

Graduate Education Ad Hoc Committee Meeting  
March 2, 2007  
Room 301

Minutes

(Note: These minutes were approved by the Graduate Education Ad Hoc Committee at the committee's April 19 committee meeting.)

**Attendees:** Katie Button, Joe Claudet, Steve Crooks, Roseanna Davidson, Heriberto Godina, Bret Hendricks, Carole Janisch, Peggy Johnson, Sylvia Mendez-Morse, Juan Munoz, Arturo Olivarez (guest), Peggie Price, Roy Rodriguez, Mary Runnels, Sheryl Santos, Doug Simpson, Reese Todd, and Julie Thomas (substituting for Jennifer Wilhelm).

Recorders: Kay Gleghorn, Esther Lucey

**Agenda:**

1. Dean's remarks
2. Task reports
3. Discussion of next steps

**Opening Remarks**

Dean Santos reviewed several articles available as handouts.

Article One: *Doctoral Preparation of Scientifically Based Education Researchers* (2005, Educational Research, Vol. 32, No. 4, pp. 3-13) by Margaret Eisenhart and Robert L. DeHaan. Dean Santos suggested to the committee that we could use the 6 principles from this article to support our principles and methodologies:

1. To pose significant questions that can be investigated empirically;
2. To link research to relevant theory;
3. To use methods that permit direct investigation of the question;
4. To provide an explicit and coherent chain of reasoning;
5. To replicate and generalize across studies; and
6. To make research public to encourage professional scrutiny and critique. (SRE, pp. 3-5, 54-72)

Basically, the article makes the argument that our candidates are not coming out of research-based programs. They are teachers, students, doctoral students, with not the same opportunities as science or math students who are, from the beginning, engaging in research.

I suggest, before we come up with a final recommendation, there is so much out there, that we need to explore. There was a big ruckus in 1910 and they went into theory, research, and practice and that is a good model for us. On the final page there is an

outline which can give us some ideas about core courses. Also on the last page, the issues about interdisciplinary research and the conclusion; please read them. In the references are Berliner 2002 - you know Berliner started as ed psych and ended up in C&I in research at Arizona State and brings in a unique theory background to this article. There is a new book on research that I have to look at that Dr. Borelli gave me on doctoral research. The Carnegie foundation has a 2003 summary.... I recommend those 3 references at least. But there is, then, of course Labaree, "The peculiar problems of preparing educational researchers" (2003).

### **Task reports**

Dr. Claudet briefly explained the handouts distributed to committee members, and invited individual committee members to give a brief verbal summary of the results of their task assignments:

Dr. Mendez-Morse: Dr. Mendez-Morse reported that Educational leadership faculty felt the 15 hours of research methods (that students select from the College of Education minimum requirements listing) the EDLD program requires of EDLD doctoral students serves EDLD students well. Dr. Mendez-Morse indicated that EDLD faculty would like to possibly add some additional courses to this requirement. Dr. Mendez-Morse then reported that she contacted Texas A&M to obtain information regarding A&M's Educational Leadership and/or Higher Education programs. Dr. Mendez-Morse stated she discussed several things with Dr. Linda Skrla, Associate Dean for Research. The major difference was that A&M's Ed.D. is much more focused towards practice, not a dissertation focus. It is a study of research. Dr. Srla referred to it as "dissertation-like", as opposed to the Ph.D. What is the difference? It is that they have four degree plans, which are listed throughout their website, the electives are up to 18 hours in Ph.D. vs. the Ed.D. having only 12 hrs. of electives. Also, there are up to 18 hours of support/field courses. They have one course that both Ph.D. and Ed.D. students are required to take – epistemology of inquiry, all students in their college of education are required to take this course. Students have lots of flexibility in terms of the types of courses, once the students get into their research area. For the Ed.D., they have a prescribed set of courses; for the superintendency, it is the internship. They have a course on development in adult education, and one on writing the literature review. Basically, for the 18 hrs of research students, take 2 stats courses and then an intro to qualitative research, and everything gets developed according to the needs of each individual and what the committee and the advisor recommend. Thus, 18 hours with flexibility - maybe 12 hours, but 6 hours with a focus of individual study. They have flexibility and more courses that go further into stats. What I saw was the recommendation of the faculty, the courses, and the flexibility so every student could hone their own individual program of study.

Dr. Crooks: Dr. Crooks reported he looked at the Univ. of Washington's College of Education, a pretty good school and one that others did not select. What they have is a requirement of 2 courses for all the Ph.D. students. They call it their "Educational Inquiry Seminar Series, EDLPS 525 and 526", an introduction to methods and theories. That's all that is a required core for Ph.D. students. All students take the sequence their

first year, and then are required to complete 4 additional courses for a combined 12 hours – can be outside of the college – as long as they are relating to methods of educational inquiry. So, they have their core that is fixed with 2 courses. Thus, 12 additional courses in the college or outside of it in two areas they recommend. Dr. Crooks noted that it is not easy to balance flexibility with student individuality. Dr. Crooks indicated that what we do in our college is similar to what they do. It made sense to have a core of some kind, which we do, maybe a qualitative/quantitative general research course and have more flexibility at the program level for students to take additional related courses of research inquiry up to a minimum of 12 hours. Our program perspective equals that. We saw the difficulty of flexibility as to student individuality and we sort of chose a happy medium there.

Dr. Simpson: Dr. Simpson noted that both he and Dr. Peggie Price surveyed the same faculty, and so some of the things he's reporting may overlap with her information. In terms of faculty feedback, there were only a few who responded and those ranged from saying each department could develop core courses, to using existing core options, to should be opened up to new core courses for approval, to more professors should be involved in teaching core courses. Dr. Simpson also indicated a variety of faculty perspectives are listed in his printed survey response summary.

Dr. Price: Dr. Price reported that she and Dr. Simpson formulated six questions to pose to their program faculty. Dr. Price stated that Dr. Simpson synthesized the responses very well. Dr. Price noted that there was no great agreement in the responses. Dr. Price indicated that, regarding the four individuals who responded to the questions, one common theme emerging was that the committee should have autonomy in deciding what each individual student needs to know; even though the four individuals suggested that, in terms of research requirements, we need both qualitative and quantitative for all research courses, but where these courses are taught and how the courses are taught are two different things. Dr. Price then reported that she reviewed Texas A&M ed psych program and C&I, as well as Univ. of NM and North Texas—all were of the same caliber. A&M's has 15 hours total, very similar to what our requirements are. Not all of their research included both qualitative and quantitative, but past the beginning ed psych and stat courses, students could take courses from a number of different programs. Most courses are offered through the ed psych department. In terms of how the qualitative courses are offered, all could take courses outside, such as sociology. At North Texas and U of NM, most of their courses were located within their department, which houses ed psych.

Dr. Todd: Dr. Todd indicated that she represented the elementary education program which, for doctoral students, falls into the C&I program. Dr. Todd reported she talked with faculty in her area, and stated she prepared a page summarizing their responses. Dr. Todd noted that she and her program colleagues are seeking a balance, and some of their students get out of the course offering sequence and can't get the courses when they start their dissertations. It is doing the dissertation—and the sequencing that has not provided the tools. Dr. Todd reported that she and her colleagues talked about some things they would do in the teacher education certification area, and that may need to be looked at

carefully—there are some gaps there. Dr. Todd then reported she looked at two Oklahoma schools – University of Oklahoma and OSU. Dr. Todd stated the University of Oklahoma program is what she came through. There are some core courses and the curriculum areas, the basic courses, are very similar to what we ask of our students—i.e., diversity, required research is 12 hrs. These are not spelled out because the individual student’s committee decides for the particular student. Their handbook says “Research proficiency is based in part on the development of attitudes and skills that vary considerably from one field to another. The faculty for each degree program is responsible for requiring that the doctoral candidate demonstrate proficiency in those skills deemed necessary for successful research performance.” (2006-2007 Graduate College Bulletin, The University of Oklahoma, Information for Doctoral Students, page 55). This is a broad statement. The OSU pitched their program as a core, including one called language, literature and culture, diversity, a research inquiry core, theoretic foundations, and an advanced research strategy. This was left up to the committee to decide.

Dr. Davidson: Dr. Davidson reported that the special education faculty had a lively discussion at their recent special education program meeting. Dr. Davidson noted that special education program faculty agree with several of the faculty comments included in the handouts. Dr. Davidson emphasized that special education faculty want to be able to address specific needs that faculty and students have within their special education program, but Dr. Davidson also stressed that special education faculty also want broad support and buy-in from the COE. In particular: Dr. Davidson stated that in the special education program, single subject research design is taught, which is the major method for research in special ed. Dr. Davidson stated that special education program faculty would like to be able to offer that course. The special education program would like to take it out of EPSY and put it into an EDSP number. Dr. Davidson indicated that special education faculty would like for their peers to recognize that it is a research tool course—and it already has been acknowledged, but make it an EDSP number. Dr. Davidson further indicated that special education faculty would like to look at the outcomes for their students and go back and look at curriculum that is offered to decide where special education faculty need to add, if additions are needed. Special education faculty prefer to look at student outcomes and review course requirements—and, any course development needs to be based on doctoral national standards. Dr. Davidson noted that it has been her observation that not all courses are based on national standards. Are there national standards to support courses in qualitative research and in quantitative research? Are there variables between course objectives in those areas? In grant writing, Dr. Davidson stated, we have to document the relationship to national standards or competencies and we need all courses tied to that.

Dr. Janisch: Dr. Janisch reported on core requirements in the College of Education at the University of Illinois. The University of Illinois offers both the Ed.D. and Ph.D. degrees, and the distinction between the two is delineated on their webpage. To pursue a research career, students take the Ph.D. route; for a career in practice, students are directed to the Ed.D. The Ph.D. is not prescriptive; the Ed.D. is prescriptive—their handbook provides the requirements. Dr. Janisch noted that the only thing prescriptive for the Ph.D. degree

is research, and there are 4 areas. The dean appoints 3 faculty members to each of those 4 areas and those committee members have the jurisdiction and the advisors work with the committee in terms of which of the four areas individual students pursue. It is all decided with an advisor and whichever area committee students chose. The Ed.D: They have a cognate across lots of disciplines and areas. The L&L program is supportive with what we would like to see - more openness in the core, what makes the core courses. Dr. Janisch noted that it appears Language and Literacy faculty would like to think about research in terms of what would be beneficial to our students in language and literacy, more so in C&I, and what the research looks like and how it is to be delivered.

Dr. Button: Dr. Button stated that she also did this assignment as a faculty member of same program (Language and Literacy), but not as a program coordinator. Dr. Button indicated she contacted Ohio State University. Ohio State has multiple Ph.D. programs. There is one in L&L and culture and there is one in a special area of school studies, which includes global and communication requirements. Ohio State has a list of courses from which students can select—12 hours required—and consult with an advisor as to what to take. So, there are generic core courses for L&L and culture and they have multiple Ph.D.s to grant. Students are asked to take two core courses, then the other Ph.D. programs in the College have the research requirements and these requirements are selected by the committee, based on the student and the faculty members on the committee. These programmatic research requirements are not listed as part of the College-level required list.

Dr. Munoz: Dr. Munoz stated that he was reporting on the Ph.D. program in the UCLA Division of Urban Schooling. This program reflects the C&I Ph.D. The core course is a research course called RAC electives. As explained by Dr. Munoz, students in the program take a cognate outside of the UCLA College of Education (an elective can supplement these cognate courses). The RAC series reflects a core for the Ph.D., which includes two units in foundations, 16 in research, and a compulsory research apprenticeship. There is a common apprenticeship experience for every graduate to prepare them; but they leave UCLA with the capability of being an associate professor somewhere. The cognate allows for great flexibility to emphasize the area the student wants to study.

Dr. Thomas: Dr. Thomas noted that she was substituting for Dr. Wilhelm. Dr. Thomas stated that the Science and Math education program faculty have not met since their last meeting. Dr. Thomas indicated that at the University of Georgia College of Education, a certification in qualitative research is offered in which students take a minimum of 5 courses to receive it—no idea what value it has, but there is incentive to take the courses for certification. Dr. Thomas stated that SMED program faculty didn't seem to indicate strong feelings about the minimum core requirements other than the language requirement. Another program faculty member is concerned with the statistics courses – specifically, that students learn programs such as SPSS to be able to do research analysis.

Dr. Runnels: Dr. Runnels reported that the educational psychology program faculty support a core. Dr. Runnels stated that she doesn't disagree that we need qualitative and

quantitative research—we should graduate students knowing both. Dr. Runnels indicated that there was other discussion within her program area about qualitative courses, but she would not talk about that at this time.

Dr. Hendricks: Dr. Hendricks reported that, overall, the counselor education program faculty feel that the core serves their students well based on committee autonomy. Definition between Ed.D./Ph.D. students—this seems to be a “developing college culture” issue. Dr. Hendricks noted that the Ph.D. degree in counseling is prescriptive—this holds the counselor education program to adhering to core requirements. For example, A&M Corpus Christi is a CACREP program and they are virtually the same as what we offer based upon committee input. The difference between TTU & Corpus is they have a specific required course in counseling research.

Dr. Godina: Dr. Godina reported that the mid-level teaching certificate may no longer be a viable certificate in the State of Texas, and this has consequences—it has implications for considering a graduate program. Dr. Godina indicated that he investigated University of Iowa. They require GRE, phased out the Ed.D., only have the Ph.D., and one degree called EDS – ed specialist. The core requirements in grad programs are very flexible. Each program in the department is allowed to define what requirements each has. Dr. Godina indicated he focused on Language and Literacy, and stated they only require taking “theoretical” courses. Students are allowed flexibility to pick outside the college to shape an area. Students identify a method of research and take a prescribed number of hours. That is a pattern across the program—a series of grad courses to pick from, with flexibility. One unique aspect of the Ph.D. program at the University of Iowa is that students need to have four committee members and one from outside the college, which is different than here. A legitimate member of the committee is from outside the college, and that member can share the committee chair role.

Dr. Rodriguez: Dr. Rodriguez reported that he surveyed the higher education faculty and “we decided to secede from the COE, which is a very common attitude in higher ed program faculty—secede to a college of programs nobody wants and not know what to do with and with higher enrollments.” More seriously, Dr. Rodriguez noted that his program faculty are in agreement on the need to have a distinct difference between the Ed.D. and Ph.D. Dr. Rodriguez indicated that Dr. Murray informed him that at Ohio State, the doctoral program is committee-driven in HIED. Dr. Rodriguez stated he called the Univ. of Texas at Austin and spoke with his own mentor about their program in leadership. At UT-A they have no core. They fought that battle years ago because of the same issues that elementary eds are different. They offer both degrees. The Ph.D. requires 15 credits of research courses, the Ed.D. requires 6 credits of research courses. The Ed.D. is practice oriented. They differ in internships and they really don’t share course work with other doctoral programs within the Univ. of Texas. The Ed doctoral program is unique.

Dean Santos: Another implication to consider is how it affects our organization. The language, literature and culture, and education foundations, make another kind of department – a conglomerate. I am hearing about resources. We can’t run a degree with

23 people. We may need to give consideration to our organization—the format of things in one piece as to core research, it could be a resource. Each department does not have specializations, since we have grown; we do have specialists who are placed in that department because of where the job is. Many of us have degrees in something and end up elsewhere. With resources, we must look towards the future and as we grow in strategic ways we need flexibility for departments to have more determination.

Dr. Johnson: The only issues set in stone have been the core and the research foundation courses and research; we have guidelines other than that. We have guidelines and we use flexibility for the individual to give that student a rigorous individualized program

Note: In addition to the above reports, Dr. Fred Hartmeister submitted website information on graduate programs at the University of Wyoming for review by the committee; and Dr. Walter Smith also submitted information regarding graduate programs at the University of Kansas for committee review. Drs. Hartmeister and Smith were not able to be present at this particular committee meeting.

Committee members then engaged in a brief discussion of current College of Education core requirements.

### **Discussion of next steps**

Committee members briefly reviewed their discussion of topics presented at this meeting in light of identifying committee member tasks and agenda items for the next meeting.

Dean Santos: My concern, as we grow, is our structure with two departments. It is unwieldy and you have no power. In other universities, each department has power, has the authority, look at science, conglomerate, their departments have power to make decisions. They have line items in the budget. My concern, we are inundated putting out immediate fires. Now we need to look down the line at a better structure for programs and departments. Visibility is an issue. Two departments, that is puny. You want to see your department up in lights. We have to figure that out. Maybe not enough money to have department chairs, more visibility for these programs.

Dr. Claudet: Dr. Claudet summarized committee member discussions by stating that it appears the committee has focused on two agenda items that could become committee member tasks in preparation for the next meeting. First, the committee could discuss at the next meeting the overall structure of graduate education in the whole college—what should it be or what do faculty want? Second, what kind or kinds of common core curriculum do faculty want for the college and should it be at a college, department, or program level? Dr. Claudet requested committee members to poll their program faculty and bring program faculty perspectives to share at the next meeting.

