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Preface

The Department of Organization and Leadership (O&L) was asked by the University Provost and the Dean of the School of Education to undertake a Program Review of its Master’s and Doctoral Programs in the fall, 2003. The periodic program review is the first formal review of the O&L Department since its inception in 1975 and the first formal program review conducted by the Graduate School of Education. The self study commenced in fall, 2003, led by a faculty facilitator, Dr. Betty Taylor appointed by the Dean in cooperation with the Department Chairperson, Dr. Patricia Mitchell.

The full time faculty, Dr. Deborah Bloch, Dr. Ellen Herda, Dr. Patricia Mitchell, Dr. William Garner and Dr. Betty Taylor, respectively, and part-time faculty actively participated in the self study process. Broad involvement in the process was solicited from the School of Education Associate Deans, the Dean’s office staff and O&L Department staff. Faculty developed, reviewed and commented on the self study draft form at faculty meetings and other scheduled meetings during the fall and spring semesters. The program faculty is eager to receive feedback from the external reviewers who will visit in April of 2004.

Initially, the O&L faculty began to develop a Preliminary Plan for the Self Study Report. However, as the Self Study process developed, the Preliminary Plan became a “living document.” It changed as the department became engaged in the process. The Department decided to utilize the Preliminary Plan as a vehicle for developing its future strategic plan. The Department’s Preliminary plan entitled, Preliminary Planning: Preparation for Developing An O&L Department Strategic Plan, 2004-2008 can be found in the Supplementary Materials.

The self study report includes the following information, analyses and materials:

- Responses from the survey questionnaires and focus groups of University students, alumni and faculty
- Review of the SOE Strategic Plan, preliminary planning strategies and Master’s and Doctoral programs
- Ongoing discussions with department faculty, interactions with representatives of the University of San Francisco Faculty Association (USFFA), and other School of Education (SOE) department faculty
- Review of University policies and procedures
- Faculty Self Analysis of the O&L Department Programs

Studies are underway by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and Educational Testing Service (ETS) to develop measures for the assessment of graduate study at the Master’s and Doctoral level. ETS’ Office of Higher Education Assessment gave us permission to use their current instruments as a basis for the O&L program review, providing we did not put the information in the public domain. The department utilized some of the survey questions, conducted additional questions to develop the faculty, current student and alumni questionnaires. The department utilized a small group of faculty from other departments to review the questionnaires for validity and reliability utilizing the parameters of the ETS research. As recommended by the University web Master, Ron Toledo, the Department decided to utilize
electronic software, surveymonkey.com, to disseminate the surveys for financial reasons, although other electronic software is more user-friendly. The analysis of the surveys and other University data were done by Dr. Ben Baub, an SOE adjunct faculty member and consultant to the project.

While the principal authors of the self study are the Organization and Leadership department faculty, the faculty received assistance from the SOE Dean’s office and University-wide offices in areas of academic affairs, library resources, technological resources and services, academic services, career services, web services and alumni advancement.

1. History of the Program

1.1 The Program at a Glance

The Organization and Leadership Department (O&L) in the University of San Francisco School of Education offers a unique program for working professionals interested in developing their leadership and organization capacities through an M.A or Ed.D. degree.

The various O&L program and emphasis opportunities prepare students to work as leaders in education, business, government, health care and social agencies in domestic and international settings.

In general program, both M.A. and Ed.D. Students may select a focus of study based on their interests. Course work in school leadership for K-12 schools can be taken within the Administrative Services program. Courses in higher education, women studies, communication, educational policy and assessment are available.

All degree offerings, including offerings for the emphases and foci, are designed for professionals working full-time. Most courses are taught on weekends (Friday evenings, Saturday mornings, and Saturday afternoons), nine times per semester, and usually on alternating weekends. Students may accelerate their coursework by taking offerings scheduled during summer sessions and during the intersession in January.

Students may apply to the Master’s program with a bachelor’s degree from an accredited university, with an overall GPA of 2.7, a 3.0 GPA in upper division and graduate courses, and a background of academic preparation/professional experiences giving initial evidence of the ability to pursue graduate work successfully.

Students may apply to the Doctoral program with a Master's degree from an accredited university, with an overall GPA of 3.0 in the M.A., M.S., or equivalent degree, a recent Graduate Record Exam (GRE) or a Miller Analogies Test (MAT) score.
Master of Arts in Organization and Leadership.

Master of Arts students may tailor the 30 semester unit degree (which can include 6 transfer units), to accommodate their individual career and academic goals, from one of the following:

- Students may elect to take an M.A. in Organization and Leadership with 30 units of coursework so that 15 units are designated for Organization and Leadership courses, 12 units for other major and elective courses, and 3 units for the Master's Thesis or Field Project.
- M.A. students also may tailor the 30-unit degree to accommodate a credential, or a focus from one of the following four options:
- A Preliminary Administrative Services Credential, with a focus on K-12 school leadership, as described below;

Master of Arts in Organization and Leadership in Combination with a Preliminary Administrative Services Credential

The Preliminary Services Credential requires the completion of 27 units, which includes 21 units of coursework and 6 units of supervised field experience. While students may choose to complete the credential only, those who desire the M.A. also complete the 3 unit Master's Thesis or Field Project. Students who have a prior Master's degree may apply for the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential only, or they may apply for the Credential and Doctor of Education programs and complete both in a process of concurrent enrollment.

Preliminary Administrative Services Credential applicants must submit the following additional items with their application:

- CBEST score report with passing scores.
- Valid copy (front and back) of a CA Basic teaching credential; or a services credential with specialization in pupil personnel services, library services, health services, or rehabilitation services; or a designated subject credential
- Verification of two years of Teaching Experience. Verification must be on school district letterhead and signed by a school district official.
- Submit evidence of an earned baccalaureate degree

Doctor of Education in Organization and Leadership

The Doctoral program in Organization and Leadership requires 60 units of coursework. The dissertation is undertaken after the completion of a designated amount of coursework, and advancement to candidacy. The dissertation demonstrates the candidate's ability to bring both theoretical and practical knowledge to bear on the analysis of a significant organization and leadership issue.
Within the Doctoral program, students may select a more focus area of study: in K-12 schooling or Administrative Credentials. The general program and options are as follows:

- Ed.D. students may elect to take an Ed.D. in Organization and Leadership with 60 units of coursework (which can include 12 transfer units), with 12 units designated for General Education courses, 39 units for major and elective courses, and 9 units for the dissertation.

- Ed.D. students also may tailor the 39-unit requirement to accommodate a focus from one or more of the following options:
  - A program on K-12 school leadership, with the Preliminary and/or Professional Administrative Services Credentials (see below).
  - A program a certificate that focuses on Educational Technology

*Doctor of Education in Organization and Leadership in Combination with a Professional Administrative Services Credential.*

The Professional Administrative Services Credential requires the completion of 24 units, which includes 12-16 units of coursework and 8-12 units of mentored field experience. While most students complete this credential at the Doctoral level through the process of concurrent enrollment, this credential may be undertaken separately. Professional Administrative Services Credential applicants must submit all of the same documents noted above for the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential, as well as a valid copy (front and back) of their Preliminary Administrative Services Credential and proof of employment in a position requiring the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential.

1.2 History of the Organization and Leadership (O&L) Department

In 1948, the University established the Department of Education under the leadership of Paul J. Harney, S. J. From its inception and through the decades of the 1950's and 1960's the Department had a highly reputed teacher preparation program. In addition to the teacher preparation program, the school's offered several Master's degree programs. In 1972 the University Board of Trustees established the School of Education and in 1975 the first Doctoral students were admitted to study for the newly approved Doctor of Education degree.

During the first year, the Organization and Leadership Program enrolled 25 students. Dr. Tony Sicdel served as the Director of the program. The years from 1975 to 1980 represented a growth period during which the enrollment grew rapidly in our Doctoral program and innovative Master's degree and credential programs were offered off-campus at various sites throughout the state. Between 1980 and 1994 the program exhibited a high degree of stability in terms of
quality, enrollment and number of full time faculty. The number of full-time faculty retirements began in 1995, but the student enrollment did not decrease. The School of Education dean began to target lower enrollments as the full-time faculty decreased and were not replaced. A downward enrollment spiral began in 1999 and it is apparent at this time. A historical account of department curriculum innovations and change can be found in Section 3.6.

1.3 The O&L Department and the University Mission

The study of organization and leadership stands at the center of the Catholic Jesuit mission in terms of the department providing students with the knowledge and skills necessary to succeed as persons and professionals. As in the Catholic Jesuit tradition of St. Ignatius Loyola, the graduate program focuses on promoting a life-learning community of students who will distinguish themselves in transforming their organization as educational leaders. Our inclusive curriculum enables the Jesuit missions, of educating students with caring hearts and academic rigor to shape a multicultural world through creativity, sound practice and compassion, to take place.

2. Vision, Mission and Goals of the O&L Department

2.1 Mission Statement

The Organization and Leadership Department offers a unique program for working professionals who see themselves as educational leaders transforming their organizations through a learning perspective. The program prepares leaders who serve schools, businesses, government, community and social agencies, and non-profit institutions in a regional and international world.

Students may pursue the M.A. or Ed.D. in Organization and Leadership and select a special interest focus such as Administration and Supervision (K-12), Higher Education, Interpretive Leadership, Community College Leadership and Chaos and Complexity Theories. Courses and field experiences are offered leading to the Preliminary Administrative Service Credential, the Professional Administrative Credential. Organization and Leadership graduates are prepared to assume leadership positions in a variety of settings. They may also consider consulting or higher education teaching positions.

2.2 Educational Philosophy of the O&L Department

The educational philosophy of the program is to prepare graduate students who will possess the knowledge, skills, values and vision to transform and change their organizations as leaders. The objective is based on the assumption that adult learners bring skill sets to the learning environment where collaborative-centered interactions take place among the faculty
and peers. It is through dialog, the action of new knowledge and experiences that new ideas and reform can take place. Within the Jesuit tradition, the faculty values the student learner and seeks to provide opportunities for self renewal and growth.

2.3 The O&L Department and Diversity

The President, Stephen A. Privett, SJ has stated,

- This is a university community where students, faculty and staff learn from each other; where diversity is not a political agenda, but the necessary ingredient of a quality education in the 21st century.

The University Provost's office indicates that "diversity is our strength." With this in mind, the O&L Department has engaged in developing strategies to increase diversity within its student and faculty populations, as well as to infuse diverse knowledge and content within the curriculum. The O&L student diversity profile can be found in Table 4.1.

The full-time faculty is small. The adjunct faculty is small long term. The ethnic and gender distribution of the full-time and adjunct faculty is outlined in Table 2.1 below:

Table 2.1 Full-time & Adjunct Faculty Ethnic & Gender Profile, Spring, 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Emeritus</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Should the O&L Department be allowed to search for new or replacement faculty lines, we would have the opportunity to further diversify the O&L full time faculty pool.

2.4 Assessment of Student Learning

The O&L department assessment of learning outcomes incorporates the School of Education profile elements for both the Doctoral and Master's degrees. The profile elements are in each faculty course syllabi and reviewed annually by the Department. The review in 2003-2004 was accomplished for all full time faculty, however there was not time to complete the adjunct faculty review prior to visit. However, the review of adjunct faculty syllabi will take place. The O&L full time faculty syllabi can be found in a binder in the Resource Room. Copies of faculty course syllabi are usually filed in the Dean's office.
The faculty reviews the course syllabi each academic year to assess whether the goals and outcomes outlined in the SOE Assessment Profiles are incorporated in all faculty course syllabi. The most recent analysis can be found in a binder in the Resource Room.

The Master’s degree in O&L and Master’s degree in Preliminary Administrative Services professional assessment profiles are outlined in section 2.3.1, Tables 2.1 and 2.2. The Doctoral assessment profile can be found in section 2.3.2, Table 2.3. The assessment profile indicates profile elements, student outcomes, evidence and location in the program plan. The O&L program benchmarks and success in achieving goals and outcomes are outlined in section 2.4 for the Doctoral degree and Master’s degree programs.

In addition to the assessment profile, developed by the O&L department, each faculty member engages in assessment at the classroom level. The methods the faculty most commonly use include syllabi analysis and reflection, fast feedback, minute papers or quizzes, self-assessment, reflective essays, pre and post course assessments, midterm tests, final papers and student presentations with faculty and peer reflection and feedback. Some professors encourage portfolio development for Doctoral students. The faculty believes that excellence in teaching and learning occurs when both faculty and students are cooperatively engaged in the educational assessment process.

The preliminary and professional credential learning standards and student outcomes are outlined in Administrative Credential Program’s Self Study, entitled “Self Study Report: Responses to the Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Administrative Services Credential Programs.” The report can be found in the Resource Room. The report was submitted for review by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) in 2001. The Administrative Services Credential programs (ASC) were accredited by (CCTC) in 2002 (Appendix A).

The department plans to draw upon the University resources from the Office of Academic Affairs led by Dr. Geraldo Marin, Associate Provost as the University-wide systematic assessment process is refined and implemented.
2.5 Goals and Student Outcomes of the O&L Department

2.5.1 Masters Program

Table 2.2 Master of Arts in Organization and Leadership Assessment Profile, Spring, 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School of Education Profile Element</th>
<th>Expectations: Students completing the Individualized Masters in O&amp;L will be able to:</th>
<th>Evidences</th>
<th>Location in Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applies research &amp; inquiry skills</td>
<td>• Respond to immediate needs, strategic issues, and school, community and organization renewal</td>
<td>• Course assignments and projects, Masters Field Project or Thesis</td>
<td>• Courses, Masters Field Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicates effectively across ethnicity and culture</td>
<td>• Utilize the body of knowledge in the areas of communication, leadership, organization, and technology</td>
<td>• Course assignments and projects, Masters Field Project or Thesis</td>
<td>• Courses, Masters Field Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates ethical &amp; professional standards</td>
<td>• Develop their personal philosophy and ethical principles and understand their connection to the community</td>
<td>• Course assignments and projects, Masters Field Project or Thesis</td>
<td>• Courses, Masters Field Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands current issues and theories in the field of education</td>
<td>• Apply practice and experience in local, state, national, and/or international settings</td>
<td>• Course assignments and projects, Masters Field Project or Thesis</td>
<td>• Courses, Masters Field Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates use of technology in education and research</td>
<td>• Utilize the body of knowledge in the areas of communication, leadership, organization, and technology</td>
<td>• Course assignments and projects, Masters Field Project or Thesis</td>
<td>• Courses, Masters Field Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gains personal awareness and engages in a process of continuous self-development</td>
<td>• Develop their personal philosophy and ethical principles and understand their connection to the community</td>
<td>• Course assignments and projects, Masters Field Project or Thesis</td>
<td>• Courses, Masters Field Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands the place of service in education and attempts to provide such service to appropriate educational publics</td>
<td>• Respond to immediate needs, strategic issues, and school, community and organization renewal</td>
<td>• Course assignments and projects, Masters Field Project or Thesis</td>
<td>• Courses, Masters Field Project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Applications for admission to the M.A. program are reviewed by O&L faculty to ascertain that students’ past accomplishment and present interests have prepared them for the program. A sequence of courses is then selected by students with the help of their advisors, all of whom are full-time faculty. Success in meeting program outcomes is measured through grades and persistence. Students are expected to meet with their advisors a minimum of once
each semester. These meetings are used as informal assessments of the accomplishment of program outcomes. Towards the end of their programs, students select a Masters Field Project or Thesis advisor. Working with this full-time faculty advisor, students develop a plan for the Masters Field Project or Thesis. Plans must also have approval of site supervisors where they will be carried out as well as approval of the Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects, if appropriate. Final Masters Field Projects or Theses are reviewed and assessed by full-time faculty.

2.5.2 M.A. and Preliminary ASC

Students seeking both the M.A. and the Preliminary ASC are subject to both the requirements of the O&L program and those of the California Commission on Teacher Education (CCTC). The CCTC has identified ten major outcomes for each Preliminary ASC candidate. The ten outcomes are “standards” of the CCTC. Each standard has, in turn, a number of factors to be considered. The ten outcome standards are met through a program of 27 units which includes seven “seat-time” courses and two field experience courses. In addition, students complete the Masters Field Project or Thesis. The relationship of the ten CCTC outcome standards to the profile elements is presented in Table 2.3.

Table 2.3 Master of Arts and Preliminary Administrative Services Credential, Spring, 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School of Education Profile Element</th>
<th>Expectations: Students completing the Preliminary ASC/Masters in O&amp;L will be able to:</th>
<th>Evidences*</th>
<th>Location in Program*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Applies research & inquiry skills    | Design, implement and evaluate instructional programs and lead in their development and improvement (11: Instructional Program) | - Course assignments and projects  
- Field Experience portfolios  
- Field Experience evaluations (USF instructor and field supervisor)  
- Masters Field Project (application at local school or district level) | - Courses  
- Field Experience  
- Masters Field Project |
| Communicates effectively across Ethnicity and culture | Demonstrate understanding of the organization and cultural context of schools and is able to lead others in the development and attainment of short-term and long-term goals. (10: Organizational Management)  
- Demonstrate understanding of the importance and dimensions of human resource administration and the need to attract, retain, develop, and motivate school-personnel in ways that enhance | - Course assignments and projects  
- Field Experience portfolios  
- Field Experience evaluations (USF instructor and field supervisor)  
- Masters Field Project (application at local | - Courses  
- Field Experience  
- Masters Field Project |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School of Education Profile Element</th>
<th>Expectations: Students completing the Preliminary ASC/Masters in O&amp;L will be able to</th>
<th>Evidences*</th>
<th>Location in Program*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Demonstrates ethical & professional standards | - Articulate a vision consistent with a well-developed educational philosophy and lead individuals and groups toward the accomplishment of goals and objectives (9: Educational Leadership)  
- Understand the federal, state and local educational laws, regulations and other policies that govern schools, and knows how to act in accordance with these provisions (15: Legal and Regulatory Application)  
- Recognize the relationships among public policy, governance, and schooling and is able to relate policy initiatives to the welfare of students in responsible and ethical ways (16: Policy and Political Influences) | - Course assignments and projects  
- Field Experience portfolios  
- Field Experience evaluations (USF instructor and field supervisor)  
- Masters Field Project (application at local school or district level) | - Courses  
- Field Experience  
- Masters Field Project |
| Understands current issues and theories in the field of education | - Plan, organize, implement, manage, facilitate and evaluate the daily operation of schools in ways that achieve organizational goals and lead to the safe, productive operation of the schools (12: Management of Schools) | - Course assignments and projects  
- Field Experience portfolios  
- Field Experience evaluations (USF instructor and field supervisor)  
- Masters Field Project (application at local school or district level) | - Courses  
- Field Experience  
- Masters Field Project |
| Demonstrates use of technology in education and research | - Understand the effective and efficient management of fiscal resources and business services (14: Fiscal Resource and Business Service Administration)  
- Effectively manage the various uses of technology for instructional and administrative purposes in the educational setting (18: Use of Technology) | - Course assignments and projects  
- Field Experience portfolios  
- Field Experience evaluations (USF instructor and field supervisor)  
- Masters Field Project | - Courses  
- Field Experience  
- Masters Field Project |
Table 2.3 Master of Arts and Preliminary Administrative Services Credential, Spring, 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School of Education Profile Element</th>
<th>Expectations: Students completing the Preliminary ASC/Masters in O&amp;L will be able to:</th>
<th>Evidences*</th>
<th>Location in Program*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Gains personal awareness and engages in a process of continuous self-development | • Develop their personal philosophy and ethical principles and understand their connection to the community | • Course assignments and projects  
• Masters Field Project or Thesis | • Courses  
• Masters Field Project |
| Understands the place of service in education and attempts to provide such service to appropriate educational publics | • Respond to immediate needs, strategic issues, and school, community and organization renewal | • Course assignments and projects  
• Masters Field Project or Thesis | • Courses  
• Masters Field Project |
### 2.5.3 Doctoral Program

**Table 2.4 Ed.D. in Organization and Leadership Assessment Profile, Spring, 2004**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School of Education Profile Element</th>
<th>Expectations: Students completing the Individualized Doctorate in O&amp;L will be able to:</th>
<th>Evidences</th>
<th>Location in Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Applies research & inquiry skills. | Respond to immediate needs, strategic issues, and school, community and organization renewal | • Course assignments and projects  
• Doctoral Dissertation | • Courses  
• Doctoral Dissertation |
| Communicates effectively across ethnicity and culture | Utilize the body of knowledge in the areas of communication, leadership, organization, and technology | • Course assignments and projects  
• Doctoral Dissertation | • Courses  
• Doctoral Dissertation |
| Demonstrates ethical & professional standards | Develop their personal philosophy and ethical principles and understand their connection to the community | • Course assignments and projects  
• Doctoral Dissertation | • Courses  
• Doctoral Dissertation |
| Understands current issues and theories in the field of education | Apply practice and experience in local, state, national, and/or international settings | • Course assignments and projects  
• Doctoral Dissertations | • Courses  
• Doctoral Dissertations |
| Demonstrates use of technology in education and research | Utilize the body of knowledge in the areas of communication, leadership, organization, and technology | • Course assignments and projects  
• Doctoral Dissertation | • Courses  
• Doctoral Dissertation |
| Gains personal awareness and engages in a process of continuous self-development | Develop their personal philosophy and ethical principles and understand their connection to the community | • Course assignments and projects  
• Doctoral Dissertation | • Courses  
• Doctoral Dissertation |
| Understands the place of service in education and attempts to provide such service to appropriate educational publics | Respond to immediate needs, strategic issues, and school, community and organization renewal | • Course assignments and projects  
• Doctoral Dissertation | • Courses  
• Doctoral Dissertation |
2.5.4 Administrative Services Credential Program (ACS)

The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) outlines the standards and competencies for the ASC programs. The specific assessment standards of the ACS program are outlined in the department's Self Study document submitted to the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) for review in spring of 2002. The complete report can be found in the Resource Room. The ASC program was accredited by the CCTC in 2002 (Appendix B).

2.5.5 Education Technology Minor in the Doctoral Program

As stated in the university catalogue, Doctoral students in the School of Education may elect to pursue the certificate in Educational Technology. Students in any Doctoral program may acquire a minor in educational technology. The Educational Technology Program, of which the Education Technology Minor is a component, is undergoing program review during the spring, 2004 semester.

Currently the Education Technology Minor and the Doctoral Program is under going a program review.

2.6 Success in Achieving Goals and Outcomes Set Out in the Mission Statement

2.6.1 Master's of Education Programs (M.A.)

There are two general paths to the Master of Arts in Organization and Leadership. The first is a self- and advisor- selected program which allows great latitude in student selection of courses to meet their intellectual and professional interests. The second is a highly structured program available only to those students who are seeking both the M. A. and the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential (ASC). Commonalities in the measurement of student success in meeting the mission and outcomes will be examined first, followed by specifics for the M.A. with Preliminary ASC.

All M. A. students are expected to achieve the following outcomes as related to the School of Education profile. While the profile and outcomes are similar to those for Ed.D. students, the level of achievement required is appropriate to each degree. Table 2.1 outlines the profile elements and related expectations. The broad citing of courses in the evidence column reflects two key principles at the heart of the development and implementation of M. A. programs in O&L. The first is a commitment to student progress through a study-experience-reflection learning model with each phase of the academic program providing opportunities for all three learning modalities. The second is an approach that integrates critical subject matter across many, if not all, courses. Therefore aspects of several courses relate to each outcome. While it is clear that some courses may have a greater bearing on a particular outcome, it is equally evident that it is in the mix of experiences that learning occurs. How this plays out in
specific Masters level courses is detailed in relationship to the section below on the M.A. with
Preliminary ASC.

2.6.2 Doctor of Education Program (Ed.D.)

Student success in achieving the goals and outcomes of the mission statement is
measured by their achievement in courses and through the various benchmarks of the program.

The first benchmark is moving from conditional admission to full admission. All
Doctoral students in O&L, and in the School of Education as a whole, are admitted conditionally.
Each department sets the particular conditions that the students must fulfill to achieve full
acceptance. In the O&L Department this consists of completion of the three O&L core subjects:
a) Socio-Cultural Foundations of Organization and Policy, b) Foundations of Leadership, and c)
Organization Theory: Applications and Implications as well as the completion of one of the first
two courses in the General Education sequence: either a) Research Methods in Education or b)
Applied Educational Statistics. Students must complete each course with a grade of B or better
and must have no incompletes. Upon completion of these units, generally within the first year of
study, students submit portfolios including transcripts of the courses completed and a paper of no
less than ten pages with instructor comments. This benchmark has both formal and informal
elements. The review of the portfolio by all faculty with individual recommendations to admit
fully, admit with continued condition, or deny admission is the formal process. The informal
evaluation occurs throughout the courses which are generally taught by the senior, full time
faculty. This gives the faculty the opportunity to discuss areas that need improvement and
general approaches to Doctoral learning with students.

The second benchmark occurs as students move into the dissertation process. To enter
the first course in the dissertation sequence, Dissertation Proposal Seminar, the School of
Education requires that students have completed 30 credits including three General Education
courses: a) a) Research Methods in Education, b) Applied Educational Statistics and c) a
"foundations" course. Again, the student may have no incompletes and must have a minimum of
a 3.0 average.

As the student moves through the dissertation sequence, additional benchmarks occur.
By the end of the Dissertation Proposal Seminar, students must have completed a proposal
summary, have sought and been granted approval of their dissertation topic by a committee of
three full-time faculty (one from O&L who serves as chairperson, a second reader from O&L,
and a third reader from another USF Department), and been granted approval from the Dean to
pursue the dissertation as summarized.

To begin formal work on the dissertation proposal students must have completed 45 units
without any incompletes and, in addition to the courses above, must have completed or be
enrolled in their final required General Education course, one from a selection of advanced
research topics. Completion of the proposal stage is granted through a defense presented to the
students' committees and approval of the proposed methodology by the Institutional Review
Board for the Protection of Human Subjects. To enter the final dissertation stage, students must
have completed 51 units.
The final benchmark in achieving the mission and outcomes of the O&L Doctoral program is the completion of the dissertation itself and a total of 60 units that meet all Department and School requirements. The defense of the dissertation is generally the last formal judgment of students' work.

2.6.3 Administrative Services Credential Program

The assessment benchmarks of the ASC program are outlined in the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) standards and O&L Department Preliminary and Professional Program Brochures. If the candidate completes successfully the ASC Program Curriculum Plan, and State Standards and Competencies, the student is recommended to the CCTC to be awarded the respective credential for which they have applied. In addition to the ASC faculty coordinator, the Credential Analyst, Jeffrey LaBelle, who supervises the SOE Credential Office reviews all student material prior to submission to CCTC. The standards and curriculum of the ASC programs and options can be found in Section 3.0.

2.6.4 Educational Technology Minor in the Doctoral Program

The Educational Technology Minor in the Doctoral Program is a component of the Educational Technology Program that is undergoing review during the spring, 2004 semester.

3. Curriculum

3.1 School of Education General Education and the O&L Curriculum

The Organization and Leadership Department's Doctoral program at USF requires the completion of at least 60 semester credit hours of coursework beyond the Master's degree. All students are required to complete 12 units in the General Education Core. The following 6 units are required: Research Methods in Education and Applied Education Statistics. Each student must take one 3-unit course in the educational foundations area and one in the advanced research design area.

3.2 The Organization and Leadership Curriculum

Research, writing, collaborative learning and the study-experience-reflection models are central to both the Doctoral and Master's programs. The four areas are essential pedagogical tools and learning modalities. Likewise, reflection and assessment of learning are integrated into the O&L Department's disciplinary methodologies.
The O&L Department offers a dynamic and unique program that educates people to create and sustain just institutions through the leadership act. In such contexts, we recognize that leadership, both formal and informal, is a summons to serve the other. The O&L faculty answers this summons through offerings grounded in ethical inquiry and course content based on a curricular foundation of trust and community, cultural and spiritual values, and leadership and development.

O&L students are prepared to work in a variety of contexts including business, education (e.g., principalship, superintendency, and higher education leadership as well as teaching in community colleges and universities), government, health-related fields, international development and foreign relations, profit and not-for-profit arenas, and full-time research and development projects. Students are encouraged to follow their individual path intellectual and professional interests and upon graduation are prepared to find employment in local, national and international sites.

3.3 Pedagogy and Disciplinary Methodologies

Doctor of Education Degree

The degree plan for the Doctoral degree is as follows:

The Ed. D. in O&L requires sixty units with the possibility of twelve approved transfer units from other institutions:

- Twelve units are General Education Requirements.
- Nine units are O&L Department Requirements (Socio-cultural Foundations, Foundations of Leadership, and Organization Theory).
- Eighteen units in O&L courses other than the above required nine O&L units, are open to students to explore individual theoretical interests such as critical hermeneutics and chaos and complexity theories applied to individual research and development contexts.
- Nine units are designed to prepare students to carry out their dissertation research requirements. Students may choose from qualitative, quantitative, or interpretive research approaches.
- Twelve additional units may be chosen from additional O&L courses or other USF graduate programs.

Doctoral course work is often completed in three years while dissertation completions vary in length of time required. Few students have difficulty in completing all their work within the seven years allotted by USF.

Qualified Doctoral students may complete the Preliminary and/or Professional Administrative Services Credential in conjunction with their Doctoral work.
Master of Arts Degree

There are two paths to the MA in O&L. Each path requires the successful completion of thirty units, six units upon approval may be transferred in from other institutions. One path is based on an individualized curriculum drawn from O&L course offerings that follow many of the same features as the Ed.D. curriculum. The second path combines the study for the MA with preparation for the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential.

While the O&L MA programs can be completed in one academic year including the summer, most students complete in two years.

Individualized MA Program

This program is based on the theory that adults learn best when choosing their study from their own experience and their reflections on this experience. Therefore, each MA student, working closely with a faculty advisor, crafts her or his own program of 30 units. The program must have a majority of courses drawn from the O&L array, but may also include graduate courses from other departments in the SOE or USF with special permission. Students capable of completing the work may also be allowed to register for Doctoral courses after a special review. All MA students must complete a Masters Thesis or Masters Field Project. Following is a list of the O&L MA courses:

- Career Choice and Work Adjustment
- Information Systems in Educational Management
- International Adult Learning: Domestic and Transcultural
- Law and Culture
- Budget and Finance
- Education Law
- Education Leadership
- Anthropology of Education
- Field Experience I
- Field Experience II
- Sociocultural Foundations of Policy and Organization
- Culture and Work
- Legitimation of Power in Societies and Organization
- Participatory Hermeneutic Research
- Organization Development and Learning
- Directed Study
- Special Topics

Preliminary Administrative Services Credential (Preliminary ASC)

The rationale and design of the University administrative preparation programs are the result of broad input: faculty discussion regarding the vision and purpose of the program, input from practitioners in the credential area, input from students and graduates, as well as representatives from the communities served by the University. In its initial design, five years ago, the program drew heavily upon findings reported in the CTC report entitled An Examination of the Preparation, Induction, and Professional Growth of School Administrators for California and other documents such as: Educational Leadership for America's Schools; Research on School Restructuring, and Fundamental Concepts of Educational Leadership and Management. In addition, the faculty included in its considerations for the design of the program, research and
exemplary program descriptions included in the issues of *Design for Leadership*, the bulletin of the National Policy Board for Educational Administration.

The rationale that underlies the program is directed by two complementary belief systems. The first belief system is derived from the missions of the University and the School of Education. The University mission states, in part, "The University offers undergraduate, graduate and professional students the knowledge and skills needed to succeed as persons and professionals, and the values and sensitivity necessary to be men and women for others." The School mission begins, "The School of Education at the University of San Francisco is committed to the support of academic and professional programs ... which seek to improve the quality of education and support services provided children, youth, and adults." The goals implied by the mission statements—academic excellence, service to the community, justice for all people and the impact of administrator performance on the outcomes for their students—are embedded in the courses and other experiences of both programs. The second belief system is driven by the commitment of the Organization and Leadership Department to programs that prepare working professionals. That means that theory, research, knowledge of best practices, opportunities for real experience, and reflection upon all of the above are interwoven strands of the administrator preparation programs. These ideas have been expressed recently in the development of the program brochure "Lead Courageously."

The organizational structure of the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential program revolves around a logical sequence of academic coursework, field experience, and mentoring. Since the credential requires the acquisition of specific competencies and provides the base of knowledge for beginning administrators, it is organized into nine required courses. An optional tenth course provides the opportunity for a concluding field project for those who are also seeking a Masters degree. The nine required courses are as follows:

- Educational Leadership (3 units)
- Educational Program Improvement (3 units)
- Educational Management (3 units)
- Educational Governance and the Community (3 units)
- Budget and Finance (3 units)
- Education Law (3 units)
- Information Systems in Educational Management (3 units)
- Field Experience I (3 units)
- Field Experience II (3 units)

**Professional Administrative Services Credential (Professional ASC)**

The rationale for the Professional ASC is similar to that of the Preliminary ASC as described above. However, where the Preliminary ASC curriculum is based on the development of pre-identified competencies, the organizational structure of the Professional Administrative Services Credential Program reflects the greater need for individualization that more experienced individuals bring to the program. It includes both required and elective courses and adds the opportunity for non-university based field experiences. The program components—coursework, field experience, mentoring and non-University experiences—are
informed by the following six thematic areas which constitute the knowledge base of the program:

- organizational and cultural environment
- dynamics of strategic issues management
- ethical and reflective leadership
- analysis and development of public policy
- management of information systems
- management of human and fiscal resources

The program contains the following elements:

- A required induction course: Professional Credential Induction Seminar (2 units)
- A required mentored field experience course: Professional Practice of Education Leadership A (4 units)
- A required assessment course: Professional Credential Assessment Seminar (2 units)
- A minimum of 12 units of electives. The courses that satisfy this requirement are developed in accordance with students’ identified needs and goals. They may include courses in the Organization and Leadership Department as well as courses in other departments of the School of Education and/or with special permission, courses in other units of the University of San Francisco. Four units of the requirement may also be met through the completion of an additional mentored field experience course, Professional Practice of Education Leadership B (4 units) or through approved non-university experiences.

Conclusion

The O&L Department offers inter-related MA, Ed.D. and administrative credential programs. The Department has developed the curriculum to meet the needs of the students and reviews the requirements and array of course offerings frequently. This may be seen in the changes in course requirements. The general direction of the changes, which have been developed about three years apart has been to reduce requirements and increase student choice and faculty advising for informed choice.

In addition, the faculty has increased its use of technology in the curriculum. All courses rely on distance communication. Many have supplementary materials available. Several courses are under development for distance learning, some utilizing distance learning alone or others in combination with face-to-face meetings for fewer sessions than has been traditional in O&L.

3.4 Curriculum and Scheduling

The initial admission to the Organization and Leadership Doctoral program is a preliminary decision. Students develop a portfolio during their first year in order to demonstrate competence in research methodology and our department specific content. During this period,
students work closely with department faculty in preparation of their portfolios. The SOE Doctoral Student Handbook is reviewed with students at orientation, prior to entrance into the dissertation phase of the program. Also it is used to assist students in planning their academic career plans within the program. In addition, School of Education and departmental publications such as The Master of Arts Credential Student Handbook, the O&L Departmental Doctoral and Master’s Programs Guides are useful to guide students through the programs. Documentation of the Department’s publications can be found in Resource Room along with the University catalogue.

3.4.1 Curriculum

The Doctoral program at USF School of Education requires the completion of at least 60 semester credit hours of coursework beyond the Master’s degree. This work must be completed within seven years of their admission’s date.

All students are required to complete 12 units in the General Education Core according to the following regulations:

Required

The following 6 units are required of all students:
- Research Methods in Education (3 units)
- Applied Educational Statistics (3 units)

Educational Foundations

Each student must take one of the following 3-unit courses:
- Philosophical Foundations of Education
- Anthropology of Education
- Sociology of Education
- Political Economy of Education
- Psychological Foundation of Education
- Law and Education
- Technology and Education
- Foundations of Linguistics in Education

Advanced Research Design

Each student must take one of the following 3-unit courses:
- Advanced Statistics
- Analysis of Variance Designs
- Survey Research
- Qualitative Research
- Content Analysis
- Educational & Psychological Measurement
• Anthropological Research in Education
• Program Evaluation
• Ethnicity and Multicultural Issues in Research
• Correlational Design
• Meta-Analysis
• Participatory Research
• Introduction to SPSS

The Organization and Leadership major is defined as 24 units of Doctoral level coursework developed by the student and their advisor. The student may elect to use 12-15 unit block as electives or to design a minor.

A block of 9-12 units is devoted to the development of a dissertation proposal and to the research and writing of a dissertation.

- Dissertation Proposal Seminar, the student prepares an outline of the dissertation proposal.
- Proposal Development, a continuation of 709, if needed/
- Dissertation Proposal Development, the student writes and defends the dissertation proposal.
- Dissertation Research and Writing, the proposed research is carried out, the writing of the dissertation is completed, the dissertation is defended.

3.4.2 Scheduling

The O&L Department program is designed for working professionals. We meet on nine “teaching weekends” each semester. There is one class period on Friday evenings (5:30 – 9:45), one on Saturday mornings (8:00 – 12:15), and one on Saturday afternoons (1:00 – 5:15). Each class session is for four and a quarter hours. Each term begins with a First Teaching Saturday in which there is a special schedule so that all classes meet for 1.5 hours.

Scheduling
The University offers the following periods of instruction for enrollment:

- Fall Semester: August - December
- Intersession: January
- Spring Semester: January – May
- Summer Session: May – August

3.5 Comparison of our Program to Other Similar Programs in Organization and Leadership

The O&L program began in 1976. It is one of a number of programs at Catholic Jesuit universities that has developed and changed over the years in response to the changing needs of graduate and adult learning populations. The program attracts students who espouse as
their career goal a need to change the organization in which they work as well as identify and modify their individual and professional growth.

The O&L program is different from traditional organization and leadership programs by the very nature of the nomenclature of the department, the market we serve, and its philosophical underpinning that address the need to integrate the needs of working adults, the experiences they bring and the academic culture/learning community.

As outlined in the Curriculum, Section 3, the program calls upon both faculty and students to integrate knowledge skills and experience in a collaborative manner.

In contrast to more traditional administration programs at our sister Catholic Jesuit institutions such as Boston College, St. Peter’s College, Fairfield University, St. Joseph’s College, St. Louis University and Fordham University, our program focus is on the transformational process and ways the student can apply knowledge, skills and disposition to workplace environments. The programs most like USF’s Organization and Leadership program at Catholic Jesuit universities can be found at Gonzaga University and Seattle University in the areas of educational organization and leadership. The Educational Policy and Leadership program at Marquette University is somewhat similar but enrollments are smaller and it is integrated with the counselor education program. The programs engender to prepare students with the basic knowledge and skills for transformational leadership similar to the USF program. In fact, both schools have been in contact with our department to discuss the ways we have developed student outcomes assessment for our Master’s and Doctoral programs.

In larger public and private institutions of higher education, our Organization and Leadership program may be housed in the School of Education or the School of Public Policy and courses are often cross-listed in the programs of study for both Schools.

In summary, while it is a program in Organization and Leadership, USF’s O&L program at the Master’s and Doctoral levels is different from other Master’s and Doctoral programs in that most focus primarily on Administration and Supervision K-12 or primarily on Higher Education, or Administration Management. The O&L program, by the very nature of its educational philosophy and mission, addresses and achieves academic rigor because the performance of its students are seen quickly in workplace setting and markets it is designed to serve.

3.6 Curriculum and Innovative Change

Over time, the existing organization and leadership faculty and new faculty developed innovative programs to enhance the department’s curriculum. Some of the programmatic innovations and changes are based on faculty interests, student demand and enrollment management issues. The department decided to identify certain curricular focus areas within the program prior to becoming a programmatic emphasis.
One curricular change, the Pacific Leadership International Studies (formerly the Adult Learners International Emphasis), progressed from a program focus into a program emphasis and has had an impact on the O&L Department programs (Appendix C). From the mid 80s through the early 90s, students enrolled in the Doctoral and Master’s Program could pursue an emphasis in Adult Learners International. With this emphasis, a student would have the opportunity to pursue current Pacific Rim topics. In 1993, the Adult Learners International Emphasis was changed to Pacific Leadership International Studies (PLI). The program has provided graduates an opportunity to develop a cultural and transnational understanding of organizations and leadership.

The Pacific Leadership and International Studies in the Organization and Leadership Department is no longer accepting applications because of a request by Dr. Herda. The faculty unanimously agreed at our April 3, 2003 faculty meeting to discontinue admitting new students in the PLI emphasis as of fall, 2003 and to forward this recommendation on to the Dean. The department values the academic discipline of this perspective within the O&L Curriculum and plans to continue to have students in an MA or Ed.D. program research in interdisciplinary and international studies. Dr. Herda will continue to focus her work on bringing ideas from hermeneutics and critical interpretive theory as applied to the social science to the O&L Department.

In 1996, Deborah P. Bloch joined the faculty and assumed coordination of both the Preliminary and Professional Administrative Services Credential Programs. This was a year in which the California Teaching Commission had called for submissions of new curricula to meet changed standards for the preliminary and final credentialing of educational leaders. (A Preliminary Administrative Services Credential is required for all entry level administrative positions in public K-12 schools in California. All administrators are required to begin the additional program towards the Professional Administrative Services Credential once they have begun work as administrators.) Prof. Bloch brought a level of coordination to the two programs that had been absent previously since each program had been overseen by a different faculty member. The submission of the O&L department to the CCTC won immediate acceptance with no modification in May 1997 and students entered the program in fall, 1997. Five years later, in spring, 2002, the programs were reviewed by the CCTC along with all other credential programs in the School of Education. While each program was evaluated separately, the general comments were the same. A selection from the laudatory comments follows:

"The Preliminary [Professional] Administrative Services Credential Program is cohesively designed; built upon the mission of the university which relates to academic excellence, diversity, ethics and justice, service to the community, and the impact of administrator performance on the outcomes for their students".

"Diversity and ethics are recurring themes in every aspect of the program. Coursework and field experience assignments are closely related and provide a dynamic and relevant link between theory and practice".

"The leadership of the program is exceptional. The accessibility of the program faculty, the support provided to students, and the resources (technological, textbook materials, and financial) made available to students allow them to be successful in the program as they work full time."
While Dr. Patricia Mitchell has been a member of the School of Education faculty since 1977, she only recently joined the Organization and Leadership Department in 1994. Dr. Mitchell has developed the focus areas on Women in Leadership. Students are given an opportunity to explore selected aspects of management as they relate to women in leadership positions. Courses are offered to help students actively investigate the complexity of women's roles in both large and small organizations. Dr. Mitchell's most acclaimed book, "Cracking the Wall: Women in Higher Education Administration" continues to be a best seller for the publisher and is used as a text book in many colleges courses.

Another focus within the O&L is now in progress under the leadership of Prof. Bloch. Prof. Bloch's interests and expertise in chaos and complexity theory are reflected in three courses. The first course in the focus, Ethical Organization, was offered spring, 2004. The second course, Career Choice, is on the Summer, 2004 schedule. Both of these are revisions of existing courses. The third course, a new one, Complexity and Organizational Creativity, will be offered in Intersession 2005. Faculty from the Centre for Systemic Development at the University of Western Sydney have been invited to participate in one session of this course. In addition to their thematic focus, the courses share an innovative structure blending face-to-face and distance learning.

Other areas of interest are K-12 issues, higher education and the community college setting. Students are given an opportunity to explore the range of thought in organizational leadership in the K-12 setting and address some of the contemporary issues facing school leaders today: to understand the critical role of research, systematic assessment, and evaluation and leadership in identifying and solving organization problems in higher education; and to examine and apply management strategies to programs and issues of organization leadership in the community college. Attention is given to the changing role of women in the community college setting.

3.7 O&L Department and Web Development

Over the past year, the President of the University has charged each of the schools and colleges to develop a universal format for web development. The School of Education under the leadership of the Dean's office staff, Ernie Franci, Manager of Tech Development and Christian Gautier, Communication and Special Events Coordinator works with each department to develop new formats for its web content. The process will result in a school-wide image for its web design, and marketing material. The O&L department has submitted its new web design for each program in December, 2003. Currently the department is working on developing consistency between its curriculum content, the new web design, program brochures, marketing materials, and the university catalogue. The department anticipates the process to be completed by the end of the spring, 2004 semester. The new marketing materials will be available to students by fall of 2004.
4. The O & L Student

Most of the data outlined in this section was obtained from the Office of the Registrar’s Fall Census Report, September 19, 2003, and the Preliminary Spring Census Report, February 13, 2004. The date of the Census Report represents a calendar date in each term when the general enrollment statistics of the University are established and the particulars of these statistics are identified among colleges, classes, and student levels. Census Date information may be regarded as a "snapshot" of the enrollment picture on that particular date. Other data was obtained from responses from the O&L Department current student, alumni and faculty survey questionnaires. The findings are outlined in the designated section reports.

4.1 Student Profile

The department's Doctoral program grew rapidly between 1980 and 1994. During this period the program exhibited a high degree of quality, enrollments, full-time faculty and stability. In 1995, the Dean targeted lower enrollment for the program as full-time faculty resigned and were not replaced. Thus by 1999, a downward spiral of student enrollment occurred as noted in Section 1.2.

As shown in the spring, 2004 census, there are one hundred and thirty-seven current students in the Doctoral, Master’s and Administrative Credential programs. One hundred and two students are at the Doctoral level and thirty-five students are at the Master’s level and seven students are in the Administrative Credential program not combined with Doctoral & Masters programs respectively. The number of Doctoral students in the O&L department program has been relatively large in comparison to its Master’s program. The breakdown by numbers and percentages according to gender, age and graduate level is shown in Table 4.1, Tables 4.1.1 and Table 4.1.2.

Demographic characteristics of the O&L department student are shown in Table 4.1. It includes the following: The proportion of female is higher than male, 64% female and 35% male. The O&L department’s students are predominantly White at 47.4% and African American at 17.5% and Asian at 10.2%. These group percentages and those of other ethnic groups are shown in Table 4.1. The mean age is 40.1 with a standard deviation of 10.58.
## Table 4.1 Profile of Current O&L Students, Spring, 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Ethnic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian/Pac Is</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Average Age

Mean = 40.1  SD = 10.58

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.1.1 Profile of Current O&L Masters Students, Spring, 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Ethnic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii/Pac Is</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Age
Mean = 30.5  SD = 8.48

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Ethnic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii/Pac Is</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Age

Mean = 43.4  SD = 9.17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1.1 O&L Degrees Granted

Data is available to assess the trend of O&L degrees granted over a period of three years. Table 4.2 shows the degrees posted as of fall census for the last three academic years, each year consisting of the posting periods of August, December and May. The year “2001,” for example, includes August 2000, December 2000, and May 2001. The numbers herein represented actual degrees posted – not graduation petitions submitted nor students who may have participated in a graduation ceremony without actually having completed degree requirements. The data show in Table 4.2 that the degrees granted in O&L doctoral programs remain fairly constant.

Table 4.2 School of Education, O&L Department Three Years of Degrees Granted, Fall, 2003

M = Master's | D = Doctoral

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catholic School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic School Teaching</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling/Ed Psych</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Technology</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International/Multicultural</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning &amp; Instruction</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicultural Literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization &amp; Leadership</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private School Admin</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Pathology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Education</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TESL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Census Date 9/19/03
4.1.2  O&L and Student Credit Hours (SCH's)

Between 1999 and 2004 the Student Credit Hours (SCHs) remained fairly stable as shown in Table 4.3. In 2001 the Student Credit Hours (SCHs) dropped to 391, but have steadily increased to 530 by fall 2003, as shown in Table 4.3. According to the Fall, 2003 Census Report (Table 4.4), the O&L Doctoral SCHs by Subject Area and Division data shows that the O&L Department's SCHs of 365 is the most SCHs earned within the SOE Doctoral Programs.

As shown in the Spring, 2004 Census Report (see Table 4.5), the number of O&L SCHs generated by Subject Area in the Doctoral Program is 485. It is a significant increase in SCHs for the program. However, the SCHs generated by the O&L Master’s program ranks next to the lowest in SOE in terms of generating SCHs as shown in Table 4.4 and Table 4.5. Given the fact that there only four full-time faculty members it is quite remarkable that the faculty is able to advise the number of students, teach courses, chair and participate on dissertation committees in the Doctoral programs. Other Doctoral programs within the SOE have fewer students, generating fewer SCHs and fewer dollars. While a student enrollment increase will subsequently generate SCHs at the master’s level, the department recommends that the SOE Dean review the faculty/student ratios in each of the School’s Doctoral programs. The department would like to see an increase in its Master’s program numbers in the future and will develop strategies to try and accomplish this task.
Table 4.3  School of Education, O&L Department
Five Year Comparative Subject Area Student Credit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>Fall 1999</th>
<th>Spring 2000</th>
<th>Fall 2001</th>
<th>Spring 2002</th>
<th>Fall 2003</th>
<th>Spring 2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Ed Ldrship</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coun Psych</td>
<td>1636</td>
<td>1514</td>
<td>1427</td>
<td>1381</td>
<td>1584</td>
<td>1404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Tech</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen Educ</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internat/Mult</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L &amp; I (C &amp; I)</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O &amp; L</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Ed</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>1796</td>
<td>1836</td>
<td>1483</td>
<td>1487</td>
<td>2299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Total</td>
<td>6631</td>
<td>6129</td>
<td>6308</td>
<td>5435</td>
<td>6195</td>
<td>6764</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Census Date 2/13/03

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>Fall 2003</th>
<th>Spring 2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Ed Ldrship</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coun Psych</td>
<td>1493</td>
<td>2167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Tech</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen Educ</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internat/Mult</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L &amp; I (C &amp; I)</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O &amp; L</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Ed</td>
<td>3014</td>
<td>3253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Total</td>
<td>7726</td>
<td>8126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4  School of Education, O&L Department
Student Credit Hours by Subject Area/Division, Fall, 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area #</th>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>Lower Division</th>
<th>Upper Division</th>
<th>Masters</th>
<th>Doctoral</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>701</td>
<td>L &amp; I (C &amp; I)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>275</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>702</td>
<td>Coun Psych</td>
<td>1052</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1066</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>703</td>
<td>Educational Technology</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>704</td>
<td>Gen Educ</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>0.55%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>705</td>
<td>Internat/Mult</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>0.59%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706</td>
<td>O &amp; L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>165</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>0.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>707</td>
<td>Catholic Ed/Leadership (PSA)</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>708</td>
<td>Teacher Ed</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2565</td>
<td>2614</td>
<td>2.67%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal on-campus</td>
<td>4803</td>
<td>1208</td>
<td>6060</td>
<td>6.18%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Off-campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>996</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>1.02%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>702</td>
<td>Coun Psych</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>704</td>
<td>Gen Educ</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>705</td>
<td>Internat/Mult</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>707</td>
<td>Catholic Ed/Leadership (PSA)</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>0.65%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>708</td>
<td>Teacher Ed</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>1.78%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal off-campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6543</td>
<td>1208</td>
<td>7800</td>
<td>7.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4.5  School of Education, O&L Department

**Student Credit Hours by Subject Area/Division, Spring, 2004**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area #</th>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>Lower Division</th>
<th>Upper Division</th>
<th>Masters</th>
<th>Doctoral</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>701</td>
<td>L &amp; I (C &amp; I)</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>702</td>
<td>Coun Psych</td>
<td>1125</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1136</td>
<td>1.22%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>703</td>
<td>Educational Technology</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>704</td>
<td>Gen Educ</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>0.48%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>705</td>
<td>Internat/Mult</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>0.81%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706</td>
<td>O &amp; L</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>0.64%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>707</td>
<td>Catholic Ed Leadership (PSA)</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>708</td>
<td>Teacher Ed</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2446</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2525</td>
<td>2.71%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal on-campus</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4830</td>
<td>1335</td>
<td>6241</td>
<td>6.70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Off-campus</td>
<td>1031</td>
<td>1031</td>
<td>1.11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>702</td>
<td>Coun Psych</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>704</td>
<td>Gen Educ</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>705</td>
<td>Internat/Mult</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>707</td>
<td>Catholic Ed Leadership (PSA)</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>0.80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>708</td>
<td>Teacher Ed</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>2.02%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal off-campus</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>6715</td>
<td>1335</td>
<td>8126</td>
<td>8.72%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Education
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MASTERS</th>
<th>DOCTORAL</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Census Date 9/9/03</th>
<th>FT/PT TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On-campus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cath. Sch Leadership</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cath. School Teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSCT (RLE)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Psych</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Tech</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internat/Multicult</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn &amp; Instr (C &amp; I)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi/Cult Lith/Child/Adult</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org &amp; Leadership</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sch Admin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach Engl Sec Lang</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal on-campus</strong></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>774</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Off-campus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cath. School Leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cath. School Teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Psychology</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L&amp;I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TESL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal off-Campus</strong></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL Education</strong></td>
<td>127</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>980</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND Total</strong></td>
<td>566</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>144</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.7 School of Education, O&L Department
Graduate Head Count by Full/Part Time Major Class and Sex, Spring, 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MASTERS</th>
<th>DOCTORAL</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Census Date 2/13/04</th>
<th>FT/PT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cath Sch Ldrshp/PSA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cath School Teach</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cath School Teach (RLE)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Psych</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Tech</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal/Multicult</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn &amp; Instr (C &amp; I)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicult Lit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org &amp; Leadership</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach Engi Sec Lang</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal on-campus</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cath School Ldrshp/PSA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Sch Teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Psych</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning &amp; Instr TESL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Org &amp; Leadership</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Engi Sec Lang</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal off-Campus</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL Education</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND Total</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>1361</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Student Admissions and Enrollment

4.2.1 Student Admissions

Students apply to the O&L Department through the normal University of San Francisco and School of Education (SOE) process for admissions as outlined in the university publications. The SOE application packet can be found in the Resource Room.

Applicants must have earned their Bachelors' and or Master's degrees from an accredited institution and they must provide a background of academic preparation and or professional experience that demonstrates their ability to pursue graduate level programs.
Required of All Applicants:

- Completed and signed application with a $55 non-refundable application fee for domestic students, and $65 for international students.

- Two sealed official transcripts from each University/College previously attended. For U.S. applicants, degree must be from regionally accredited University/College. An applicant with a pending degree must provide official verification of expected degree completion for institution's Registrar or school official.

- Two original, signed letters of recommendation, noting suitability for graduate work, in sealed envelopes. (Letters must be on provided forms).

- Typed statement of intent outlining purpose for seeking admission to programs and career/academic goals.

- Current resume.

In addition, all DOCTORAL APPLICANTS must submit:

- Abstract of M.A. thesis or graduate level paper.

- Official Graduate Record Examinations (GRE-verbal and quantitative) or Miller Analogies Test (MAT) scores are required. Test scores must be sent directly to USF by the Education Testing Service (GRE) or the Psychological Corporation (MAT). Official scores mean no photocopies of the results and no scores older than five years.

In addition, all INTERNATIONAL APPLICANTS must submit:

- Copy of a passing TOEFL or Michigan Test scores. Required scores: M.A. applicants 570 (Paper Test) or 230 (DBT); Doctoral applicants 600 (Paper Test) or 250 (CBT).

- Certificate of Finance.

In addition O&L Students applying for a California Credential such as the Administrative Services Credential, must submit the following documents:

- CBEST score report.

- All Preliminary Administrative Services Credential applicants: Valid copy (front and back) of California Basic Teaching Credential.
  1) A service credential with a specialization in pupil personnel services, library services, health services, or clinical rehabilitation services; or
  2) A designated subject credential.
• All Preliminary Administrative Services Credential applicants: Verification of at least two years full-time teaching experience. Verification must:
  1) Be on school district letterhead;
  2) Be signed by a school district official.

• All Professional Administrative Services Credential applicants: Valid copy (front and back) of Preliminary Administrative Service Credential. In addition, verification of employment in an administrative position and must:
  1) Be on school district letterhead;
  2) Be signed by a school district official.

It is important for Doctoral applicants the following information: The initial admission to the O&L Doctoral Program is a preliminary decision. Students develop a portfolio during their first year in order to demonstrate competence in research methodology and department specific content. During this period, students work closely with department faculty in preparation of their portfolios (Appendix D). Applications are evaluated only after ALL required documents have been received. Please send your application as early as possible to ensure receipt of a timely written admission decision. Master and credential applications received after the deadline will be reviewed on a space-available basis.

APPLICATION DEADLINES:

All M.A. and Credential Applicants:
Fall semester: July 1
Spring semester: December 1

Doctoral Applicants:
Fall semester: March 1
Spring semester: November 1

Applications to the O&L Program are reviewed by the Department Chair and by individual full-time faculty. The admission process is conducted by the Department Chair. The decisions are based on the criteria outlined in the SOE application materials noted above. In addition, the department will review the GPA, and schedule the candidate for an interview with the department chair, as appropriate. The department reviews all admission materials holistically.

4.2.2 Student Enrollment

The downward trend in the O&L Department student enrollment is outlined in Section 2.1. Over the past two years the SCHs have increased as the student head count has increased in the Doctoral programs. The Master’s student headcount and SCHs has remained fairly constant over the past two years.
While the department recognizes that prospective students may be deterred from enrolling in the programs due to tuition costs. Internal and external competition for Master’s students may be a factor contributing to the low enrollment in the O&L Master’s program. For example CPS recently approved a Master’s program in human resource management, an area very close to our Master’s program. In hindsight, the Departments’ within the two Schools should have cooperated to offer a joint Master’s program instead of being in competition with each other. There is even stiffer external competition in the graduate student enrollment area for the O&L program due to the low tuition rates of the CSUs for programs of study at the Master’s level. The O&L Administrative Services Credential (ASC) in concert with the Masters’ program may provide opportunity for enrollment growth. The California Commission on Teacher Credentials (CCTC) developed an alternate route for individuals to acquire their ASC credential by satisfactory completing a state test. Many potential applicants are seeking alternative routes as opposed to entering a college course of study. As a result of the data derived from the self study, the department has included a review of its Master’s program in the preliminary planning document.

Currently the department does not offer financial aid to O&L students even though other departments within the SOE have financial aid assistance for graduate students. The department will review the strategy to assist students in the future. Some O&L students receive merit scholarships as outlined in Section 4.2.3.

Most of the O&L students are able to balance the demands of a full-time job and family obligations with their academic assignments. Currently, the O&L Department is reviewing the attrition rate and the re-entry rate of its students.

As shown in Table 4.8, the ten year trend in O&L enrollment headcount indicates that the total enrollment of Doctoral & Masters students in the mid 1990’s was consistently between 179 and 160 students, respectively. The average enrollment was 141.4. In the spring of 1998 the O&L Department enrollment average was 106.5, thus the department began a downward trend at the time the SOE Dean targeted lower enrollment as the full-time faculty decreased and were not replaced, see Section 1.2. Between fall, 2002 and spring, 2004, a trend of increasing departmental enrollment is noted. The Doctoral headcount began to increase significantly in the fall of 2001, from 100 students in fall, 2001 to 130 students in spring, 2004. The Masters program increase began in spring, 2002 from 15 students to 30 students in spring, 2004. The current total student headcount according to the spring 2004 Census Report is 130 (excluding the 7 ACS students). The Doctoral headcount is 97 students and the Masters headcount is 33 students.

Conclusion

The O&L Department recognizes the need to develop an enrollment management plan with the Dean’s office to identify and assess enrollment goals and to develop an action plan to implement the goals and objectives of the plan. The self study process reveals the need for the department to increase enrollment in its Master’s program. Under the leadership of Dr. Patricia Mitchell, the Department chair, the department is planning to offer O&L programs at the University’s off-campus sites. The department is in the process of assessing
whether its Doctoral program or its Master’s program will be more appropriate for off-campus development. Also the faculty is creating various instructional options to implement on-line delivery of existing and new courses.

Table 4.8 O&L Department Trend in Ten Year Headcount, Fall, 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Master</th>
<th>Doctoral</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2004</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2003</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2003</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2002</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2002</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2001</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2001</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2000</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1999</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 1999</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1998</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 1998</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1997</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 1997</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1996</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 1996</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1995</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 1995</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1994</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.3 Graduate Student Financial Aid

The School of Education and the USF Office of Financial Aid provide information about financial opportunities for O & L graduate students. The material highlights institutional, state and federal resources available to enrolled students (Appendix E). The information is also available on the School of Education website at: http://www.soe.usfca.edu:16080/admissions/financial_aid.html. In addition, the University Financial Aid office approves and distributes a brochure entitled Financing Your Graduate Education (Appendix F). As recommended by the Graduate Task Force, the Financial Aid office is redesigning its current website to include a page to make the website more user friendly for graduate students.

The School of Education funds a Graduate Merit scholarship program as an avenue to encouraging enrollment of graduate applicants with outstanding academic credentials. The funds are allocated by the university to the schools and colleges with graduate programs.
Each unit is allowed to administer the Graduate Merit Scholarship program in a manner that best serves its mission. The SOE receives $100,000 in merit scholarship funds each fiscal year. The O&L department participates in the program and receives approximately $16,000 in award monies for its students (Appendix G).

4.3 Student Advising

One of the main purposes of graduate advising is to lend support to the students’ development, meet students’ needs and create a mutually satisfactory advisory relationship. Some of the functions of the O&L department faculty in advising students include the following areas: a) Assist students with the application process by providing them with access to materials and accurate interpretation of information concerning the programs in a timely manner, b) Orient the students with the programs of study, c) Meet with students to address any program or classroom performance issues, d) develop an advisor-advisee relationship that may result in a mentoring process, e) advise and refer students to university support services as needed.

Upon admission each student is assigned an academic advisor from among the full-time faculty members of our program. In making this assignment, every effort is made to find common areas of interest and expertise. The advisor contributes to each student’s academic career by assisting him or her to:

- Understand USF’s vision and mission as an urban university with a global perspective that educates its students to learn and work in a more humane, caring world.
- Understand USF’s core values, standards, policies and procedures, and resources that support a learning, action-oriented community;
- Meet the challenge of being a University student by establishing a clear relationship between the University programs and the individual student’s needs;
- Understand and appreciate his or her abilities, strengths, and interests;
- Help the student plan a program of study that complements their background and career interests. Students may petition to change advisors if they have a change of goals. A form is available in the Dean’s Office of from the department program assistant.

Since many students now register on the Web, it is important for them to schedule at least one meeting per semester with their advisor. In general, it is best to schedule a meeting, either in person or by phone, during a faculty member’s office hours or at a mutually convenient time. Technology has assisted faculty with advising students. Often, working students prefer follow-up advising via email.

For the Doctoral students, an academic advisor need not be your dissertation committee chairperson. When forming a dissertation committee, the chairperson should be among the full-time faculty in the Organization and Leadership Department. Once the chair has been assigned, s/he becomes the student’s advisor.
In summary, the O&L Department will review its current advising activities and develop ways to further assess student advising in its strategic planning.

Research and Scholarship of Students

O&L student research is strongly encouraged during the Master’s and Doctoral programs. In the Master’s program students are given research assignments for analysis and assessment by faculty. In the Doctoral program, research is emphasized and benchmarks are used to assess student progress. Department faculty engages in joint research projects with students and participates with them in national conferences such as the American Educational Research Association (AERA) Annual Conference. Such activities are partially support by departmental faculty. Students are encouraged to join professional organizations in their field of study. The faculty encourages students to create work through class assignments such as book reports, projects and research paper presentations that have the potential for publication.

Recent Doctoral student dissertations titles include:

- Beyond Systems Theory: A Paragon of Autopoietic Organization, Mimesis and Praxis
- Hermeneutic Exploration Toward the Design and Application of Grassroots Montessori Teacher Education Courses in Resource-Limited Communities
- Power and Resistance: Berkeley’s Third World Liberation Front Strikes
- Keeping the Vision: Strategies Charter Schools with Alternative Curricula Adopt to Comply with External Accountability Requirements
- California Community College African-American Female Administrators: Their Perceptions as to Why They Leave or Remain in the Administrative Process
- Improved Leadership Through a Myers-Briggs Analysis: Personality Styles of Principals and Teachers at the Secondary Level
- Teachers’ Perceived Effectiveness of Their Evaluation Process at Selected School Districts
- The Role of the Intermediary Organization in Applying a Venture Capital Model to K-12 School Reform: A Case Study
- TheExtent and Access of Academic and Occupational Integrated Curriculum in Illinois’ Community Colleges
- African-American Children in the California Foster Care System: Recommendations for Reducing Their Numbers
- Determining the Efficacy of Service Learning With a Population of Adult Learners in an Accelerated Degree Program
- An Evaluation of Compassion Education Curriculum Designed for Students in a Profession of Social Work
- A Study of the Nature of Workplace Learning for Human Resources Practitioners
- Lifeworlds of Chinese-American Students in California: An Interpretive Study of Self and the Other
• A Symbiosis of Jewish Folk Tales and Streetlaw Principles
• Global Dialectics of Narrative Identity: Mediating the Voluntary and the Involuntary
• A Critical Hermeneutic Inquiry into the Nature of Entrepreneurial Leadership and Commitment in High Technology Organizations
• Relationships Among Students' Levels of Institutional Commitment, Social and Academic Integration, and Attitudes Towards Technology Use
• The Moral Ethos of Managing in an Engineering Environment
• Assessment in Non-Governmental Organizations: Negotiation of Meaning Through Narrative Identity, Social Space and Surplus of Meaning
• Management, Faculty Participation, and Accreditation Outcomes: A Survey of Physical Therapy Faculty and Program Directors
• The Luminous Clearing: Ontological Significance in an Interpretive Mode of Development
• International Narratives in the Configuration of a Transcultural Model of Education Development: Emerging Pedagogy for Cambodia in Partnership with the United States
• Building a Community of Practice: A Case Study of Technology Augmented Beginning Teacher Support
• Communication in the Workplace: The Influence of Communicative Styles in Cross Gender Work Groups
• Power of Narrative: A Hermeneutics of Identity, Iranians' Transition to the United States

The faculty would like to spend more time with students in the area of writing for publication. We think an increase in full-time faculty would allow us to focus more on this area. Currently, teaching, student advising, department and college committee work, and administrative tasks preclude the faculty from accomplishing this task in a meaningful way.

4.4 Student Questionnaire

A copy of the Student Questionnaire can be found in (AppendixH).

4.5 Conclusions Derived from the Student Questionnaire

Student Surveys

Survey Methodology

An online, web-based survey of current students in both the Master’s and Doctoral programs was conducted during the spring semester of 2004. Candidate survey instruments were reviewed and modified to meet the assessment needs of the programs. The initial survey questionnaire validation of validity and reliability was done by ETS. The follow up validation of questions added to the survey by the O&L Department was done by a faculty group external to the department. The methodology used in collecting data included encoding the instruments’ items into a web-based format used by SurveyMonkey.com, a general-purpose data-collection.
tool. E-mail and paper requests were sent to current students. Announcements were also made in classes to encourage students to provide their feedback. There are 130 current students in both the Masters and Doctoral programs. Out of the 35 students in the Masters program, 22 students responded (63%). Out of 97 students in the Doctoral program, 63 students responded (65%).

Master’s Program

The survey responses received from 22 current students in the Master’s program were generally positive with a majority of students indicating a favorable response to each item. Complete results of the Master’s program student survey can be found in (Appendix H).

Part I

Responses to Questions 1 (Faculty interest in students’ professional development) and 3 (Human environment of mutual respect) were the most positive, with no student disagreeing to Question 3 and only one student disagreeing to Question 1. In both cases, 18 out of 22 students (81.8%) chose the response, Agree Strongly.

Least positive responses were observed in response to Question 6 (Department helps students find employment) and 8 (Department is receptive to new ideas and methods). While still indicating a positive response, 9 out of 16 students (56.2%) agreed with reservations to Question 6, and 10 out of 19 students (52.6%) agreed with reservations to Question 8. These two areas are targeted for future strengthening.

Part II

Excellent responses were noted for each item in Part II except Question 1 (Curricular and career advising), which was rated as less than good by 6 out of 18 students (33.3%). The most favorable responses were indicated for Question 8 (Weekend format), which received Excellent ratings from 16 out of 21 students (76.2%) and Good ratings from the remainder of respondents. Maintaining the weekend format is highly advised, while improving advising will likely increase student satisfaction in this area.

Part III

Responses to the items in Part III reflect the respondents’ participation in departmental and institutional activities. Four out of 20 students (20.0%) indicated that they had developed a detailed proposal or research plan (Question 1) and 17 out of 20 students (85.0%) responded in the negative to both Questions 5 (Served on committee) and 6 (Participated in planning). 14 of 19 students (73.7%) reported independent work in the field beyond course requirements (Question 4). These results are most likely related to the fact that only 5 out of 20 students (25.0%) have been in the program for over one year and may not have had the opportunity for fuller participation.

Doctoral Program

Similar to the responses for the Master’s program, responses for the Doctoral program were generally positive with a majority of students indicating a favorable response to each item. Complete results of the Doctoral program student survey can be found in (Appendix I).
**Specific Findings**

**Part I**

Students overwhelmingly found the department to be a stimulating place to study (Question 7) with 52 of 63 students (83.9%) choosing Agree Strongly and only 3 students disagreeing. Likewise, all students indicated that they had learned a great deal in the program with 52 out of 63 students agreeing strongly and no one disagreeing.

Again, mirroring the findings of the Master’s survey, 19 out of 43 students (44.2%) disagreed that the department helped them find employment. Also, 12 out of 60 students (20.0%) disagreed that the department was receptive to new ideas and methods, and 25 out of 60 students (41.7%) only agreed with reservations.

The need to assist with employment and the need to be open to new ideas was identified by both groups of students. Improving these areas would most likely increase student satisfaction with the department.

**Part II**

Of the items in this section, Question 1 (Intellectual environment) and 5 (Overall teaching quality) received the highest ratings with 41 of 63 students (65.1%) rating Intellectual environment as Excellent and 38 of 62 students (61.3%) rating Teaching quality as Excellent.

Students rated all items positively, however, Question 4 (Degree requirement administration) and 16 (Advising and counseling quality) received the least positive response. Degree requiring administration received Poor or Fair ratings from 12 of 60 students (20.0%). Advising and counseling quality received Poor or Fair ratings from 12 of 62 students (19.4%). Strengthening the service to students in these areas would help to increase student satisfaction.

**Part III**

Only one respondent disagreed with Question 5 (Preparing working professionals in various non-educational settings), however, 15 of 58 students (25.9%) agreed with reservations. Alternatively, the most disagreement on the items in this section was observed for Question 4 (Preparing educational leaders), with 8 of 53 students (15.1%) disagreeing. These findings reflect the varied background and emphasis of the students and faculty in the program.

**4.6 Conclusions Derived from Student Focus Group**

In addition to the survey questionnaire, the department conducted a focus group with current O&L Masters and Doctoral students. The focus group was held on January 24th, 2004 at the beginning of the spring semester. The note taking (Appendix J) were put into the following matrix for future departmental study and planning purposes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Group Matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key Elements</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Concerns for Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.9 Student Focus Group Data, Organization and Leadership, Spring, 2004

Focus Group Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Elements</th>
<th>Major Themes for Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department has a good reputation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department chair gives positive leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combining Masters and Doctoral courses in the same class does not always work well</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Satisfaction with the Program</td>
<td>Faculty seen as good role models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meets my career needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good group interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration/Support Services</td>
<td>Need more opportunities for student input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classes are canceled at the last minute by the administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some lack of organization at times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administration should post courses time changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need more help from career services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative material clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Handbook is very clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Some department faculty do not like each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need more cooperation and collaboration among faculty members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Would like to see O&amp;L and L&amp;L combined within the SOE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.7 Student Activities

O&L Department students are involved in the Graduate Student Association and have held positions as officers. Students are nominated and received into the University of San Francisco chapter of Phi Delta Kappa. They are all involved in many aspects of achieving the Society's goals. Most often, our adult graduate students are involved in local community activities and professional organizations related to their work environments. Presently, all of the officers are full time Masters and Doctoral students in the Organization and Leadership Department. The students are involved in joint activities with faculty through their attendance at conferences and professional events.
4.8 Internships and Field Experiences

Field experiences are incorporated into the Preliminary and Professional ASC programs. While these experiences have been designed to meet CTC requirements, they also fulfill the USF goal of providing service learning opportunities for students at all levels.

Field Experiences in the Preliminary ASC

Field experiences in the Preliminary ASC are designed to meet Standard 7 of the California Teaching Commission. It states:

*In the program of administrator preparation, candidates participate in significant field experiences that are designed to facilitate the application of theoretical concepts in practical settings. Each candidate addresses the major duties and responsibilities authorized by the administrative services credential in a variety of realistic settings. Field experiences include intensive experiences both in the day-to-day functions of administrators and in longer-term policy design and implementation.*

Candidates for the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential enroll in and complete 6 units of Field Experience. The supervised, planned work of each candidate provides opportunities to apply and relate theories and practices of all the courses in the Program in a real district or school setting. Each candidate, working with a University instructor and field site supervisor, develops an individual plan. The plan addresses responsibilities and tasks that are designed to meet student needs and address specific competencies related to the seven course content domains as well as overarching competencies. In addition, the plan must provide for experiences with diverse populations and in school settings that cross grade levels.

An integral part of the field experience is the development, by each candidate, of a portfolio containing records and materials of work accomplished along with reflections on the work and its relationship to the competencies to be achieved and personal goals to be met.

The University instructor and the field site supervisor play complementary roles in providing assistance to the candidate in developing the plan, executing the plan, and reflecting. The entire portfolio, as well as the observations of the field site supervisor and University instructor, serves as the basis for evaluation. The method for developing the field experience plan, the basis for the content of the plan, the roles and responsibilities of the University instructor, the site supervisor, and the candidate as well as the method for evaluation of the field experience are all contained in a handbook, *Preliminary Administrative Services Credential: Guidelines for Candidates, Advisors, Instructors and Field Supervisors.*

The competencies and sample activities for the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential which are at the heart of each candidate’s plan are as follows:
Over-Arching Competencies
The candidate will be able to:

1. Demonstrate the ability to apply theoretical perspectives to their own organizational setting.
   
   **Sample Activity:** Candidate examines research on new approaches to language learning and provides information to teachers in a staff development meeting.

2. Work collaboratively with faculty, staff, parents, community members and learners who are culturally, ethnically and socio-economically diverse and learners drawn from at least two school levels.
   
   **Sample Activity:** Candidate chairs a faculty committee to examine the changing demographics of the neighborhood and any relationship between the demographics and the level of parent involvement in the school.

3. Demonstrate an understanding of shared leadership and its concomitant need to develop and/or utilize the leadership skills of others.
   
   **Sample Activity:** Candidate works with a group of fellow teachers to develop a needs assessment of the staff for professional development.

Domain 1: Educational Leadership
The candidate will be able to:

4. Demonstrate the ability to lead groups and individuals in the development and/or implementation of long or short range organizational goals and objectives utilizing appropriate leadership styles.
   
   **Sample Activity:** Candidate organizes a series of staff development seminars to meet the identified needs utilizing both in-school personnel and outside consultants.

Domain 2: Program Improvement
The candidate will be able to:

5. Demonstrate understanding of the developmental needs of learners, the socio-demographic make-up of the school community, and school district curricula through the development, modification, implementation, and/or evaluation of appropriate learning methods and activities for diverse groups of students.
   
   **Sample Activity:** Candidate works with other teachers on the development of a modification to a curriculum to meet the needs of a specific group of students.
Domain 3: Educational Management
The candidate will be able to:

6. Manage human resources to benefit the instructional program and/or the ongoing operation of school.

   Sample Activity: Candidate develops the proctoring schedule for all standardized testing.

6. Manage student services in response to individual and diverse learner needs, making use of the services of appropriate support personnel both within the school and in community agencies.

   Sample Activity: Candidate attends meetings with community agencies either with or on behalf of the field supervisor.

Domain 4: Educational Governance and the Community
The candidate will be able to:

8. Involve families of all cultural groups and patterns in school programs.

   Sample Activity: Candidate develops and begins implementation of a plan to involve parents in a homework help program based upon the factors identified by the faculty committee.

9. Communicate school information to families, including families whose primary language is not English, and to other groups within and outside the school.

   Sample Activity: Candidate develops a one-page school brochure describing the school’s special features to be sent out by the school in English and two additional languages to all parents and to local community group leaders.

Domain 5: Educational Finance
The candidate will be able to:

10. Demonstrate knowledge of the use of fiscal resources, time, and/or facilities to benefit learners and the operation of the school.

    Sample Activity: Candidate develops a grant proposal (including budgets, personnel and timelines) designed to increase the use of parents as homework helpers.

Domain 6: Educational Law
The candidate will be able to:

11. Apply appropriate local rules, procedures, and directives, and federal and state constitutional provisions and laws related to the school.
**Sample Activity:** Candidate works with parent association leaders to develop a parent handbook detailing the school's expectations of students and its disciplinary code.

**Domain 7: Information Management**
The candidate will be able to:

12. Collect, analyze and interpret information about student progress and/or other data for school management and school improvement.

**Sample Activity:** Candidate works with the administrative staff to develop a method for teachers to see standardized test information about their students at the start of each term using a one-page "class at a glance" format.

**Field Experience in the Professional ASC**

Field experiences in the Professional ASC are designed to meet Standard 6 of the California Teaching Commission. It states:

*The beginning administrator's professional credential induction plan specifies provisions for mentoring and support activities to be provided by one or more experienced colleagues throughout the candidate's enrollment in the credential program.*

One of the earliest tasks in working with the newly enrolled candidates is the identification and selection of their mentors. Mentors are senior administrators within the districts in which the candidates are working. Those who participate need to have an understanding of the on-going supportive role they will play in the growth of the candidates.

In many cases, the immediate supervisor of the candidate will be the mentor. In other cases, the immediate supervisor may delegate the role to another or delegate aspects of the role to specialists within the district. Much depends upon the organizational structure and climate of the district.

Early in the process, the supervisor of the candidate is sent a copy of the *Professional Administrative Services Credential: Guidelines for Candidates, Advisors, and Mentors* which includes the responsibilities of the mentor, the University advisor, and the candidate. Just as the planning for the candidate's work is done collaboratively with the University, the district and the individuals involved, so is the selection of the mentor or mentors by the district. The mentoring component of the professional credential induction plan is developed collaboratively by the candidate, the University advisor and the mentor administrator.

The University considers the guidance, advice, and feedback from the experienced colleagues and the support and the nurturing of incoming professionals as critical to the success of the candidate's program. The development of professional norms, the understanding of the role of educational leaders in today's society, and the opportunity to successfully practice leadership principles alongside established educational leaders are all factors in the candidate's program.
Mentored experiences may be individual or group activities and may include, but need not be limited to, orientation of new administrators, job-alike meetings, community participation, professional meetings, support staff meetings and relationship development with people from diverse backgrounds. Activities are balanced to provide awareness and experience of a full range of administrative responsibilities on the site level, district level and community level.

To date, no problems have arisen in the mentor-candidate-university relationship. However, provision has been made for such an eventuality. There are four key elements to the process: communication, replacement, support and record keeping.

1. Communication: The Program Coordinator will be responsible for handling the difficulties on both the informal and formal level. The first step will be informal conversations with all parties in an attempt to establish trust, identify areas of conflict, and, if possible, resolve them.

2. Replacement: If conflicts cannot be resolved, a new mentor will be selected along with continued advisement from the coordinator and the support persons until the entire issue is understood. There will be opportunities for the candidate to meet with administrators from other districts to establish a broader base of knowledge of today's educational leadership challenges.

3. Support to the candidate: Additional support will be provided to the candidate through any difficult period through face-to-face, telephone and, if desirable e-mailed conversation. If needed, counseling resources of the University will be utilized.

4. Record keeping: The Coordinator will keep a log or similar memoranda of the events.

Conclusions

Students, faculty, and mentors in both the Preliminary and Professional ASC have been satisfied with the developmental process and outcomes. Nor were there any recommendations from the California Commission in Teacher Credentials (CCTC) to alter our practice.

4.9 Overall Student Satisfaction

It is our distinct impression that student satisfaction with the program has improved over the past years. An informal review of the program was undertaken in 1996 - 1997 by a graduate assistant under the direction of the Department Chair, Dr. Mitchell. The study revealed a moderate to high level of student satisfaction. The faculty addressed the issues of developing a community college specialization, raising standards of excellence by strengthening the admission policy and increasing the ethnic and gender diversity of the faculty that were pointed out to the department by students in an 1996/1997 study conducted by the Department Chair, Dr. Mitchell and a graduate student assistant. The study is on file in the Resource Room.
The most recent questionnaires distributed to current students for the program review, student focus groups, as well as informal feedback from classroom assessment measures, have convinced us that the department progress is at a high level of student satisfaction and is meeting student needs and expectations.

In nearly every category of the survey questionnaire the current student responses were significantly higher and the responses as positive as alumni in both the Master’s and Doctoral programs. The ASC program students were not surveyed separately from the Master’s and Doctoral program cohorts.

The exit survey conducted by the University at the time of graduation reveals a high level of satisfaction of student responses from School of Education students, although the responses are not targeted by program. A copy of the survey instrument used by the University for assessing graduating student satisfaction can be found in the Supplementary Materials.

**Testimonials**

Student testimonials are another indication of student satisfaction with the O&L programs. The following students' testimonials make reference to their satisfaction with the department's mission, goals and programs:

"The Organization and Leadership Ed.D. Program has provided me the opportunities to:

- Vastly increase my academic knowledge of contemporary leadership theories and practices and how they can be applied in today's world.
- Meet amazing people who have positively influenced and changed my life.
- Grow as an intellectual, an educator, and as a human being."

[Name Redacted]
2nd year Teacher, Jefferson High School

"The Organization and Leadership Doctorate Program at The University of San Francisco helped me achieve my career goals of becoming a university professor and earning a terminal degree crucial for advancement in the public management filed."

[Name Redacted], Ed.D.
Energy Facility Siting Project Manager
California Energy Commission

"The Doctoral Program in Organization and Leadership taught me critical skills needed in my career. I am able to analyze organizational systems and data, recognize excellent leadership practices, and develop and implement high quality programs. I have also discovered a passion and skill for qualitative research. I recommend USF's School of Education to working professionals who want hone their intellectual skills and use their leadership abilities."

[Name Redacted], Ed.D.
Director
College of Marin
“Being in the Doctorate program in Leadership and Organization at USF has been one of the most exciting and inspiring journeys of my life. The program enhances not only my role in my organization, but also my involvement with my community. Additionally, the program has enriched my family life by nourishing my search for doing something important to positively impact the world.”

[Name Redacted]

Senior Vice President, Human Resources
Connexis Corporation

“My name is [Name Redacted] and I am the single parent of two boys, ages 4 and 5. I am a social worker for Child Protective Services. I made the decision to apply to the program because I had a vision of creating a community-based organization in the community of which I was raised. This has been my first semester in the Doctoral Program and it has been exciting and challenging and I continue to look forward to what I am learning. I am motivated to complete the program because I feel that I have the opportunity to create change in my family and community.”

[Name Redacted]

Adjunct Professor
Mathematics Department
College of Arts and Sciences

“This course has given me a context for the work I do each day. I now feel part of a community of leaders, struggling to better understand what we do and identify ways to do it better. Reading about Servant Leadership, in particular, was an “a-ha!” experience for me. I saw the principles I was vaguely aware of earlier, clarified and set down on paper. “That’s me!” I thought. Or at least, that’s the me I want to be.”

[Name Redacted]

Associate CIO, USF

“This program has opened my mind and spirit. Not only do I understand the existing relationships as a leader and a follower in the corporate world, but in my personal life as well. I would recommend this program for anyone who wants to have an impact in today’s world and our future. We are all leaders and followers.”

[Name Redacted]

Sr. Business Analyst
Providian Financial

“The Leadership Program at USF is opening up new horizons, opportunities and friendships for me. It is a valuable experience and holds the key to wonderful things in my future.”

[Name Redacted]

Adjunct, USF
College of Professional Studies

"Since I became a student in the Organization and Leadership program this fall, I have started to redefine my role as a leader and how I relate to everyone in my work community. The experiences I've had in my classes have been invaluable in that process of change."

ESL Specialist
Ecole Bilingue

"I have enjoyed attending the University of San Francisco. The experience has opened my eyes to a different aspect to life and leadership."

Resource Management Specialist
NASA Ames Research Center

4.10 Alumni Activities

All SOE graduates belong to the University Alumni Association. The Education Alumni Group (EAG) has not been reliable over the past few years. Thus it has not been feasible to keep the EAG active. While there has been a reduction in formal alumni activities, informal relationships with alumni have remained strong. One of the departments planning goals is to create an advisory group for the program that involves O&L alumni.

Within the O&L Department, alumni serve as guest lecturers in classes. For example, alumni have addressed classes on the place of assessment in educational improvement, on the development of caring communities in schools, executive management and program development in community colleges, administration of schooling K-12, and on research techniques for the dissertation. In addition, the most talented alumni are called upon to teach as adjuncts. Alumni, for example, have taught Social Cultural Foundations, Ethical Organization, and Educational Program Improvement. This is particularly useful to the students who see these alumni as role models, to the alumni who have the chance to build their teaching skills under the watchful eye of senior faculty, and to the faculty are thus freed for sabbatical leaves or for the development of new courses. In addition, alumni are available, on a one-to-one basis, to speak to students at the dissertation stage when topics or methodologies may be usefully shared. Finally, alumni serve on the Advisory Board of the Administrative Services Credential programs. The Advisory Board is in the process of being rearranged.

A Dean of SOE has been appointed and will begin his duties August 1, 2004. The department faculty will request that the EAS be reconstituted. The EAS were once a more active group and sponsored a speaker series and other activities. However, they have gradually become less active and last year the decision was made to incorporate their major award (the Griffin Award, named after the first dean of SOE) into the annual alumni awards banquet (Spring Gala) rather than hold a dinner of their own.
Recently, one of the department's alumni sent us an article noting her activities and achievements. [Name Redacted] was highlighted in a recent issue of the American Association of University Women (Appendix K).

Conclusion

At this time, informal relationships with alumni are flourishing and should continue to be fostered. One alumna recently suggested that a cadre of volunteer alumni be identified to serve prospective students with "informational interviews." She pointed out that the alumni would be able to speak to those prospective students about both their experiences in the program and the affects of their O&L experience on their careers. It is one of the O&L planning strategies to work with alumni development.

4.11 Alumni Employment

Graduates of the O&L Department continue to enhance the productivity and employment in the Greater Bay Area. As of fall, 2003 O&L graduates are employed by the following organizations, corporations, agencies and institutions. Other graduates are self-employed as consultants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assistant Principal</th>
<th>Vice President</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield High School</td>
<td>Knox Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Senior Admission Counselor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Dorado Elementary School</td>
<td>Fairfield University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Teaching Assignment</td>
<td>Consultant/Trainer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of San Francisco</td>
<td>Timner Consultant Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of San Francisco</td>
<td>San Francisco State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.R. Smedberg Middle School</td>
<td>Westwood College of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Consultant</td>
<td>Temporary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Diablo District</td>
<td>University of San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farnham Properties, Inc.</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time Faculty</td>
<td>Chapman University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of San Francisco</td>
<td>Education Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>Alum Rock Union Elementary School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of San Francisco</td>
<td>Corporate Account Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sun Microsystems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4.12 Alumni Career Changes and Alumni Development

The surveys of current MA and Ed.D. students show that most of the O&L students are employed when they enter the program. It is difficult to assess the precise relationship between
their subsequent position and the program. However, data from the surveys of MA students and alumni reveal the following:

- Of the MA students responding to the survey, 57.1% were employed in a full-time position related to their studies, and 14.3% were employed in a part-time position related to their studies. Only 9.5% were not employed at all.
- Of these same respondents, 70% expected to continue in their current position or with their current employer or return to a previous position after graduation and 30% did not expect to continue in their current employment or return to their previous employment.
- Of the MA graduates responding to the Alumni Survey, 66.7% continued in their position or returned to a previous position, while 22.2% returned to their employers in a new position. While the two groups surveyed do not include the same individuals, the actual career paths of the graduates are consistent with the plans of the current students.
- Further, 66.6% of the MA students reported that the training they received in the MA program contributed "quite a bit" or "a great deal" to their first position after graduation. Only 5.6% responded "not at all" to this question.
- Finally, for the MA graduates, more than half (53%) reported that they considered themselves "underemployed in your present position because it is not in your field or not consistent with your level of training and experience." This issue might be worth exploring further to ascertain the career expectations of students, how the department's program contributes and can contribute to these expectations, and how USF's Career Services Center may enhance the professional development of the O&L graduates.

The questions posed in the Ed.D. and MA surveys were somewhat different, so parallel observations and conclusions cannot be drawn. The Ed.D. data reveal the following:

- Of the Ed.D students responding, 91.7% are currently employed. O&L students work in every sector: universities, college, community colleges, primary and secondary schools, non-profit agencies, business, government, and self-employment. No single sector dominates.
- Of these respondents, 50.8% expect to continue in their current position after graduation, while 15.3% expect to return to their employers in a new position.
- The Ed.D. alumni surveys show that 92.9% are employed full time. They are employed across the same industrial sectors as the Ed.D. students.
- Only 6.2% of the alumni report that their current position does not make use of their Doctoral training.
- Unfortunately 71.9% of the students disagreed or disagreed strongly with the statement: "The department actively helped Doctoral graduates find appropriate employment." Given the range of fields in which O&L students are employed, it is difficult to establish the kings of networks that are useful in more targeted programs. The Department does maintain a set of current job openings which are available in the student "lounge" area of the office suite. Recently, some members of the O&L faculty met with USF Career Service Center, a list of strategies to better O&L graduate students were developed as a result of the meeting. The USF Career Services Center has developed a brochure targeted towards "experienced job seekers", more information can be found in section 6.7.
Conclusion

For the time being, it is difficult to quantify the role of the O&L Department in enhancing graduates' employment prospects. Two efforts may be planned for the ensuing academic years, particularly 2004-2006. One effort is to collect data more systematically. Questions from the MA and Ed.D. surveys will be examined to choose the best from each. The goal is to collect data that is not only particular to each program but also comparable across programs. The second effort is to work more closely with the Career Services Center so that O&L students and graduates are better served and so that they see this service as integral to their experience in the O&L programs.

4.13 Alumni Questionnaire

A copy of the alumni Masters and Doctoral questions and results can be found in (Appendix L & Appendix M).

4.14 Conclusions Derived from the Alumni Questionnaire

Alumni Surveys

Survey Methodology

An online, web-based survey of alumni of both the Master's and Doctoral programs was conducted during the spring semester of 2004. Candidate survey instruments were reviewed and modified to meet the assessment needs of the programs. The initial survey questionnaire validation of validity and reliability was done by ETS. The follow up validation of questions added to the survey by the O&L Department was done by a faculty group external to the department. The methodology used in collecting data included encoding the instruments' items into a web-based format used by SurveyMonkey.com, a general-purpose data-collection tool. E-mail announcements of the surveys were sent to alumni. Out of 230 invited alumni, responses were received from 21 alumni (9.1%) of the Master's program and 33 alumni (14.3%) of the Doctoral program.

Master's Program

Survey responses were received from 21 alumni of the Master's program. Complete results of the Master's program alumni survey questions and results can be found in (Appendix L).

Specific Findings

Part 1

Responses to Question 3 (I learned a great deal) and 10 (Opportunity to pursue individual projects) were the most positive, with only one respondent disagreeing to each question. In both
cases, 14 out of 21 respondents (66.7%) chose the response, Agree Strongly and 6 out of 21 (28.6%) chose Agree with Reservations.

Similar to the responses obtained in the current student surveys, Question 7 (Curricular and career advising) received the least positive results from the alumni. Overall, the responses were divided in half with 10 of 20 respondents disagreeing and 10 of 20 agreeing. Nine of 20 respondents (45.0%) chose the responses, Disagree with Reservations. Further research should be conducted to identify specific methods for improving advising. See results in Question 14 in Part III below.

Part II

In Part II, alumni were asked in Questions 1 and 2 to identify their purposes for pursuing the Master’s degree and then evaluate the degree to which the program met their purpose. Two purposes, Qualifying for higher pay and advancement and Preparation for professional or technical practice, obtained the most responses with Higher pay/advancement receiving 10 out of 21 responses (33.3%). On Question 2, only 2 alumni reported that their purpose was not met, while 11 out of 21 respondents (52.4%) chose the response, Extremely well.

Part III

Question 14 probed the effectiveness of various job search activities. Reflecting the overall dissatisfaction with employment assistance, the response, Not at all helpful, was chosen most often for each activity. Blind mailings (11 of 12 (85%)) and the University placement office (12 of 15 (80%)) were reported to be least helpful. Assistance from individual faculty was noted to be very helpful by 5 of 15 respondents (33%).

Doctoral Program

Survey responses were received from 33 alumni of the Doctoral program. Complete results of the Doctoral program alumni survey questions and results can be found in (Appendix M).

Specific Findings

Part I

All except one alumnus indicated that they had learned a great deal in the program with 28 out of 33 respondents (84.8%) agreeing strongly to Question 3.

Again, mirroring the findings of the Master’s survey, 12 out of 32 respondents (37.5%) disagreed strongly that the department helped them find employment. In fact, only one respondent chose Agree Strongly for Question 5.

The need to assist with finding employment was identified clearly by students and alumni.
Part II

Of the items in this section, Question 6 (Program flexibility) received the highest ratings with 19 of 33 respondents (57.6%) choosing the rating Excellent and 11 of 33 (33.3%) choosing Good.

While still favorable, responses to Question 4 (Teaching methods) received the least positive responses with 8 out of 33 respondents (24.2%) rating this area as Fair or Poor.

Part IV

Alumni identified great value in most features of the program, including required and elective courses, association with fellow Doctoral students, and standards of excellence. Each area was noted of “Considerable value” or “Very great value” by over 75% of the respondents. Reflecting the typical pattern for commuter students and working adults, the responses to Question 5 (Cultural and social life of the university) were mixed with equal numbers of responses across all value levels.

5. The O&L Faculty

The O&L Department is comprised of tenured faculty who performs teaching duties, pursue professional development and enhancement of the public good and of the prestige of the University through research, scholarly publications, and interest in professional groups and societies and adjunct faculty who are renowned in the field of organization and leadership.

5.1 Faculty History and General Profiles

In 1948, the University established the Department of Education under the leadership of Paul J. Harney, S.J. From its inception and through the decades of the 1950’s and 1960’s the Department had a highly reputed teacher preparation program. In addition to the teacher preparation program, the school offered several Master’s degree programs. In 1972 the Board of Trustees established the School of Education and in 1975 the first Doctoral students were admitted to study for the newly approved Doctor of Education degree.

During the first year, the Organization and Leadership Program enrolled 25 students. Dr. Tony Stedal served as the Director of the program. Other program directors to follow were Drs. Don Delay, Wayne Doyle, and Bill Garner. The years from 1975 to 1980 represented a growth period during which the enrollment grew rapidly in our Doctoral program and innovative Master’s degree and credential programs were offered off-campus at various sites throughout the state.

Between 1980 and 1994 the program exhibited a high degree of stability in terms of quality, enrollment and number of full time faculty. During this time there were over 200 students pursuing their Doctoral degree and the department had 11 full time faculty members: Drs. Ellen Herda, Wayne Doyle, Bill Garner, William Swartz, Dan Muller, Allen Calvin, John Devine, Jim Counselis, Larry Bishop, Robert Lamp and William Van Burgess. Dr. Patricia
Mitchell joined the O&L department in 1994 after leaving the Teacher Education Department. The number of full-time faculty retirements began in 1995, but the student enrollment did not decrease. Dr. Deborah Bloch joined the faculty in 1996 and Dr. Mary Abascal-Hidebrand in 1997. Dr. Betty Taylor, a former dean, joined the faculty in September 2003. The School of Education dean began to target lower enrollments as the full-time faculty decreased and were not replaced.

We have gone from a healthy faculty of 12 full-time faculty to presently only having four full-time faculty members. Even though Dr. Gamer has been moved from the O&L Department to the Teacher Education Department, we were not able to secure that faculty line. Additionally, Dr. Mary Abascal-Hildenbrand was not granted tenure. However, the department has not received a replacement for the position. A downward enrollment spiral began in 1999 and it is apparent at this time. Currently, we have 96 students enrolled in the Doctoral program, 33 in the Master’s program and 6 special status students. Our focus continues to serve the professional growth needs of mid-career working adults.

The current O&L faculty profiles and expertise is outlined in sections 5.10, 5.10.1, 5.10.2, 5.10.3, 5.10.4, 5.10.4.1, 5.10.4.2, 5.10.5, 5.11, 5.11.1 and 5.11.2; short and long form vitae can be found in (Appendix N).

5.2 Faculty-Student Relations

Upon admissions the students are assigned an academic advisor from among the full-time faculty members of the program. In making this assignment, every effort is made to find common areas of interest and expertise. The advisor will help plan a program for the study that complements their background and career interests. The student may petition to change advisors if they have a change of goals. A form is available in the Dean’s Office or from the program assistant.

Since many students now register on the Web, it is important for the students to schedule an appointment at least one meeting per semester with their advisor. In general, it is best to schedule a meeting, either in person, or by phone, during a faculty member’s office hours at a mutually convenient time.

At the beginning of each semester, a department meeting is held with all students registered for that particular semester. This is an opportunity for new students to be introduced and for the returning students to reconnect with each other.

The faculty relations with the O&L students in both the Master’s and Doctoral programs appear highly satisfactory. The student focus groups mentioned that “faculty are very interested in us,” “we see the faculty as role models” and “most of the O&L faculty are very helpful.” A few students commented that they think some members of the faculty do not always get along with each other. The current student survey indicated that students strongly agreed their relations with faculty are positive.
5.3 The Full-time Faculty

The Organization and Leadership Department is under the leadership of the Acting Dean of the School of Education, Dr. Larry Brewster.

The department chair, Dr. Patricia Mitchell, is responsible for the coordination and planning of the Doctoral, Masters and administrative credential programs on and off campus for the University of San Francisco. Dr. Mitchell is accountable to the Dean and performs duties and responsibilities as set forth by the Dean. The chair's position is an elected position. The chair is compensated with release time. Release time shall be from three (3) to six (6) units per semester as determined by the Dean. Dr. Mitchell is being compensated with (3) units of release time each semester.

Dr. Deborah Bloch, Professor of Education, Dr. William Garner, Professor of Education, (Dr. William Garner was transferred to the Teacher Education Department in March, 2004 by the Acting Dean), Dr. Ellen Herda, Professor of Education and Dr. Betty Taylor, Professor of Education (who returned to the faculty from a deanship fall, 2003) are all on the USF faculty and teach in the program area. (Appendix N). In addition, there are six renowned Professor Emeritus: Professors Larry Bishop, William Van Burgess, Allen Calvin, James Counelius, John Devine, and Robert Lamp.

The faculty long and short form vitae outlining their education, experience, research interests and publications can be found in (Appendix N).

5.4 The Adjunct Faculty

The department utilizes an outstanding group of adjunct faculty to assist in delivery of classes each semester. While the number of adjuncts varies each semester, we presently have a pool of 13 adjuncts: Dr. Ben Baab, Dr. Judy Castro, Dr. Veronica Knott, Dr. Gwendolyn Powell Todd, Dr. Harley Baker, Dr. Silvia Harris, Dr. Elena Ting, Dr. Chris Olsen, Dr. Larry Johnson, Dr. Susan Silver, Martin Bloch, Dr. Kenneth James, and Nancy Bourne.

In an effort to support adjunct instructors the SOE conducts adjunct faculty analysis each semester. The O&L Department's adjuncts who, for the most part, have long-term teaching association with the department even though they do not teach every semester or attend the seminars. The Department's focus group with adjunct faculty reveals a need for full-time faculty to involve adjunct faculty in department matters on a more regular basis. It is one of the O&L planning strategies to work more productively with department adjuncts.

5.5 Faculty Workload, Faculty Participation and Cooperation

Our workload is governed by the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the USF Faculty Association and the administration. The workload of each full-time faculty member, including teaching assignments and all other duties, is based on a work week of forty (40) to
forty-five (45) hours during the academic year and is, for purposes of determining teaching assignments, calculated on an equivalent of thirty (30) units per academic year. Of the thirty (30) unit work requirement, six (6) units per academic year are allotted for non-teaching duties (such as student program advising, committee work, administrative duties, or other extra-curricular duties) and twenty-four (24) units per academic year are allotted for teaching and research assignments during the academic year. A minimum of nine (9) units per semester will be taught by all full-time faculty unless the faculty member is formally excused from such workload by the Dean.

The Academic Career Prospectus (ACP) shall govern all professional workload responsibilities as such are defined in the contract between the faculty member and the University during the specific period agreed to between the faculty member and the Dean. No later than October 1 of each academic year, each faculty member shall submit, on a form supplied by the Dean, a professional prospectus for the subsequent academic year. No later than December 15 of each academic year, each faculty member shall meet with the Dean to discuss and agree upon the ACP.

The O&L Department places a high priority on student advising in its graduate and credential programs. A snapshot of faculty advising which was taken in the spring, 2004 semester for Doctoral and Master’s programs are shown in Tables 5.1 and Table 5.2. As noted in Tables 5.1 and 5.2, Dr. Mitchell, the Department Chair, has the highest percentage of both Master and Doctoral advisees. Dr. Herda has the next highest group of both Doctoral and Master advisees at 48%. Dr. Bloch was on sabatical in the past year. Dr. Taylor joined the faculty in fall, 2003 and as the new faculty coordinator of the Administrative Credential Program addresses all of the prospective and on-going candidates in the program who are usually at the Master’s level.
Table 5.1 Faculty/Student Advising Master’s Program, Spring, 2004

Legend:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Members:</th>
<th>Number of Students:</th>
<th>Percentage %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yellow – Dr. Bloch</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pink – Dr. Herda</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue – Dr. Mitchell</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Blue – Dr. Taylor</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.2 Faculty/Student Advising Doctoral Program, Spring, 2004

Legend:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Members:</th>
<th>Number of Students:</th>
<th>Percentage %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yellow – Dr. Bloch</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pink – Dr. Herda</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue – Dr. Mitchell</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Blue – Dr. Taylor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.6 Faculty Workload and the Curriculum

The attrition of full-time faculty has created problems for the program, which has implications for the curriculum, students and the faculty. The O&L program is designed to give students an overall perspective of the structure of organization management and leadership knowledge skill and dispositions to develop and work successfully in disparate organizations (as outlined in our mission statement). However, the loss of full-time faculty in the area of administration and supervision K-12, presents curricula with field supervisor problems. We have a pool of a dozen or so adjuncts to cover these areas and school-based mentors with specialized expertise to cover the disciplines within the curriculum. However adjuncts cannot, for their own self preservation, be committed to our students. We would like to call upon other full-time faculty in the SOE who have this expertise. For most part, the SOE qualified faculty in this area has been committed to the Master’s program in teacher education. We are now experiencing an increase in student enrollments in the Doctoral Program, and would like to request replacement full-time faculty as outlined in section 5.7.

Quality control is a serious issue related to adjuncts. There are only four full-time faculty in the O&L department. A small department has the same academic functions as found in a larger department. The department faculty do not have as much time as they would like to work with adjunct faculty. Recently, the Dean’s office has initiated an adjunct development program as full-time faculty lines have dissipated from the School’s ranks. The O&L faculty participates in the Deans adjunct development program. For a truly healthy departmental program, we should have enough permanent full-time faculty to consistently teach all of our courses.

In addition, increased full-time faculty lines would allow the faculty time to work more with students in and out of class or in some cases in assigned research projects that could result in conference presentations and published work. Further additional faculty lines would give the faculty more time to work with students in the areas of career planning and employment.

5.7 Faculty Hiring and Long Range Planning

The Department chair makes recommendations to the Dean of the School of Education regarding the hiring of full-time and adjunct faculty with input from other members of the department. The Dean acts in accordance with the hiring policies approved by the Academic Vice President of the University. When a new faculty position is open, a search committee with faculty representation is formed. All decisions regarding personnel are made in the context of the University’s Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action Policy. Should replacement faculty become available, the O&L department would hire three faculty over the next three years: one with expertise in administration and supervision K-12, one in community college, and one in student development. The acting dean has informed the faculty that the hiring priority for SOE is in the area of teacher education.
5.8 Quality of Instruction

Professors at the University of San Francisco are evaluated by students in all of their classes except directed studies, Master's Field Project courses, and the dissertation coursework (790 & 791). The University uses SUMMA Course Evaluations instruments. The Associate Dean regularly reviews the course evaluations (SUMMA) of both full-time and adjunct professors. Copies of evaluations are sent directly to each professor. The Associate Dean assesses the aggregate course data related to the department mean, the school's mean and the University means for quality instruction. The O&L faculty instruction data is considered at or above the norm of the School and University standard mean. Anecdotal evidence suggests that in general students feel positively about the quality of classroom instruction.

Further the quality of instruction is measured by the assessment of student outcomes instituted in faculty courses and the departmental course profiles. The measures are discussed in Section 2.4. The student evaluation form can be found in (Appendix Q).

5.9 Grading Policy at the Graduate Level

The O&L faculty is committed to the potential of each student. Given our thorough review of applicants' portfolios and the conditional admissions process for Doctoral students, we expect that students will perform with excellence. This results in a non-competitive grading policy. Students are not measured against each other but against the achievement of the outcomes and related assignments, projects, and tests of each class. The result of this policy and belief, and of the performance of the students, is that most grades are within the A range, that is A+, A, or A-. A grade in the B range, that is B+ or B, is a signal to the student that work is merely satisfactory. A grade below B is essentially a failing grade since students are required to maintain a B average.

Once the student is in the dissertation sequence, courses are graded Pass/Fail. Students in field experience and Masters Field Project may receive grades of IP or "in progress" until the work is completed.

If a student is unable to complete the work of a course during the term of that course, he or she is permitted, with the instructor's approval, to receive a grade of I for "incomplete." The student has one semester to complete the work and receive a letter grade. After one semester, if the student has not finished the work satisfactorily, unless there are extenuating circumstances to which the instructor has agreed, the grade of I becomes an F. Students may still have the opportunity to receive a passing grade if the instructor agrees to accept the missing work and it is done in a satisfactory manner.

Conclusion

The only persistent problem with the grading system has been the lack of protocols in relation to grades of I. The School of Education has recently instituted a system to ensure that
students and faculty agree upon work to be completed and the timeline for doing so. This is a new system and needs monitoring to judge its effectiveness.

Faculty curricular vitae can be found in (Appendix N). The short faculty vitae are used for departmental information meetings and web design.

5.10 Faculty Research and Scholarship

The four full-time members of the faculty each have an active program of research and scholarship. Collectively, in the last five years, they have contributed the following to the field:

- 8 papers published in professional journals
- 5 published books and 3 books in progress
- 2 published book chapters
- 4 monographs or reports
- 1 instrument
- 43 conference presentations at local, regional, national and international conferences

This array of work is presented in detail in the corresponding sections on the following pages:

1. Journal articles published in the last 5 years:
2. Books published in the last 5 years and books in progress:
3. Book Chapters published in the last 5 years:
4. Other publications (i.e. an instrument, government reports or monographs) of the last 5 years; and
5. Conference presentations in the last 5 years

5.10.1 Journal articles published in the last five years


5.10.2 Books published in the last five years and books in progress


Herda, E. Forthcoming, “The ‘Other’ in Development Practice: Management, Education, Technology and Health”.


5.10.3 Book chapters published in the last five years


5.10.4 Other publications of the last five years

5.10.4.1. Instrument

Bloch, D. P. (2003). Salient beliefs review: Connecting spirit and work. Indianapolis, IN: JIST Publishing. [Published in Australia and New Zealand by the Centre for Worklife Counseling].

5.10.4.2. Reports and monographs


5.10.5 Conference presentations in the last five years


Presentations, 8th Annual Statewide California Forum for Diversity in Graduate Education. University of San Francisco. 1999.


5.11 Faculty Service to the Profession and University

The four full-time members of the Organization and Leadership Department contribute actively to the profession and to the university.

Service to the Profession

Contributions to the profession in the last five years include a wide range of activities and a wide range of service areas. The faculty is active in local, national, and international arenas. As an example, one member of the faculty has served on editorial boards and offers columns in professional newsletters which are read in many English speaking countries. A second has reviewed United States Department of Education grant proposals. A third member of our faculty has developed learning technology centers in Southeast Asia. A fourth has served on a regional accreditation team. And the fifth has served a chairperson of the the San Francisco Board for Newspapers in Education. Examination of faculty curriculum vitae for earlier periods, that is, before 1998, shows the same level and variety of service.

Service to the University

The faculty is equally involved in the life of the university. Examination of faculty curriculum vitae show that members of the Organization and Leadership Department contribute to the formal structure of department, school and university committees, often taking leadership roles. In addition, O & L faculty are often in the forefront of University initiatives such as service learning or development of the Phi Delta Kappa chapter and the acquisition of grants.

The following pages provide details of some of the activities of O&L faculty. The contribution of each faculty member to the profession is presented first. This is followed by a list of activities undertaken in service to the university. The two lists are organized by faculty member in alphabetic order.
5.11.1 Service to the profession in the last five years

Deborah P. Bloch


Contributed to *College for Career Practitioners*. [Internet-based training for human resource professionals], Mosman, NSW, Australia: Centre for Worklife Counselling, 2000-present

Provided radio interviews on a variety of career development topics, 1998-present

Consulted to Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery (ASVAB): Participated in Expert Panel designed to improve the Student Testing Program used by high schools throughout the U.S., 2001-2002.

Consulted to BritannicaSchool.com: Developed, delivered, evaluated model for teacher, librarian, media specialist training in the use of new Internet-based school service dedicated to building student and teacher research capabilities, 2000-2001.


Ellen Herda

Developed Six Learning Technology Centers in Northern Thailand, Northern Laos and Cambodia.
Patricia Mitchell

Member. Advisory Board for Chapman University College for Bay Area, 2003

Member of the WASC evaluation team that visited Fuller Theological Seminary, 2003

Vice-Chair, Trustee Board at Second Baptist Church, 2003

Member of the Benicia Middle School Site Council, 1999–2003

Vice-President of the Benicia High School Site Council, 1999–2003

Member of the Powerful Teaching and Training Committee, Benicia High School Self-Study. WASC committee, 1999–2003

Chair, San Francisco Chronicle/San Francisco Examiner Educators Advisory Board for Newspapers in Education Program, 1999–2003

Consultant and Chief Judge for San Francisco Examiner Written and Oral Spelling Bees for 1999-2003

Field Reviewer for the Commission on Teacher Credentialing Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Program, 1999–2003

Member of the WASC evaluation team that visited Pacific Oaks College, Pasadena, Ca. (February, 2002)

Member of the Strategic Plan Committee, Benicia Unified School District, 1999–2000

Member of the Search Committee for the Associate Superintendent for the Benicia Unified School District., 1999–2000

Betty Taylor

Academic Consultant, Liverpool Hope University College, Education College, Liverpool, UK, 2001-

National Steering Committee and Board Member, Western Cooperative for Educational Telecommunications, 2000-2003

Member, Martin Luther King Commission, Plattsburgh, NY, 2000-2003

Advisor, Dominica Catholic Students, Newman Center, Plattsburgh, NY, 2000-2002

Middle States Accreditation Team Member, 2001
Martin Luther King Commission Speaker, City of Plattsburgh, Community Martin Luther King Celebration, 2002


5.11.2 Service to the University in the last five years

Deborah P. Bloch

Chair School of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee 2003-2004

Member School of Education Promotion and Tenure Committee 2001-2004

Prepared submission to California Commission on Teacher Credentialing for Preliminary and Professional Administrative Services Credential Programs, 2000-2002

Presented to various USF students and alumni on Soul Work (Career Services Center and University Ministry, February 2002; Phi Delta Kappa initiation, April 2001)

Member School of Education Curriculum Committee, 2000-2002

Member School of Education General Education Advisory Committee, 1999-2002, 2003-

Delivered keynote address to USF CPS, MBA and Education Alumni Societies' 4th Annual Career Event: Putting Your Vision To Work, May 1, 1999

Member Koret Center Advisory Board, 1999-2001

Member USF Task Force on Service Learning, Chair Committee on Faculty Development Grants, 1998-2000


Represented USF at the Western Conversations on Jesuit Higher Education in October 1998

Member School of Education Retreat Planning Task Force, 1998-1999

Member School of Education Task Force on New Directions in Teacher Education, 1996-1997

Alternate secretary, School of Education Faculty Association, 1998-2000
Coordinated School of Education submission to California Commission on Teacher Credentialing for Preliminary and Professional Administrative Services Credential Programs, 1996-1997

Developed and modified annually handbooks for students in both the Preliminary and Professional Administrative Services Credential programs.

Developed course sequences for Professional and Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Programs and submitted them to the O&L Department and School of Education Curriculum Committee for approval.

Developed sequencing of courses in the Professional and Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Programs that would facilitate coherence between on-campus Masters and Doctoral program scheduling to benefit students and faculty.

Delivered an address to the community, "Exploring the Connections Between Spirit and Work" sponsored by the Career Action Center to initiate their 25th Anniversary Speaker Series, 1998.

Ellen Herda

Serves on School of Education Committees: Graduate Policy Committee, Curriculum Committee, University Committee, Koret Board of Advisors.

Patricia Mitchell

Member, Search Committee for USF Dean of Students, 2003

Member, School of Education Task Force concerning merger of CPS and School of Education, 2003

Member, USF Faculty Association Policy Board, 2001-2003

Member, USF Multicultural Action Plan Advisory Committee, 1999-2003

Member, USF Sexual Harassment Appeal Committee, 1999-2003

Member, USF Academic Services Committee, 2003

Member, School of Education Faculty Development Committee, 2001-2003

Member, USF 150th Anniversary Committee, 2003
Advisor of the USF Chapter of Phi Delta Kappa, 2004
Chair, School of Education Faculty Association, 2001-2004
Chair, Organization and Leadership Department, 2001-2004
Member, School of Education GEAC, 2003
Advisor to the School of Education Graduate Student Council, 2001-2002
Member, Curriculum Committee, 2001-2002
Member, General Education Committee, 2001-2002
President of the USF Chapter of Phi Delta Kappa, 1999-2002. Our chapter was the recipient of the Outstanding Website Award and the Outstanding Membership Award for the year 1999-2000
Member on the USF Distinguished Research Award Committee, 1999-2000
Member of the President’s Committee on the Status of Women Committee, 1999-2000
Member of the School of Education Curriculum Committee. Co-chair during the spring 2000 semester.
Advisor to the School of Education Graduate Student Council, 1999-2000

Betty Taylor

(USF) 2003-2004
Committee on Youth and Family
Co-Advisor, Phi Delta Kappa
Coordinator O&L Periodic Program Review
Faculty Coordinator, Administrative Services Credential Program
Grant Development: Educational Policy Web Site

(SUNY, Plattsburgh) 1999-2003
Elected member, Campus wide Strategic Planning Committee
5.12 Faculty Questionnaire

A copy of the Faculty Masters and Doctoral Questionnaires can be found in (Appendix O).

5.13 Conclusions Derived From the Faculty Survey Questionnaire

Faculty Surveys

Survey Methodology

A traditional, paper-based survey of faculty in both the Master's and Doctoral programs was conducted during the spring semester of 2004. Candidate survey instruments were reviewed and modified to meet the assessment needs of the programs. The initial survey questionnaire validation of validity and reliability was done by ETS. The follow up validation of questions added to the survey by the O&L Department was done by a faculty group external to the department. Survey instruments were sent to the current and recent faculty. Faculty members were asked to complete both forms, answering common questions only once. Responses from nine faculty members were received and analyzed using an Excel spreadsheet to produce the results shown in (Appendix P).

Demographics for Adjunct Faculty:

Four adjunct faculty members responded to the survey.

Gender: 2 women and 2 men
Ethnicity: 2 African Americans and 2 Caucasians

Master's Program

In Part I, faculty members indicated the highest degree of agreement on Question 1 (Faculty members are genuinely interested in student welfare and professional development) and 5 (Master's students support each other) with 5 out of 7 faculty (71.4%) choosing Agree Strongly. Similar to the pattern found with the student responses, faculty also indicated disagreement that the department is open to new ideas and methods (Question 6) with 2 of 7 faculty (28.6%) disagreeing and another 2 agreeing with reservations.

The responses to the items in Part II indicated the highest rating for Question 2 (Curricular and career advising) with 8 of 9 faculty (88.9%) rating this area as Excellent or Good. The lowest rated area was Question 13 (Faculty collegiality) with 4 of 7 (57.1%) faculty
rating this area as Fair or Poor. The responses to Question 2 contradict the student responses in which advising was among the lowest rated items. The advising area is one that should be targeted for further analysis and improvement.

The responses to the items in Part III Section B assigned varying degrees of importance to each listed purpose with Item c (Preparing other practitioners) receiving the highest importance rating (7 of 8 faculty (87.5%) indicated Extreme or Considerable) and Item b (Preparing teachers) receiving the lowest importance rating (3 of 8 faculty (37.5%) indicated Some importance). These patterns reflect the background and wider emphasis found in the department.

**Doctoral Program**

Responses to the items in Part I indicated the highest degree of agreement on Question 5 (Academic freedom) and II (Different curriculum for Doctoral students) with, for both items, all but one faculty member choosing Agree Strongly or Agree with Reservations. The items with the lowest rate of agreement were Question 10 (Tracking Doctoral students) and 12 (Opportunities to influence decisions). On both items, 4 faculty members chose Disagree with Reservations or Disagree Strongly. Two other items require mentioning. First, for Question 6 (Department receptive to new ideas), 3 of 8 faculty (37.5%) noted disagreement, which somewhat reflects the student findings. In Question 7 (Move to another university), 3 of 8 faculty (37.5%) indicated agreement that they would move in an appropriate offer was received. The responses to this item could predict a future challenge retaining faculty.

The items in Part II measured aspects of the academic pursuits of the department. The highest rating, with all faculty choosing Excellent or Good, was obtained on Question 5 (Relevance of courses). The lowest rating, with 6 of 8 faculty (75.0%) choosing Fair or Poor, was obtained on Question 9 (Personal relationships among faculty). Attention should be focused on improving the working relationships among faculty.

Notable among other responses is the fact that faculty indicated spending on average 69.4% of their time on teaching and advising students (Part IV Question 10a). Given the relatively low rating received for advising activities, improved advising techniques and tools may help faculty increase the effectiveness of the time they spend advising students.

Complete results of the faculty surveys for both the Doctoral and Master’s programs can be found in (Appendix P).

### 5.14 Conclusions Derived From the Adjunct Faculty Focus Group

On Saturday, February 28, 2004, the Organization and Leadership Department held a roundtable discussion with our adjunct faculty to assess what they considered to be the strengths of the program and to make suggestions for improvement.

The following were identified as strengths:
• The courses offered integrate theory and practice making them relevant to both immediate and long term needs of the students.
• The alternative format of the program coursework (weekends and online) are a program attraction.
• Diversity and ethics are recurring themes in every aspect of the program.
• There is personalization of the program and flexibility in elective requirements.
• There is a sense of community in terms of its contribution to training and enduring relationships for the students.
• A roundtable discussion should be held once a semester for the adjuncts.

The following suggestions should be considered:
• When a key faculty member vacates a position, i.e. retirement, sabbatical, etc, it is suggested a vehicle be in place to create a seamless transition, thus ensuring the continuation of a quality program.
• Involve the adjunct faculty more in department meetings, etc.
• Consider some new course offerings.
• Consider shortening the requirements for the doctorate because of the overall financial cost.

5.15 The Department Unit and Operation

The O&L department meets regularly during the semester. Department meetings are held once a month but more often if necessary. The faculty operates by consensus. An agenda is sent to faculty prior to meetings by the Department Chair and each faculty member rotates monthly, to take the minutes, to type and send them to department faculty prior to the next meeting. The department agendas and minutes can be found in the Resource Room. The Department is for the most part collegial and department business is accomplished. However some of the obstacles to enhancing faculty coordination are the competing demands of departmental, college obligation and curriculum discussions that limit the time faculty can often spend with students. Faculty members serve on School of Education and University-wide committees. The college wide and campus wide committee reports and actions are shared at the faculty meetings. The Chairperson reports to the faculty information from the School of Education Department Chairpersons Committee meeting.

The election and responsibilities of the department chair are outlined in the USF/USFFA agreement as follows: All department chairs shall remain in the bargaining unit. The department chair shall be accountable to the Dean and shall perform duties and responsibilities as set forth by the Dean. Such duties may include but not be limited to: communication with faculty; student advising, scheduling, budgeting, program development and review, recruitment, report writing, planning department functions, working with the Dean on administrative responsibilities, evaluation and review of appointment procedures, reporting to the Dean on faculty accountability for workload or for funds spent for departmental activities, curriculum and the like. The department chair shall be compensated with released time. Released time shall be from three (3) to six (6) units per semester as determined by the Dean. Should the department
chairperson not perform duties as set forth by the Dean, such released time shall be immediately withdrawn and the individual may be reassigned by the Dean. All full-time faculty, without exception, may participate in the selection of the chair. The election for chair shall be by secret ballot and by a simple majority of members who are present to vote.

The Department began “brown bag” meetings this year to inform each other of ongoing research, scholarship and professional activities, and to share information and dialogue with colleagues on topics of interest in our field (Appendix R).

6. O&L Program Resources

6.1 The Department Budget

The Department’s budget is determined by the Dean of the School of Education and is allocated annually. Operating expenses and purchases for the department are reviewed by the Chair who receives a print-out each month. Mr. Jim Brennan, Director of Budget Planning and Ms. Kim Ngay, Office Assistant, Budget and Planning, oversee the budget in the Dean’s office and approve expenditures. The budget is distributed to all members of the faculty and discussed at our monthly faculty meetings, as appropriate.Salaries and benefits for full-time and adjunct faculty are included in the SOE budget, but only the O&L operating budget is sent to the department. The department budget is supervised by the Department chair and its spending on a monthly basis. A snapshot of the O&L 2003 budget can be found in (Appendix S). Space is very limited for group functions within the School of Education, thus the department would like to review SOE facility plans for our department. The department would like to organize additional research and scholarship activities with students and engage in outreach activities with principals and superintendents and mentors who work with us in the ASC Program. In addition, the department would like to host more “friendship development” activities with alumni that could lead to fundraising development activities. The department budget is in the black annually.

The department has no student workers to provide faculty assistance but participates in the School of Education’s Graduate Ment Scholars Program. The O&L department is allocated $16,000 from the School’s $100,000 allocation (Appendix G).

6.1.1 Cost Analysis (A snapshot)

The cost analysis covers four academic semesters between Summer, 2002 and spring, 2003. A review of the O&L budget analysis reveals the Doctoral program has generated a total of 1,011 SCHs and the Master’s program a total of 466 SCHs for a total of 1,477 SCHs. The total dollars generated is $1,227,820 during this period. The program’s total operating expenses is only $468,411. Thus the program’s gross contribution margin to the SOE is $759,109 and 61.8% of the O&L revenue. Since the program receives no school-based financial aid as do other SOE Doctoral programs, the O&L program is returning to the SOE approximately .62 cents on every dollar earned.
The total SOE SCHs Doctoral programs generated 2410 SCHs of which O&L contributed 1011 SCHs or slightly less than 42% of the total Doctoral SCHs generated by SOE. However, SOE Master’s programs generated 17,226 SCHs and the O&L program only generated 466 SCHs and .03% of the Master’s program SCHs throughout the SOE. This means that the O&L program needs to generate more SCHs in its Masters program and thus generate more revenue in this area. Obviously, the O&L Doctoral program generates more SCHs for the SOE than other Doctoral programs and the additional support should be given to the program in terms of faculty lines and programmatic support to maintain academic rigor and quality.

6.2 Office Staff

Mariel Christian is the Program Assistant for the program and faculty for the O&L department and Catholic Education Leadership department. She responds to “face-to-face” student inquiries, handles correspondence and completes administrative university procedures for the department area. She reports to the department chairs of both departments. Ms. Christian refers all student calls to faculty telephone voice-mail which may prolong responses if the faculty member is not in the office that day. Ms. Christian may assist the department with general departmental duties and the department faculty with the functions outlined in her job description (Appendix T). The other department, Catholic Education Leadership also has an administrative assistant to help with office duties as well. The sharing of office support staff becomes problematic when a faculty or office project requires intensive involvement in both departments.

6.3 Facilities for the Program

The teaching facilities within the School of Education for the O&L program are adequate. The Organization and Leadership Department students, faculty and staff, have full access to the university library system. Off campus students can obtain library services by using a toll-free number. In addition, students have access to the School of Education Curriculum Resource Center. While the Resource Center offers primarily materials for the Teacher Education Department, the resources available to Organization and Leadership Department students and faculty are growing (Appendix U).

The Center for Instruction and Technology (CIT) is a resource for students and faculty. Located in the basement of the School of Education, there are open lab hours for students to browse. A library of state-of-the-art computer, software and videos is available for student use. Workshops on different computer applications are offered for students. The Center provides both a Mac, PC and Smart classrooms facilities. A more detailed description of CIT services is outlined in Section 6.4.2.
6.3.1 Teaching Facilities and Equipment

Each classroom is equipped with an overhead projector and a television/VCR. If other equipment is needed, the university maintains an Instructional Media Center. Faculty members are able to order equipment for special needs. Additionally, the center supplies videotapes that can be used to supplement our teaching.

Each faculty member is assigned a new computer every three years. This computer can be installed in the faculty member’s office or at their residence. Faculty are available through voice mail or email. Each faculty has an email address and is able to access their mail through the campus pipeline.

6.3.2 Faculty Development Funds and Teaching Resources

The university has made funds available for faculty development in the areas of scholarly travel, teaching effectiveness, and research. The O & L faculty applies regularly and is funded often. Faculty work with the Dean to individualize their programs for professional development through and Academic Career Plan process under the USFFA agreement. Other types of institutional support that enhance the work of the faculty include: financial support to order books, video tapes, and instructional need for the program; the use of materials and equipment in the Instructional Media Center; the use of the Center for Instruction and Technology for previewing videos, reviewing software, preparing materials for presentation: books, journals and computer searches in the Gleeson Library.

6.3.3 Office and Department Facilities

Each faculty member has a private office located on the second floor of the School of Education building. The department has a program assistant who has the responsibility to act as our receptionist as someone enters the offices. The facility is shared with other SOE faculty and staff.

The O & L department has a nice waiting area and a small conference area for student and faculty meetings and a working space for special projects. However, the work area space is often insufficient for faculty work projects. The bulletin boards located in the department area and in the main hallway are freshly decorated at the beginning of each semester.

6.4 Computer Hardware and Software

Organization and Leadership faculty and students are able to access computer services through the University’s Information Technology Services (ITS) and the Center for Educational Technology (CIT).
6.4.1 Information Technology Services (ITS)

The University's Information Technology Services (ITS) is located in the Harney Science Center. ITS addresses the technology needs of the University as a learning community by providing technology solutions and services to enhance the University mission and improve its services. ITS provide computer laboratory services in various campus locations. A detailed overview of its mission and services can be found in (Appendix V).

6.4.2 The Center for Instructional Services (CIT)

The Center for Instructional Services (CIT) is housed in the School of Education. The Center supports all programs and departments within the SOE as well as faculty and staff training in the area of information technologies. The CIT laboratory of one Mac and one PC classroom is open to O&L students and faculty as a teaching and learning facility. More specific information on the CIT's mission, services and budget can be found in (Appendix W).

6.5 University Library and Educational Resources

6.5.1 The Gleeson Library/Geschke Resource Center and O&L Department

Generally, the library seems adequate for a graduate program of our size. The library added about 10-12,000 books to its holdings each year from 1973-1997. The largest increases occurred in 1972/73 with 20,586 books added, and more recently with 14,425 in 1997/98; 19,834 in 1998/99; 18,916 in 1999/2000; 16,424 in 2001/02; and 11,670 in 2002/03. The present collection consists of 668,199 monograph volumes, 128,000 bound periodical volumes, 725,478 microforms, 239,921 government documents, 858 videos, and 13,069 electronic resources including databases, full-text journals, and ebooks. The library subscribes to 2,332 print journals. In the Ricci Institute for Chinese-Western Cultural History there are 80,000 Chinese language books.

The Library Report will be available in the Organization and Leadership Resources Room during the site visit. Faculty can request book purchases for the library, and the book requests are usually granted. The School of Education has a faculty library liaison who works with the library reference librarian assigned to the school to order materials. Department faculty can contact the School of Education liaison to request books, journals and other material orders. Some faculty are more conscientious than others about requesting books in their respective fields, thus some professional education fields are more represented than others. The USF library internet is a very helpful tool for both faculty and students. The Library repository of Eric documents and microfiche is very useful for graduate research. In addition, the librarians facilitate many other services including recommending books and journals for purchase, providing individual and class instruction, assisting students at the reference desk and by email, and obtaining books from other libraries through interlibrary loan.
The new "Link Plus" system allows for books that the library does not possess to arrive within a short period of time. [In addition, the library facilitates may other process such as recommending books and journal for purchase, and ordering books through interlibrary loan.] The Library has holding of about 256 education journals, of which 60 current subscriptions are directly related to the fields of organization & leadership, and administration & supervision. Some of these journals are also available online. On a questionnaire distributed to students, the respondents indicated that the current Gleeson library resources meet their needs as they pursue graduate research.

6.5.2 The Gleeson Library network environment and computer-based information technology applied in the library

The software and hardware for our integrated library system (Ignacio) http://ignacio.usfca.edu/ is provided by Innovative Interfaces and is shared with the Law Library. The following operations are provided—Acquisitions (ordering electronically and print, receiving materials, processing invoices, fund accounting), Circulation (management of checking in and out of books, renewal, holds, overdues), Reserves (management of course materials), Periodicals (management of subscriptions and claiming of issues), Interlibrary Loan (self service requests to acquire materials from other libraries), Catalog Database Maintenance (where bibliographic and item records are created and maintained to provide a foundation for all the other modules), Management reports, URL checking, remote authentication and the web based library catalogue.

Computers in the library: http://www.usfca.edu/library/computers.html. There are PC's dedicated to Ignacio (23) throughout the library and PCs and Maes dedicated to Reference databases in the Ref. Dept. (27) http://www.usfca.edu/library/refcomputers.html; however, access to all these services is available from any equipment in the building as well as the 24 hour remote access. ITS has two labs established in the library as well. There is wireless access for laptops in the Atrium and the range extends throughout the south side of the first and second floors. The library has active jacks for laptop use as well throughout the building.

The library also has a classroom equipped with 24 computers, a classroom control system which integrates projection, video, satellite teleconference reception, instructor control of all workstations and collaborative capability.

Current Database List is available here:

Additional services include a web video web based tutorial introducing the library and its resources to new students. Email reference is available, electronic III requests, requesting expedited book delivery from other college and university libraries via LinkPlus. LinkPlus provides 48 hour turnaround in delivery of patron initiated book requests for materials not owned by the library. There are currently 38 institutions participating including both academic and public libraries.
O&L students may involve themselves in the following services:

- Place themselves on a waiting list for books that are checked out using the Place Hold feature in Ignacio. Soon electronic self renewal of books will be available.

- Obtain electronic documents available online through the Reserves Module. The library intends to integrate with Blackboard, an online service, in the near future.

- Make electronic requests for instruction (group or one to one).

We are collaborating with ITS on the implementation an LDAP protocol which will allow patrons to use their USF Connect logins to access library services.

We are in the process of profiling two new products. Metafind is a meta search engine allowing simultaneous searching across library resources. WebBridge offers a smart linking capability, which enable libraries to link together information resources when appropriate. This can include content enrichment such as book-jacket images and book reviews, and fee websites related to the records the user is viewing, but can also include linking to the most appropriate copy of full-text articles or e-books.

6.6 Marketing, Recruitment, and Admissions

Beginning in fall, 2001, Jan Weiss, the Coordinator of Recruitment and Admissions, was charged by the Dean to develop, coordinate, and implement marketing plans for the graduate programs in the School of Education. This is done in collaboration with the Dean and faculty through the coordination of ads, press releases, brochures, outreach materials, and the School’s web page. In addition, Jan facilitates communication with prospective students and assists with on-campus and off-campus information meetings and recruitment fairs. The Coordinator assesses procedures to determine the effectiveness of outreach strategies to improve and encourage enrollment. The School boasts an Open House each semester to inform the general public about our graduate programs for working adults and those who are changing careers. Information Meetings are also held each semester as a recruitment tool for new students. The follow up to the recruitment activities is done by department faculty.

Students are admitted to the Organization and Leadership Department during the fall and spring semesters. The School is particularly committed to recruiting and supporting candidates who represent the diversity of San Francisco and the San Francisco Bay Area. Through a combination of direct recruitment initiatives, tuition reduction policies for credentialing program candidates, and tuition grants for students representing diverse communities, the School has substantially increased the diversity of candidates over the past four years.

Application materials are assembled and tracked in the University Admissions Office where they are held until all required materials have been submitted. Applicants with outstanding requirements are notified of each deficiency by the Admissions Office. Only
complete application packets are forwarded to the faculty for admission consideration. Admission requirements are stated on the application and in the university catalogue. The admissions office checklists and notification letter show how the office insures that all requirements have been submitted and students notified.

6.7 O&L Career Development Opportunities

The Priscilla A. Scotlan Career Services Center (CSC) provides USF students and alumni with opportunities and services to develop, evaluate and implement effective career plans. While the Center offers career counseling, job search preparation and recruitment services for all students, its focus on graduate education is designed not only for "first time job seekers", but for experienced job seekers as well. More details concerning the Center's graduate services can be found in the O&L graduate student packet, (Appendix X). Also, the Center's services to all USF students can be found in a binder in the O&L Resource Room.

Currently, the Center staff meets with faculty, conducts seminars, presents poster sessions and information at SOE Open House events, meetings and Graduate Student Association events. The staff meets with individual faculty, students and classes upon request. Also, the Center is open evening hours and selected Saturdays to meet graduate student scheduling need for services.

Recently, the staff of the Career Center met with the O&L faculty to discuss ways the Center can expand its services to our graduate student population. The recommendations from the group included adding links on the existing website related to experienced job seekers and post graduate employment in areas of interest to O&L students. As the Center begins to conceptualize and revise its website, the staff will develop extended opportunities for graduate student participation in its activities and events.

7. Operations

7.1 By Laws

The name of this division of the University of San Francisco Faculty Association (USFFA) is the School of Education Faculty Association, hereinafter called SOETA. The Association faculty members developed a set of bylaws to help in the administration of the School (Appendix Y).

7.2 Governance

The purpose of School of Education Faculty Association is to organize and administer the School of Education faculty under the terms of the Collective Bargaining
Agreement between the USFFA and the administration of the University of San Francisco. Meetings of the SOE shall take place at least once each month.

The SOE Committee of Chairs is to provide direction the activities undertaken by the faculty of the SOE and USFFA through the Policy Board representative.

The O&L Department meets on a regular basis of once each month. Other meetings are held as necessary. Department faculty members serve on school wide and university wide promotion and tenure committees, curriculum, admissions, academic policy and procedure committees. O&L faculty representatives give reports and presentation at USFFA meetings, SOE chair meetings and Department meetings.

7.3 Collective Bargaining

The University of San Francisco recognized the Association as the exclusive Collective bargaining representative of all full-time faculty members and all non-administrative full-time professional librarians in the agreement. The USFFA Collective Bargaining Agreement can be found in (Appendix Z).

7.4 Relations to Other Units

The Department Chair participates in the SOE Department Chairs Committee on a regular basis. The Committee meets monthly or as necessary. The Committee of Chairs meets with the Acting Dean to discuss SOE academic policy, school administrative and departmental issues within the boundaries of the USFFA agreement.

The Department conducts a "brown bag" seminar each semester to discuss scholarship, research and professional association activities. All department faculty and staff are invited to attend the meetings. O&L faculty work with other departments and other university schools and colleges on specific issues such as curriculum, assessment and student related issues on an ongoing basis.