while creating a more field-based program that was built more on intentional partnerships with schools where the field placements occurred. These reviews also suggested a need to shorten the program from the current two-year model – as well as a need to offer more targeted course work that focused on the needs of specific kinds of schools. Throughout summer, 2015, the college then convened an expert panel of school administration professionals to participate in a charrette-style design process led by Dr. Ann Foster, co-director of the National Network for Educational Renewal.

The panel included participants from industry, public schools, Catholic schools, charter schools, and independent schools. Over the summer of 2015, they met, offered ideas, reviewed concepts and models, and provided broad perspectives on the future of the EDAD program. They also each interviewed at least five program recently graduated administrators to report on those administrators experiences so that the group could, in addition to what it learned from the literature of successful programs and the prior focus groups and surveys conducted for EDAD, triangulate knowledge into a clear picture of what an SU program should look like. They collectively participated in building the model, and have approved the final design. The resulting model is an outcome of their work and it provides a program that is more responsive to the needs of potential students and the districts that employ them.

What particular constraints or challenges does the department/program face?

Response:

As noted in the above section, the college included leaders from a variety of sectors in the design of a new program. This was important to the program's ability to be responsive to the sectors that these people represent. Through its review of the market needs, and with these experts' counsel, the college learned of the needs that formed the new program. The resulting program design is a response to those needs. Additionally, the redesign responds to a growing demand for school administrators in the state.

According to the National Center for Educational Statistics (*Characteristics of Public and Private Elementary and Secondary School Principals in the United States: Results From the 2011–12 Schools and Staffing Survey*), 31.6% of public school principals in 2012 were 55 years of age or older nationally. For private schools overall, that number is higher at 47.1%, and in Catholic Schools, it is higher still at 55.2%. There is a clear coming need for school administrators as these experienced administrators retire over the next decade. This is coupled with a turnover of positions in high need areas of Washington state. The Center for Reinventing Public Education (a non-profit research center of the University of Washington) has challenged districts to think differently about how leaders are prepared. In their 2014 report *School Leadership in Washington State: Today's Leaders and Key Challenges They Face*, CRPE notes:

The non-monolithic nature of the workforce raises the question of whether it is time to think more creatively about a specialized and intentional approach to supporting leaders in Washington's most challenging settings, rather than treating preparation as a set of experiences that can be generalized. District leaders might also become more aggressive about growing their own best teacher leaders, providing a challenging hiring process with in-school experiences to test leader abilities prior to hiring, and providing ongoing coaching and mentoring once principal staff are hired.

Districts throughout the region have responded to this call and similar ones. Seattle Public Schools, for example, has established its own leadership academy and has established standards for whom the district will accept in university-based internships. The district and the college have begun discussions about joint processes that will allow the college of education to work in partnership with the district to develop their next generation of district leaders. This review of EDAD comes at an opportune time when districts like Seattle are seeking to develop partnership agreements with universities that will allow the district to work with the college and select and participate in the training of its future leaders. The college plans or has begun similar conversations with other districts and school systems. This revised program will be more of a jointly developed and managed partnership between the college and partnering districts in direct response to the changes that the profession is undergoing.

Is there anything else you would like to put on the record?

Response:

The faculty member in the EDAD program passed away in 2014. A search in AY 15 failed to find a replacement faculty member. The college has just successfully completed the process of conducting another search. The position is a full-time, tenure-track position. Additional adjunct faculty members have always been a component of this program, and they will continue to be so since they provide excellent practitioner-focused perspectives to the program. These positions have always been a component of the college's budget.

The college's standard load for a faculty member is 18 credits annually. Therefore, the newly hired faculty member will be responsible to teach 18 credits within the program annually. Additionally, that person may elect to teach six credits during the summer term (although that is not a requirement of employment). There are nine credits in the degree that are college of education "core" courses that most programs in the college also require within their degrees. These three courses are offered college-wide: EDUC 5000, Educational Research, EDUC 5130, Adult Learning, and EDUC 5120 (Social Justice). The remaining 19 credits in the program for the year will be taught by adjunct faculty. That has been the model for the program for the past 12 years and it does not represent a budgetary or staffing change.