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Nova University is chartered by the State of Florida and accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.
Nova University admits students of any race, color, and national or ethnic origin.
Having entered its second decade, Nova University is beginning to see the impact that its graduates are having upon the institutions within our society. Many of the University's programs are mission-oriented, designed to improve the performance of professionals, and evidence is being collected which indicates that Nova alumni are having a strong, positive effect on the institutions in which they are employed.

Independent education must continue to be responsive and adaptable to the varying needs of potential students if it is to represent a true alternative to the tax-supported sector. Nova University is committed to maintaining quality at the same time it is meeting these needs.

Abraham S. Fischler
President

The growth of Nova University as a dynamic, mission-oriented educational institution has been coupled with an intensive search for strategies designed to make each of its courses of study maximally responsive to individual human needs. Hence, Nova University continues to press forward in seeking solutions to major societal problems while offering to its students many opportunities for intellectual challenge, professional preparedness and personal awareness.

Alexander Schure
Chancellor
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Founded in 1964, Nova University is an independent university which is non-sectarian, non-profit and racially non-discriminatory.

Unusual among institutions of higher education, Nova is a university for all ages. Nova College provides undergraduate education. Numerous graduate programs in a variety of fields provide master's, doctoral, and post-doctoral education. Also, non-degree, continuing education programs are offered. The University School, a demonstration school, serves children from pre-school through seniors in high school.

Since its beginning, the university has been distinguished by its innovative outlook, its unique programs which provide non-traditional choices in educational programs, and its important research which is aimed at solutions to problems of immediate concern to mankind.

In 1970, Nova University joined in an educational consortium with the New York Institute of Technology, an independent, non-profit institution with campuses in Manhattan and Old Westbury, Suffolk County, Long Island. This mutually beneficial relationship permits each institution to draw on the personal and physical resources of the other, giving maximal benefit to the students of each and to society in general.

With students studying in Florida and in 20 states, Nova University is a university of national scope.

Accreditation Nova University is accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

Campus and Off-campus Locations The Nova University main campus is located on a 200-acre site west of Fort Lauderdale at 3301 College Avenue in the town of Davie, Florida. It is 10 miles inland from the Atlantic Ocean and is easily accessible from major U.S. and state highways, including I-95 and Florida’s turnpike.

The Center for the Study of Law is located at 3100 S.W. 9th Avenue in Fort Lauderdale, just north of the Fort Lauderdale-Hollywood International Airport.

Nova University at Coral Springs is located at 3501 University Drive. Degree programs, non-credit courses, and cultural events that serve the residents in north Broward County and in Palm Beach County are held in Coral Springs.

The Oceanographic Center is located on the south side of the marine entrance to Port Everglades at 8000 North Ocean Drive, Dania, Florida.

Many Nova University students attend classes on the main campus, at the Law Center or at Coral Springs. But consistent with its educational mission to provide educational opportunities to adult students wherever they may be, Nova offers degree programs and continuing education experiences at off-campus centers locally, throughout Florida, across the United States, and in foreign countries.

With the New York Institute of Technology, Nova University maintains an office in Washington, D.C. It is located at 1511 K St., N.W. Suite 624.
Purpose and Overview of the Program  

Our goal is to improve the nation's schools. The means to the goal is to improve the leadership skills of school administrators through an innovative doctoral program consisting of study, assessment, and action.

In designing a program to meet the needs of school administrators, Nova was guided by several overall considerations. First of all, it was Nova's intention to develop leadership skills that would be applied immediately to the solution of real problems in the schools. A major objective was to create a program for the exploration of new approaches to the improvement of elementary and secondary schools through a focus on real-life situations and school problems.

While the goals of the Nova program are similar to those of some "traditional" programs, the methods developed to attain them are different. Traditional programs take their students out of the very school setting they seek to improve. That has been one of the underlying reasons for the irrelevance of most university programs to the urgent question of educational leadership. Nova decided not to go along with the usual practice of isolating students from real-life situations. Nova brings the resources of the campus to the student. This permits participants to formulate a pattern of study and pursue their degrees at a pace harmonious with their job responsibilities. It also brings national resources to the local community in a way no local program can.

The basic design of the program permits participants to work alone and with colleagues organized into local clusters. Outstanding scholars and practitioners drawn from universities and educational systems all over the country provide a national point of view through systematic interaction with participants, colleagues, and lecturers from other areas and backgrounds. Annual summer meetings called Education USA bring participants together for exchanges with one another, Nova staff, academicians from other disciplines, and leaders in the political world. There is no experience in graduate education equivalent to the Summer Institute.

School leadership requires a broad knowledge of social, political, and economic forces at work in the society. Too narrow concentration on mechanical or logistical problems tends to perpetuate parochialism and failure of leadership. A program has therefore been fashioned that brings expertise and breadth of learning to participants. The behavioral sciences and related disciplines have been integrated and focused on the roles of administrators in the school system. Practicum projects focusing on actual problems within the sphere of influence of the individual participant
are also an innovative and essential part of the program. The school systems in which Nova participants are administrators constitute a national laboratory in which practicum projects are explored, tested, implemented, and evaluated.

Leadership is a central focus of the program. To address this concept in a meaningful way the program has invested heavily in the development of a procedure for evaluating the leadership attributes of participants. The Educational Leadership Appraisal (ELA)™ system has been especially developed by Educational Research Corporation of Watertown, Massachusetts, to provide such an analytical tool. This appraisal system has proven to be without built-in bias on any known dimension — age, sex, ethnicity, or culture. After some pilot tests with several clusters, it is now incorporated as a central element of the Appraising Leadership in Education study area. In addition to providing diagnostic information for individual participants, ELA holds promise for influencing leader behavior, adding to the base of information on educational leadership, and formulating programs for school administrators.

Program Recognition  In 1981, the American Association of School Administrators introduced a competition open to all university programs seeking to prepare school administrators. Criteria for determining which program to identify as “outstanding” were (1) the degree to which the education of school children could be shown to be improved through the work of graduates of the program; (2) the degree to which the philosophy of the program was carried out through the actual goals and procedures of the program; (3) the demonstrated impact of the program in improving the performance of administrators in the field; and (4) the place of social science knowledge in shaping the learning experience of graduate students. Universities competing for the award were evaluated by a panel of administrators and professors on the basis of a written report and documentation and, also, on the basis of a presentation at AASA’s annual convention.

The National Ed.D. Program for Educational Leaders entered this competition in 1982 and was rewarded by being selected as recipient of the “AASA Outstanding School Administrator Preparation Program Award” for that year.
Participants and the Cluster Concept

PARTICIPANTS — Since 1972 the term “participant” has been used to refer to administrators admitted to the National Ed.D. Program for Educational Leaders. The term was chosen to demonstrate our aspirations; it has been continued because it reflects the spirit of cooperative learning characterizing the program and is descriptive of the relationship of “students” to the program. As is noted elsewhere, participants are typically in their 40’s and have responsible positions in education. They expect, and are encouraged to expect, to participate fully in all dimensions of their graduate experience: educational, social and political, historical and developmental.

LOCAL CLUSTERS — The local cluster is a key organizational and educational component of the program. Physically, a cluster is the cohort of about 25 administrators, living and working in proximity to one another, who enroll in the program at a given time. Educationally, the cluster is a cohort of administrators organized to share their professional expertise, to provide social support and encouragement, and to further relationships that will facilitate their efforts to improve schools long after they have graduated.

The local cluster meets formally with the National Lecturer as scheduled and with program staff and local resource people as arranged over the three years of the program. With the budget provided, the local cluster provides an identity in the area and a reference point for participants, and others. To facilitate the pedagogical and social goals related to cluster concept, admission is closed once the cluster begins.

CLUSTER COORDINATORS — Every cluster is under the direction of a coordinator who provides overall direction and, especially at the outset, forceful leadership to the cluster. The coordinator serves many roles: ombudsman for participants, liaison with the program staff and National Lecturers, identifier of local resources, stimulator of cluster activities, and, generally, executive secretary of the cluster.

Since leadership cannot be developed without the experience of responsibility through decision-making, Nova regards participant control of cluster activities as an important goal. The coordinator serves as an expeditor and motivator of participants. But he or she continually attempts to shift the responsibility for expediting and organizing cluster activities to the participants. As it becomes feasible, for example, he or she turns over responsibility to participants for the budget, direction of the study program, self-evaluation, and program evaluation.
## Operating Clusters and Coordinators*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLUSTER</th>
<th>START DATE</th>
<th>CLUSTER COORDINATOR</th>
<th>CONTACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Callahan, Florida</td>
<td>October 25, 1980</td>
<td>Julian Williams—Asst. Superintendent. P.O. Box 959, Douglas, GA</td>
<td>P.O. Box 959, Douglas, GA (912) 384-2086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston, South Carolina</td>
<td>October 25, 1980</td>
<td>Charles Hirshey, Citadel University, Charleston, South Carolina</td>
<td>21 Charing Cross Road, Charleston, SC (803) 556-5204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus, North Carolina</td>
<td>October 24, 1981</td>
<td>Floyd Wright—Aynor Conway Career Center, Conway, South Carolina</td>
<td>Route 8, Box 343, Conway, SC 29526. (803) 248-2206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dade/Broward, Florida</td>
<td>April 12, 1980</td>
<td>Bert M. Kleiman—Director of Secondary Schools, Dade County, Florida.</td>
<td>P.O. Box 35326, Miami, FL 33157. (305) 642-7555.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayetteville, North Carolina</td>
<td>October 23, 1982</td>
<td>Charles Davis—Director of Federal Programs, Fayetteville City Schools,</td>
<td>P.O. Box 35326, Fayetteville, NC 28303 (919) 868-1846</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Operating Clusters and Coordinators*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Person(s)</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ft. Myers, Florida</td>
<td>November 6, 1982</td>
<td>Carrie Robinson—Principal</td>
<td>3066 Apache Street, Ft. Myers, FL 33901</td>
<td>(813) 995-0151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bayshore Elementary, Ft. Myers, Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville, Florida III</td>
<td>April 10, 1982</td>
<td>Cecil Allison—Principal, Stillwell Jr. High</td>
<td>7840 Burma Road, Jacksonville, FL 32205</td>
<td>(904) 781-3776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>School, Jacksonville, Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dependents Schools Atlantic, London, England</td>
<td>01-44-1-262-3694</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles, California III</td>
<td>October 24, 1981</td>
<td>Thomas Fiello—Principal, West Vernon Elementary School, Los Angeles, California</td>
<td>13514 Oceangate Ave, Los Angeles, CA 90250</td>
<td>(213) 232-4218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland II</td>
<td>June 23, 1979</td>
<td>Eugene M. Karol—Superintendent</td>
<td>P.O. Box 627, Prince Frederick, MD 20678</td>
<td>(301) 535-1700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Calvert County Public Schools, Prince Frederick, Maryland.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Central Bucks High School East, Buckingham, Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix, Arizona</td>
<td>October 27, 1979</td>
<td>Marion Donaldson—Education Consultant</td>
<td>7665 Montecito Avenue, Scottsdale, AZ 85251</td>
<td>(602) 945-2441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scottsdale, Arizona.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phoenix II Arizona April 30, 1981 Mary Cook—Reading Specialist, Paradise 7145 North 7 Ave., Valley School Dist., Phoenix, Arizona Phoenix, AZ 85201 (602) 867-1702

Potomac, D.C. February 6, 1982 Marilyn Brown—Asst. Supt., Division of Student Services, D.C. Public Schools, 201 Whittier St., NW Washington, D.C. 20012 (202) 829-2706

Robeson, North Carolina April 1, 1981 Alvin R. Hooks—Professor of School Administration, Winthrop College, 7 Hamilton Wood Court Riverhill, Lake Wylie, SC 29710 (803) 323-2151

San Antonio, Texas I April 4, 1981 Dwain Estes—Executive Director Educational Service Center, Region 20, 1314 Hines Street, San Antonio, TX 78208, (512) 271-7611.

San Antonio, Texas II February 26, 1983 Dwain Estes—Executive Director Educational Service Center, Region 20, San Antonio, Texas 1314 Hines Street, San Antonio, TX 78208 (512) 271-7611

San Francisco Bay Area, California November 20, 1982 Don Johnson—Superintendent of Schools, Sausalito, California 1360 Butterfield Road San Anselmo, CA 94960 (415) 332-3190

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City, State, Zip</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Florida</td>
<td>October 23, 1982</td>
<td>Bert M. Kleiman</td>
<td>Director of Secondary Schools, Dade County</td>
<td>14321 S.W. 77th Avenue, Miami, FL 33157</td>
<td></td>
<td>(305) 642-7555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Park II Pennsylvania</td>
<td>April 11, 1981</td>
<td>Robert S. Piatt</td>
<td>Director of Elementary Education</td>
<td>1713 Port Vue Avenue, McKeesport, PA 15133</td>
<td></td>
<td>(412) 672-4688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamsport II</td>
<td>April 25, 1981</td>
<td>Harry I Sharp, Jr.</td>
<td>Superintendent, Ridgway Area Schools</td>
<td>P.O. Box 590, Ridgway, PA 15853</td>
<td></td>
<td>(814) 772-4488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmington, Delaware II</td>
<td>October 24, 1981</td>
<td>J. Howard Hunt</td>
<td>Superintendent, Upper Upper Pittsgrove</td>
<td>Upper Upper Pittsgrove Township, Monroeville, New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
<td>(609) 358-8163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*As of July 1983*
Study Areas The need for school administrators to have a broad understanding of the complex problems faced by schools and society was critical to the selection of the specific substantive study areas required by the Nova Ed.D. Program. The eight required substantive study areas were also chosen in order to provide school administrators with sufficient information and conceptual resources to improve school systems and individual schools. Consequently, it is stressed that this element of the instructional program may not be appropriate for all persons seeking graduate preparation. Those, for example, who are interested in careers as basic researchers or specialists in educational technology will find that other graduate programs are more appropriate to their needs.

The eight substantive study areas deemed necessary to the professional development of school administrators are: Appraising Leadership in Education, Curriculum Development, Education Policy Systems, Evaluation, Finance, Management and Supervision, Research for Improving Schools, and Resource Management: Utilizing Resources for Improving Education. Each study area was conceived to present a perspective rooted in traditional disciplines and to provide breadth and interdisciplinary understanding. Within the eight substantive areas, many related topics are explored. Among them are school law, teachers' and students' rights, statistics, research, criticisms of educational systems, and proposals for school reform. Each substantive area is considered from the local, state, and national points of view, and each is sufficiently flexible to accommodate special objectives of individual participants. Clusters are also encouraged to respond to critical issues in their own localities and to bring local authorities into the discussion.

National Lecturers with rich backgrounds of academic achievement and practical experience are responsible for providing formal instruction. Working in concert with the Nova Director of Instruction the Senior National Lecturer in each subject area designs his or her own program of study, selects and monitors the performances of Associate Lecturers, and
evaluates participants. Each study area includes three months of formal instruction. Formal instruction is conducted in day-long, intensive seminars under the general direction of the Senior National Lecturer who conducts the first seminar in a given study area on a Saturday, after which his or her associates conduct subsequent seminars. A month of independent study and cluster and sub-cluster work precede and intervene between the appearances of lecturers at a cluster. Such activities often go on for a month after the appearance of the last lecturer in a study area.

Presentations are designed to offer a historical perspective and a critique of the theoretical literature as well as current developments in a field. While the lectures include such substantive information, the emphasis is on development of perspectives and insights that help both the participant and the cluster to proceed on their own. Exploration of value questions is vital to all discussions. The study areas impose no dogmas on participants, but lecturers are explicit about their own value positions. The lecturers require participants to think through, articulate, and defend their own value positions on crucial questions.

Participants are evaluated on the basis of examinations, projects or papers, and must pass in all eight study areas. If a participant does not succeed in satisfying lecturer requirements on the first attempt, additional opportunities to earn a passing grade are provided under direction of the Senior National Lecturer.

**ALTERNATIVE EVALUATION PROCEDURE** — Once two attempts to satisfy study area requirements have been unsuccessful, the participant is entitled to try to succeed through performance of an Alternative Evaluation Procedure (AEP). However, this option is available for no more than two of the eight study areas. Once an AEP has been used for two study areas, the procedure is no longer available.

Participants wishing to take advantage of this procedure must propose to the Director of Instruction, in writing, an activity by which they may demonstrate their competency within a given study area. The proposal outline, generally one or two pages in length, must specify what is to be done and within what time period. It must provide a rationale for the activity as a reasonable means of demonstrating competency within the study area.

The outline serves as a basis for developing an understanding between the Director of Instruction and the participant. This understanding takes the form of a formal proposal. Once it has been approved, in writing, the participant may proceed.

When the AEP has been completed, it is submitted to an outside evaluator selected by the Director of Instruction; the lecturers for the relevant study area are not utilized for this purpose. Thus, a totally independent judgment is made as to the participant’s competency in the area. The judgment made by the outside evaluator is reviewed by the Director of Instruction, who makes the final decision.
APPRAISING LEADERSHIP IN EDUCATION

ALLAN B. ELLIS
Senior National Lecturer

General Description. While every facet of the National Ed. D. Program for Educational Leaders is concerned with educational leadership, the particular focus of this study area is on procedures for the observation and depiction of leadership behavior in terms of its principal dimensions. The purposes here are to encourage among the participants the habit of monitoring their own leadership behavior and to assist them in the formulation of personal strategies for their continued development as leaders. To achieve these ends, this study area focuses on three areas: the systematic observation and categorization of leadership behavior; the application of this process by each participant to a detailed self-assessment; the study of the nature of leadership as portrayed by selected leaders within and outside the domain of education.

Instructional Methods and Materials. The primary mechanism for accomplishing this highly personal self-examination by each participant of his or her own leadership proclivities is a system called Educational Leadership Appraisal (ELA)<sup>TM</sup>. ELA is a system consisting of a set of leadership dimensions, a comprehensive collection of problems, exercises, situations, simulations, and the like based on these dimensions, and a carefully established procedure for observing and rating leadership performance on these dimensions. Prior to meetings with the National Lecturers, each participant will perform various ELA exercises. Then a major portion of each cluster session will be devoted to a detailed review and examination of each ELA exercise to the end that each participant will become proficient in relating specific behavior to specific leadership dimensions, thereby developing the skills necessary to performing a rich self-appraisal.

Discussions, readings, analyses of transcribed interviews with selected national leaders, laboratory-like training sessions, and small group projects are the other activities in which the lecturers and the participants will engage.

Evaluation Process. The National Lecturers of this study area will not evaluate or judge the leadership strengths and weaknesses of the participants. That is the responsibility of the participants themselves. Rather, evaluation will center on the participant's ability to observe and support judgments of the leadership behavior of others; the scope and detail of the self-appraisal; the quality of proposed strategies for personal development; and the depth of analysis of readings and transcriptions.

Associate Lecturers: Andrea M. Goldman; Richard Willard.

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

LOUIS J. RUBIN
Senior National Lecturer

General Description. The study of curriculum is designed to familiarize participants with the various principles, generalizations, and issues related to instructional content. Emphasis is placed on alternative philosophies of educational purpose, differing teaching methodologies, and various approaches to organizing instruction. In addition to a general review of basic learning theory, the participant has an opportunity to develop a fundamental understanding of the relationship between societal and educational change, the processes by which educational change takes place, and the ways in which attitudes, beliefs, and values of teachers influence the curriculum. Affective and humanistic education, computer-assisted instruction, educational accountability, early childhood education, and other movements in the forefront of education are covered. Similarly, issues relating to the architecture of the reform itself are examined. As these issues are treated, considerable effort is made to relate theory to practice so that the underlying ideas take on functional utility. Finally, the interactions of the curriculum and the school's responsibility for socialization are analyzed. The society is in flux. New values are replacing old ones. Different life styles are evolving. Wise men and women disagree as to what knowledge is most worthwhile. As a consequence of these conditions, curricular decisions are invariably controversial. The essence of these controversies constitutes the heart of the student's study.

Instructional Methods and Materials. Because of the importance of teachers' roles in interpreting curriculum, the study materials review the relationship between teacher in-service education and curriculum modification. Working with the study guide and representative texts and articles from the professional literature, the participant gains an exposure to the major
issues underlying current curriculum revision. What are the relative advantages of peer-group teaching and paraprofessional aides? What are the major advantages and disadvantages of behavior modification techniques? To what extent should behavior objectives characterize curriculum planning? These and other questions are pondered in both a theoretical and pragmatic context. During the work sessions with National Lecturers, time is divided between formal presentations and teacher-participant interaction.

EVALUATION PROCESS. Evaluation tools include several informal devices and a final examination. In preparing for this examination, participants are encouraged to work with one another to take advantage of resources inherent in the cluster.

ASSOCIATE LECTURERS: Elliot W. Eisner; James B. MacDonald.

EDUCATION POLICY SYSTEMS

LAURENCE IANNACONE
Senior National Lecturer

GENERAL DESCRIPTION. The political dimensions of the school administrator's job have always been important. At this time in our history, as education becomes more decentralized and struggling interest groups become more organized to compete for limited public funds, an understanding of the basic political processes becomes a crucial aspect of educational leadership. This study area analyzes the political aspects of education as a political phenomenon. It seeks to give participants analytic skills necessary for effective functioning in various policy systems of the educational enterprise. This is based on the pedagogical assumption that education is a valued commodity in the society and that decisions regarding education are made through processes about which political scientists know a good deal. Participants are introduced to the literature of political science and encouraged to develop skill in borrowing concepts and analytic frameworks, especially as they apply to the role of the school administrator. Concepts such as political symbolism, access and influence, as well as American federalism, are brought to bear on policy formulation and the implementation process in education. Educational policy systems at all levels of government are analyzed with special attention to micro-political systems of education. Leadership roles within the general arena of education politics are also discussed.

INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS AND MATERIALS. National Lecturers develop their presentations around phenomena characterizing specific education policy systems. Each system selected is designed to illustrate and clarify the application of basic concepts to the task of problem analysis and strategy development. Clusters are encouraged to bring representatives of various public policy systems into their discussions in panels, seminars, and dinners. Many clusters find the study area provides excellent opportunities for them to meet Congressmen, school board members, lobbyists, legislative staff members, and state legislators in off-the-record settings.

EVALUATION PROCESS. The standard evaluation of participants' competency is based on (1) a two-part examination requiring demonstration of substantive knowledge, and (2) preparation of a paper that requires participants to identify and describe a real problem, analyze the political systems involved, and create a sound intervention strategy based on the analysis. It is also possible for participants to contract for alternative evaluation projects of particular pertinence to them. These projects can be kept confidential if the participant so desires.

ASSOCIATE LECTURERS: Louis Masotti; Frederick M. Wirt.

EVALUATION

MICHAEL SCRIVEN
Senior National Lecturer

GENERAL DESCRIPTION. This study area seeks to increase the participant's knowledge of the tools and procedures of educational evaluation and to persuade him or her to make greater use of them. One of the school administrator's major responsibilities is to evaluate and to cause others to evaluate. Evaluation is the control mechanism of education. The presupposition of the study area is that every significant decision of an administrator is based on evaluation and that
almost every decision would be improved if it were based on better evaluation. For purposes of the study area, the administrator has been conceived of as a consumer of evaluative information. In other words, the skills needed are those of a user of evaluation, a customer of evaluators, rather than those of a specialist evaluator.

To provide the skills necessary for a consumer of evaluation, the study area covers a wide range of questions. Needs assessment, for example, is an important part of evaluation. Also important are various organization skills, including the ability to create and monitor ongoing evaluation programs. Interpersonal skills are needed in working with consultants, students, and faculty. It is also necessary to deal with such diverse elements of the education enterprise as curriculum, federal projects, and institutions.

Instructional Methods and Materials. The study guide, readings, and presentations of National Lecturers focus on understanding and skill development necessary for educational leaders. The study guide provides many illustrations, pretests, and sample questions to direct the participants' reading and to encourage self-monitoring. In order to direct study and assist the lecturers in working with each cluster, prepared exercises are required in advance of each lecture. Examples used for discussion and examination are taken largely from a pool to which participants contribute. One of the seminars is a true workshop concerned principally with working examples and skill development on the theory that the doctor should try out his own medicine. All seminars are aimed at providing a good grasp of the basic language, concepts, and techniques in the field rather than highly technical methodology. Approximately one-third of the study area is devoted to the quantitative aspects of developing skills in understanding, interpreting, and acting on evaluative information.

Evaluation Process. Judgments about the merits of participants' performance in this area are gained by means of a two-part evaluation. The first part is a take-home project in designing an evaluation. The second is a comprehensive examination requiring demonstration of an integrated understanding of the concepts and issues of evaluation.

Associate Lecturers: Richard M. Jaeger; Alexander Law; Nick Smith.

FINANCE

JAMES W. GUTHRIE
Senior National Lecturer

General Description. This study area might more accurately be described as the economics of education. It covers such traditional concerns as sources of revenue, taxation policy, and minimum foundation programs. But the introduction of new forces into the school finance arena has demanded an approach that goes far beyond traditional concerns: the design of this study area takes advantage of the turmoil in the field. The overall purpose is to enable school administrators to understand the state and federal government arrangements from which local schools draw resources. Beyond that, an effort is made to acquaint administrators with contemporary school finance issues so that they can communicate more effectively with the public and with state and federal-level policymakers with whom they would like to exert influence. Analytic tools and substantive information are drawn from economics and constitutional law. An exploration of the historical role of states, localities, and the federal government in providing and distributing revenues for schools is an essential element. The study area analyzes, intensely, the school finance arrangements of particular states of special interest to the cluster in question. Time and reading are devoted to consideration of such topics as the returns to society from investment in schooling, the relationship between cost and educational quality, equal protection suits, and the relationship of school finance to overall public finance problems such as tax policy. School finance reform proposals are also discussed — among them, “Full State Assumption” and “District Power Equalizing.”

Instructional Methods and Materials. In dealing with this volatile subject, a blanketing approach is used. In addition to presentations from three National Lecturers, participants are provided with a series of readings in economics and finance and a study guide consisting of both written materials and audio tapes. A set of ten audio cassettes presents the views of various authorities on current topics. Together these materials provide a variety of perspectives on rapidly changing situations and clarifications of central economic concepts. They are augmented by local consultants recruited by the local cluster.
Evaluation Process. A competency examination given at the end of the three-month module constitutes the primary mode of evaluation. Participants are also required to demonstrate in other ways sophistication in communicating with both lay public and finance experts about the effectiveness of present fiscal systems and trade-offs involved in various reform proposals.

Associate Lecturers: John M. Gemello; Robert Singleton.

MANAGEMENT AND SUPERVISION

HARVEY SCRIBNER
Senior National Lecturer

General Description. This study area emphasizes development and analysis of administrative and supervisory skills and behavior. The terms "management" and "supervision" are used in preference to "administration" because they focus on the responsibility of school administrators to direct school resources to the improvement of children's education and because the National Lecturers focus on the role of the school leader within a societal context. They do not consider such questions as time management or cardinal administrative principles. They do discuss general concepts derived from organizational theory, personnel management, and decision theory within a framework of organizational leadership. They also devote attention to examining intrinsic rewards associated with teaching, group processes, interpersonal relations, understanding personalities, and learning theories by which human maturation stems from self actualization. Decision-making skills such as planning technology, and information systems form one focus of the study area which is developed in accordance with the special concerns of each cluster. Mobilizing resources and support are given thorough consideration, including such aspects as relationships with school boards, risk taking, change and resistance to change, and communication with a variety of publics. Administrative skills form a third focus of the study area. Delegation, personnel management and staff development are discussed under this heading. The National Lecturers assist participants in gaining a perspective on the functions of management and supervision, the variety of theoretical and pragmatic approaches, and possible futures for supervisors and managers in education. Three contemporary issues of management and supervision are discussed: (1) organizational constraints and innovative strategies; (2) supervision and personnel management; and (3) budgeting and control systems. Clusters are encouraged to involve local resource people in specific concerns such as parent participation and mandated accountability programs.

Instructional Methods and Materials. The National Lecturers are experienced school administrators who have demonstrated that they can mobilize research and stimulate change in educational systems. They raise questions about alternative leadership roles available to participants by discussing large management and supervisory issues such as decentralization, planning and budgeting systems, citizens' councils, and collective bargaining. Selecting from a broad range of management and supervision topics, each participant signs on to master units representing certain skills. By requiring each participant to declare self-expectations and by requiring each cluster to make decisions about the contributions of the National Lecturers, the Management and Supervision study area makes explicit the joint responsibility of participant, cluster and lecturer in the Nova Ed.D. program of instruction.

Evaluation Process. Participants are required to demonstrate ability to provide sophisticated analyses of actual management and supervisory decisions in which they have been instrumentally involved.

Associate Lecturer: Gordon L. McAndrew; Ulysses Van Spiva.

RESEARCH FOR IMPROVING THE SCHOOLS

GERALD E. SROUFE
Senior National Lecturer

General Description. Among those responsible for the success of the American education enterprise exist two groups of dedicated and competent professionals: school administrators and school researchers. They appear to have similar concerns, often focusing on the same problem at the same time. However, they do not
work cooperatively on resolving problems; for the most part, they ignore one another.

There are multiple reasons why research has so little impact on education: some are definitional; some are methodological; some are political. However, the principal reason is the absence of a viable linkage system among researchers and administrators. The central objective of this area of study is to foster perceptions, skills, and behaviors that will make school administrators active partners in the effort to improve the schools through research.

Development of an administrator-researcher partnership requires, at least, that administrators understand the research establishment, and become familiar with principal values and symbols of researchers. It requires, also, that they develop skills necessary to become active consumers of research, such as ability to criticize existing research in terms of problem definition, methodology, reporting and appropriateness. Finally, becoming an active partner requires overt steps to develop an on-going relationship with the research community, to develop skill at defining problems and identifying necessary research information, and development of a role definition which incorporates such a partnership.

**Instructional Methods and Materials.** While a good deal of reading and reflection is required, involving a fugitive literature as well as standard texts, the study area is designed around activities. Many of the activities are designed to be accomplished by small groups of participants over the duration of the study period.

Assignments are designed and sequenced to require that the topics of Research for Improving Schools, and questions related to this general topic, be in the forefront of the thoughts of the participants as they pursue their daily administrative activities.

The study area is atypical in that instruction is provided entirely by Nova staff (not counting individuals involved by the cluster as local resources). This staffing pattern is designed, in part, to serve system needs such as increased interaction among participants and central staff, and facilitating problem identification and information access, two skills related to the practicum process.

**Evaluation Process.** Opportunities are provided for participants to demonstrate skills in criticizing research, in gaining access to research studies, and in understanding research relevant symbols and techniques. Also, participants will be expected to demonstrate ability to formulate problems and to articulate dimensions of an administrator-researcher partnership. Participants will be expected, also, to demonstrate development of active engagement with researchers and research associations. Evaluation is based on a composite score for performance across a variety of activities, including some tests, rather than a single examination.

**Associate Lecturers:** David S. Flight; James A. Johnson.

**RESOURCE MANAGEMENT: UTILIZING RESOURCES FOR IMPROVING EDUCATION**

**MARIO D. FANTINI**
Senior National Lecturer

**General Description.** Traditionally, resources for educating children have been narrowly conceived. There have been exceptions, but managing educational resources has been defined exclusively as utilizing public funds in classrooms and schools. Allocation of existing resources within this narrow framework remains a major task of school administrators. But educational leadership today requires specific attention to developing broader concepts of resource management aimed at improving the effectiveness of student learning. This study area asks participants to rethink the role of public schools within a comprehensive framework in which education is seen as an integral part of an overall community human service system with a focus on providing resources necessary for children and youth to learn. For purposes of this study area, the school is viewed as one part of a comprehensive system of education within the community. Educational leadership as a catalytic agent for mobilizing resources within and without the school on behalf of learners is examined. Administrators have considerable opportunity to exercise leadership roles in identifying and integrating resources of the school and community for improved learning. This study area explores contemporary concepts such as optional learning environments, vouchers, alternative schools, community education, volunteerism, human services, and schools without walls, together with issues and procedures in resource development and application. Special attention is given to the educational, economic, political, and legal implications. Assumptions about the one-role view of school administrators are analyzed and alternative perspectives are considered. The National Lecturers promote an awareness of
the range of human and material resources available and indicate how they can be used and evaluated. Major plans aimed at linking resources to the educational needs of students are studied. Alternative leadership roles are also considered within a range of possible professional roles to help participants develop their personal administrative styles as resource managers.

**Instructional Methods and Materials.** The bulk of the assigned readings explores operating systems of resources that appear to hold promise and systems still in the design stage. Resources in local school systems are explored through cluster activities. Participants themselves design plans focusing on new dimensions of resource utilization aimed at improving education in specific settings. Such plans may involve new conceptualization of potential resources, the working of linkages between schools and other public and private agencies, and attention to new sources of financial support. Proposals affecting educational directions and resource utilization are assessed. Individual and group activities are used as well as media presentations.

**Evaluation Process.** Participants are expected to demonstrate competency in resource management, including instructional relationships between the schools and agencies in their communities, to reflect critically on their effectiveness in accomplishing this task, and to relate the implications to public policy issues at the national level. They demonstrate such competency by identifying the range of resources available in their schools and communities, developing and implementing "mini-delivery systems" by advising policy makers on the strengths and weaknesses of proposed plans and by analyzing their own stances as resource managers and leaders.

**Associate Lecturers:** Allen Calvin; Audrey Ross.

---

**Practicums** A series of practicum projects parallels the sequence of Study Areas as a basic component of the Ed.D. Program for Educational Leaders involving participants throughout their three years of doctoral work. Practicums are problem-solving interventions within the work settings of the participant/administrators who must plan, execute, and evaluate them. These projects must be designed to result in documented educational improvements within the school systems where
they are conducted, whether those systems are defined as classrooms, building units, or entire districts. They must also be planned to result in demonstrated competence on the part of the Nova participants in executing the essential and complex tasks demanded within the structure of the practicum process.

A systematic needs analysis marks the initiation of practicum planning activity. As the definition and dimensions of the problem become clear, a thorough review of research literature is begun and continues throughout the life of the project as reference is made to scholarly works on substantive aspects of the problem as well as on methodological issues bearing on such matters as solution formulations and outcome assessments.

After the basic framework of the project has been delineated in consultations with practicum faculty advisers at Nova, participants prepare a formal, written proposal including detailed sections on problem definition and analysis, anticipated outcomes of intervention activity, the conceptualized solution strategy, the implementation design, and the evaluation system to be used. Upon receiving faculty approval of their proposed projects, participants then put their plans to the test as they embark on the action component of their work. Such action may span nine months to a year or more during which time the project managers must monitor activity flow, adjust plans to accommodate unanticipated events, and remain in periodic contact with University personnel. Following the conclusion of practicum activity and evaluation of outcomes, participants prepare reports of their accomplishments from the formulation of plans to the analysis of results. These documents are addressed to practitioners, must be scholarly in presentation, and are selectively available through the Educational Resources Information Center or the School Practices Information File.

INSTRUCTIONAL PROCESS AND MATERIALS — As they enter the doctoral program, participants receive text materials on the practicum process and departmental expectations. Instructional sessions with full-
cluster groups during the first few weeks following cluster formation are followed by subcluster meetings at which Nova faculty engage groups of three to five participants in discussion of practicums by speaker phone. These interchanges are intended to clarify basic concepts in the specified problem-solving design and to assist participants in applying the elaborated planning procedures to possible initial projects. As may be necessary to achieve mastery, participants may be involved in more than one discussion of the basic planning process. Then individual telephone conferences are conducted to hammer out acceptable plans for each participant’s actual Introductory Practicum project. When this has been achieved, sometimes after several such conferences and the exchange of informal written material, participants prepare written proposals which they submit for formal evaluation as the final step prior to taking the planned action.

Materials of instruction utilized throughout the practicum program component start with the Practicums Manual, a set of descriptive and explanatory publications, and related samples of actual practicum proposals and final report elements. Video and audio tapes are used by participants to supplement the written and spoken communications exchanged during the orientation experience. All telephone conferences are routinely tape recorded, with the knowledge of all involved, and cassettes are mailed to participants for study and review. Exercises in the critical analysis of representative practicum documents and the preparation of proposal parts are assigned within the progression of instructional events. Such activities are also used at the Practicum Workshop associated with the annual Summer Institute—Education U.S.A. and at other times as a secondary agenda when practicum faculty may meet with participants at national conventions and cluster meetings for Study Areas. Materials used in most of the Study Areas are directly applicable to practicum work. Text and exercises in the Appraising Leadership in Education area are particularly relevant to practicum planning. The Evaluation and Research Study areas also contribute importantly to understandings crucial to successful practicum execution.

Participants are expected to complete the Introductory Practicum during the first year of program activity. Following demonstration of a verified educational improvement (plus mastery of the process) in this first significant problem-solving effort, they are then encouraged to join with one or two others in their clusters with similar interests and concerns for the organizing of a Group Practicum extending through the second program year. The third and final practicum is usually a year-long individual project reflecting sophisticated application of the requisite techniques and understandings. While this sequence of work is typical, alternative patterns are quite acceptable. For example, the period after completion of the Introductory Practicum may be devoted to an ambitious two-year, individual undertaking or two one-year projects, depending on problematic conditions facing participants at particular times and places.
The Summer Institute  The final element in the instructional program, Education USA (the Summer Institute), is a way of providing a national perspective for participants — one of the major goals of the program.

Summer Institutes are held for eight days each summer and provide a national forum for the program. Daily meetings, discussions, and presentations provide opportunities for face-to-face sharing of experience, expertise, and views on matters of primary concern to school communities across the nation. Resource people are brought in, not just to lecture formally, but also to be available for individual discussions with participants. Participants meet with individuals and share ideas that are shaping education and society. Interaction of participants and achievement of a national perspective are fostered through the mechanism of national clusters — a regrouping of local cluster members into an array of working teams. A diversity of regional, cosmopolitan, and local views is thus brought to bear on issues and problems. National clusters foster collegial relationships among participants across the boundaries of their local clusters.

The themes and activities of the meeting change from year to year, but procedures for maximum participant participation have become a tradition. Participants contribute to the identification of relevant topics and selection of presenters. They meet and introduce the presenters, chair discussions, and organize and direct the activities of national clusters or task groups. The kind and level of interests experienced through this involvement enhance the evaluation functions of Summer Institutes and provide Nova staff with a compendium of participant views and attitudes.

Each Nova participant must attend two Summer Institutes during his or her involvement in the program. Attendance at all sessions and residence at the Summer Institute site is required. Participants are responsible for their own travel and living expenses but there is no fee for the Summer Institute. Summer Institutes are held in South Florida, Washington, D.C., and in the Western States.
Instructional and Research Materials  Since this is a field-based program, traditional campus-based library facilities must be supplemented by additional, special resources. While students generally have ready access to local community, university, or school system libraries, additional resources have been developed specifically for the field-based students of the National Ed.D. Program for Educational Leaders. These resources include the following:

- AN INFORMATION RETRIEVAL SERVICE (IRS), which houses the entire microfiche collection of ERIC (Educational Resources Information Center) documents. This collection now numbers about 225,000 documents and is growing at the rate of about 1,200 documents per month. Using widely available printed indexes or computer searches, participants may identify needed documents and obtain them from the IRS free of charge. Since it began operation in September of 1976, the IRS has distributed over 30,000 documents on microfiche.

  The IRS also has computer access to ERIC and more than 200 other databases, including many social and behavioral science databases, such as Psycinfo, Sociological Abstracts, Federal Index, and Books in Print, that contain education-related information. The computer files to which IRS has access contain more than 80 million records. The IRS does computer searches of these files for program participants, graduates, and staff. This service helps users identify journal articles, books, doctoral dissertations, research reports, government publications, and other print and non-print materials needed for practicums and other projects.

  Another database to which the IRS has access is the School Practices Information File (SPIF). This database contains references to documentation on validated school practices. Programs cited in SPIF are submitted by universities, state departments of education, and other education agencies. Selected practicum reports submitted by participants in the National Ed.D. Program for Educational Leaders are included in SPIF.

  The IRS may also retrieve information from Special Net, a special education telecommunications system, and NEXIS, a system that allows access to newspapers, magazines, and wire services.

  For more information about the IRS, see The Gatekeepers’ Gazette, Vol. 8, No. 1 (1979), or the “Users Guide,” April 1982. Both are available on request.

- A LIBRARY of books and other materials relevant to each study area are supplied to each cluster (see list below).
- MICROFICHE copies of the more than 250 Nova practicum reports that have been indexed and microfiched by ERIC are provided to each cluster. The *Thesaurus of ERIC Descriptors* is provided for each cluster. The *Practicums Manual*, previously referred to, is given to each participant.

- A FINANCIAL ALLOTMENT to each cluster can be used to purchase any kind of supplementary materials deemed necessary by the group.

- A STUDY GUIDE for each of the eight study areas, is provided at no additional cost to each participant. Each guide has been written by a Senior National Lecturer. Each guide provides participants with the resources needed in order to gain access to the burgeoning literature within the disciplines and the behavioral sciences. It also provides contextual resources for interpreting the literature. Study guides call attention to the major moral, theoretical, and research questions within the study area and to the implications of new developments in the field. Over a period of time the lecturers have developed several distinct approaches to the study guides, depending on the subject. For example, in the case of the *Education Policy Systems Study Guide*, large amounts of substantive knowledge, theory, concepts, and research are synthesized into an introduction to the discipline. In the case of the *Appraising Leadership in Education Study Guide*, a process by which participants assess their leadership skills is provided. The program includes specific substantive information, exercises, and procedures for self-evaluation. It also includes provisions for the development of self-improvement planning and implementation. The *Finance Study Guide* makes extensive use of the professional literature because of the dynamic nature of the subject matter.

### STUDY GUIDES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Area</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Revised/Reprinted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appraising Leadership in Education</td>
<td>Allan B. Ellis</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Development</td>
<td>Louis J. Rubin</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Policy Systems</td>
<td>Laurence Iannaccone</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Michael Scriven</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>James W. Guthrie</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management and Supervision</td>
<td>Harvey B. Scribner</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research for Improving the Schools</td>
<td>Gerald E. Sroufe</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Management:</td>
<td>Mario D. Fantini</td>
<td>Presently under Revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilizing Resources for Improving Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Study Materials — by study areas, provided to each cluster

APPRAISING LEADERSHIP IN EDUCATION

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

EDUCATION POLICY SYSTEMS


**EVALUATION**


**FINANCE**


**MANAGEMENT/SUPERVISION**


**RESEARCH FOR IMPROVING THE SCHOOLS**


**RESOURCE MANAGEMENT**


Admissions

REQUIREMENTS FOR ENROLLMENT.

Participants with intellectual ability and a penchant for action are sought for the National Ed.D. Program for Educational Leaders. While admission standards are no less rigorous than those of traditional doctorate-granting institutions, they have been developed to carry out the special objectives of the Nova program. Accordingly, admission to the program requires a master's degree from an accredited institution, current employment in an administrative position, administrative certification (where appropriate), and three letters of recommendation from persons knowledgeable about the candidate's administrative performance. The letters of recommendation are to be written on forms provided by the Admissions Office. An interview with a central staff member or cluster coordinator is also provided as part of the admissions procedures. For an applicant to be considered for admission, the following credentials must be submitted: completed application form, master's transcript, evidence of certification, and letters of recommendation. A deposit and application fee is also required.

Applications are received and considered throughout the calendar year. Therefore, there may be a period of several months between the time an applicant is admitted and a new cluster is formed and merged into the schedule.

The formation of a cluster is determined by interest expressed within a limited geographical area. A minimum of twenty qualified admitted candidates are required to start a cluster.

Application materials and other information may be obtained from the Ed.D. Admissions Office, Center for School Leadership Development, Nova University, 3301 College Avenue, Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33314, or by calling 305/475-7378.

CREDITS AND CERTIFICATION.
Since the Nova program is not intended as preservice training for potential administrative personnel, it does not attempt to meet every state's certification requirements for such positions. These requirements are usually quite detailed and vary from state to state to such an extent that any attempt to train for specific positions would defeat the purpose and flexible nature of the Nova educational leadership program. In addition, attempting to meet constantly changing and diverse state regulations would be an extremely difficult task if the goals of consistency and high quality are to be met.
Credits are granted for successful completion of blocks of work including both study areas and practicums. Blocks vary in the length of time they take to complete, the number of study areas covered, and the complexity of practicum involvement. The sequence in which the eight study areas are covered varies from cluster to cluster. The initial block of 9 credits is awarded for successful completion of one study area and an accepted practicum proposal. A second block of 18 credits is earned through completion of two study areas and the final report of one practicum. A block of 27 credits is awarded for successful completion of three study areas and one additional practicum. The final block of 18 credits is earned through successful completion of two study areas and the final practicum. An entire block of work must be completed satisfactorily before the registrar will issue any credit.

Schematically the credit system is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Areas</th>
<th>Practicum</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Introductory Practicum Proposal</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Introductory Practicum Report</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Areas</th>
<th>Practicum</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Group Practicum Report</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Areas</th>
<th>Practicum</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Individual Practicum Report</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 A "year" is twelve sequential months.
2 Study areas are interchangeable for credit purposes. Letters are used only to indicate that a given study area may receive credit only once.
3 Credits are given only for complete blocks.

TRANSFER OF CREDITS AND SPECIALIST DEGREE.
Because the Nova program is designed as a unique configuration of academic and leadership experiences, it maintains a no-credit-transfer policy. Participants are expected to experience the total program. Because the Nova program differs in so many fundamental ways from traditional programs, there simply is no equivalent course work for which credit could be transferred. The Education Specialist degree is not offered through the National Ed.D. Program for Educational Leaders. No credits are awarded for professional or life credit.
Academic Requirements

GRADUATION REQUIREMENTS AND GRADING SYSTEM.

To graduate a participant must (1) satisfy the expectations of the Senior National Lecturer in each of the eight study areas, and be given a pass grade in each study area; (2) must satisfy the expectations of the practicum advisory staff in each of the three required practicums (or their equivalent) and be given a pass grade for each practicum report; (3) must attend and actively participate in two Summer Institutes; and (4) must meet all financial obligations to the University.

A pass/no pass grading system is used in evaluation of participants' work in both practicums and study areas. Every study area and every practicum must receive a pass grade in order for a participant to graduate.

TIME REQUIREMENTS AND PROGRAM TIME LIMITS.

The program is designed to require three calendar years beyond the masters degree. Many students require some time in a fourth year to complete their work.

All participants must complete the program within a maximum of four calendar years from the cluster start date. In some circumstances participants may successfully appeal for a six-month extension following termination at the conclusion of the fourth year. Four years and six months is the maximum time available to complete the program and earn the Ed.D. degree.

Rationale For Program Time Limits

Applicants to this program are required to be in administrative positions in order to be admitted. The attainment of such a position is evidence of leadership ability sufficient to deal with conditions as they presently exist. No substitute measures presently available can estimate the potential of persons to obtain such influential roles. The importance of being in an administrative slot is further emphasized by the practicum requirements through which all candidates must carry out real-life projects for school and school system improvement.

This admission requirement obviously means that persons in the program are somewhat older than traditional program doctoral candidates who may have had little or no experience in the schools. In fact, the average age of Nova candidates at the time of admission for this degree is 42.

If the program were to operate in the same manner as other programs, candidates would spend an average of seven years in attaining the degree, and the average age on completion would approximate 50; some would be
To handle this real problem and, we think, to cure one of the basic ailments in existing programs, the program is designed to be completed by most administrators in three years. A fourth year is provided (with reduced charges) to make possible degree completion for those who have had personal or program problems during the first three years.

The central difference between this program and the traditional programs is its focus. Here, the candidate is required to improve himself on the job. Because of the symbiotic relationship of career and program, participants are able to be highly productive without competing with one another. The tasks they perform are relevant to qualifying for the highest professional degree in education.

A vital aspect of on-the-job performance relates to completing contracted-for efforts within the time available. The four-year deadline motivates candidates to achieve that goal. Graduates testify that one of the greatest benefits of the program is that they have learned of the absolute need to manage time effectively, and they have derived satisfaction from having performed tasks well and on schedule in both the job and the program.

Rules of Conduct and Academic Responsibility

The canons of intellectual freedom and responsible scholarship that have evolved since the middle ages are as essential to the vitality of Nova University as they are to any other university, whatever its degree of innovativeness. The prescriptions related to participation in an academic community stem from the historic function of the university to develop, preserve, and share knowledge. Because Nova University shares this historic purpose, it insists upon personal and intellectual freedom for its students and faculty.

Nova University demands that work of students and faculty reflect customary standards of academic integrity. Specifically, it requires that work submitted by students be original work and that appropriate attribution be provided when work is not original. The University reserves the right to terminate students involved in fraudulent academic procedures. For example, cheating, plagiarism, and submitting the work of another as one's own, are grounds for dismissal.

Cost It is anticipated that most students will complete this doctoral program in three years. The tuition fee of $2,900 per year (1983) must be paid for each of the three years by every candidate. It is anticipated that tuition will be increased for clusters beginning after January, 1984. Although they are expected to complete the program in three years, candidates are allowed up to four years. Services in this program are rendered on a twelve-month basis; charges and refunds are computed accordingly. Tuition (1983) beyond the third year is $400 per three-month term, not to exceed a total of $1600.00.
TUITION PAYMENT PLAN (FOR CLUSTERS BEGUN DURING 1983).*

Participants may pay their tuition in one single payment of $2900.00 before the cluster start date, (plus an initial application fee of $25.00 the first year only), thereby avoiding $50.00 in service charges, or payments can be made in three installments over the year as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRST YEAR</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due before first meeting.</td>
<td>$ 25.00 (application fee to be paid with application)</td>
<td>$200.00 (tuition deposit to be paid with application)**</td>
<td>$800.00 (tuition to be paid before first meeting)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Payment</td>
<td>$1025.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due before the fifth month of the cluster.</td>
<td>$950.00 (tuition)</td>
<td>$ 25.00 (service charge)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Payment</td>
<td>$975.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due before the ninth month of the cluster.</td>
<td>$950.00 (tuition)</td>
<td>$ 25.00 (service charge)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Payment</td>
<td>$975.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*It is anticipated that tuition will be $3,300.00 per year for clusters beginning in January, 1984.

**Tuition deposit is refundable if participant withdraws by letter prior to the cluster start date. See refund policy.

32
SECOND AND THIRD YEARS

Due before the first month of the cluster year (first payment) $1000.00 (tuition)
Due before the fifth month of the cluster year $950.00 (tuition)
\[ \text{service charge} \]
\[ \text{Second Payment} \]
\[ \text{Third Payment} \]
Due before the ninth month of the cluster year $950.00 (tuition)
\[ \text{service charge} \]
$25.00 (service charge)
$975.00
$975.00

FINANCIAL AID AND STUDENT LOANS. Nova University participates in several programs designed to assist participants in securing funds to pay for their education. Information regarding student loans, tuition payment plans, and general assistance are available from the Financial Aid Office (305-475-7409).

COSTS OTHER THAN TUITION. Attendance at two Summer Institutes is required for graduation. While there is no fee for the Summer Institute, participants must pay their own transportation and living expenses associated with attendance at the Summer Institute.

In addition, participants should expect to purchase sufficient books and learning resources to assure that when they complete the program they possess a good professional library.

LATE FEES AND REINSTatement FEES. All payments must be consummated according to this schedule presented above. No exceptions will be made for delayed loan applications. A late payment penalty of $50 will be assessed each time a payment date is missed. When a payment is delayed excessively, the participant may be dropped from the program. If reinstatement is desired, an additional fee of $100 must be paid.

REFUNDS. If a participant has not notified the Registrar—in writing—of his or her withdrawal before the first official meeting, he will be liable for the first tuition payment ($1025). On the other hand, a participant notifying the Registrar in writing of his or her intent to withdraw before the first meeting of the cluster will receive a full refund less the application fee.
Persons paying the total annual tuition prior to the start of the first official meeting and withdrawing from the program will be entitled to a refund based on the partial payment schedule: withdrawal before the due date of the second payment—$1900 refund; withdrawal before the due date of the third payment—$950 refund.

If an application is rejected, the applicant will be refunded all monies except the $25 application fee.

**IF A CLUSTER FAILS TO FORM IN THE PARTICIPANT'S GEOGRAPHIC AREA, ALL MONIES, INCLUDING THE APPLICATION FEE, WILL BE RETURNED TO THE APPLICANT.**

A participant with a grievance with respect to payment of tuition and fees may appeal to a board comprising the Comptroller, the Registrar and a representative of the President of the University.

**FOURTH YEAR FEES.** Tuition beyond the third year of the program is $600 per three-month term. There is no charge for participants granted a six-month extension beyond the fourth year (1983).

**TRANSCRIPT FEES.** The first transcript after graduation is provided free of charge. Subsequent transcripts cost $3.00, payable in advance. Requests for transcripts must be made in writing to the Admissions Office.

**Program Re-Entry** Participants in this program occasionally encounter personal or professional situations which make it impossible for them to complete the program within the time permitted. The catalogue of traumatic events related to spouses, children, one's self or one's school setting need not be related here. However, when these circumstances do occur a humane response is called for, one that does not weaken the quality control or performance expectation of the program.

Participants terminated from the program have one opportunity to petition to re-enter no sooner than one calendar year following the date of their termination (or withdrawal). In such instances, a review of the petitioner's entire file within the program is undertaken by the Executive Committee and a decision reached about conditions (time allowed and tasks to be completed) under which re-entry might be granted. Re-entry provisions are designed to accommodate participants unable to handle the program demands at a point in time. Re-entry is not granted to participants simply unable to perform the requirements of the program. The decision of the Executive Committee regarding re-entry petitioners is final and may not be appealed.

Complete information about procedures for filing a re-entry petition and guidelines for granting of petitions are available from the program office. Requests must be made in writing and should be addressed to the Office of the Director.
Alumni Association  Nova University has an active alumni association that is coordinated by the Office of Alumni Affairs. The association is organized on three levels—local, state, and national—which work in concert to provide special programs and other services that promote the professional and intellectual growth of graduates and that maintain communication between graduates and the University. The Office of Alumni Affairs also offers job placement and credentials file services. Additional information may be obtained from the Office of Alumni Affairs, Nova University.

Termination  Failure to complete requirements in a satisfactory and timely fashion results in termination from the program. While status reports are prepared for participants for purposes of information and evaluation each academic year, there are two periods in which participants' work is reviewed and a formal decision made about their continuing in the program. First, after eighteen months in the program each participants' work is reviewed. If the quality and quantity of work produced make it reasonable to expect that continued performance of the same level will result in graduation, the participant will be continued. If the quality and quantity of work produced leads to the conclusion that the participant is unlikely to be able to complete the program, he or she will be terminated. Participants terminated at the end of eighteen months may appeal for reinstatement (please see discussion of appeals below).

The second point at which participant performance is formally reviewed and a judgement made about continuation or termination is at the end of four calendar years in the program. At this point, participants expected to be able to complete the program in six additional months are granted a one-time, six month extension. Participants so deficient in meeting program requirements that they may not reasonably be expected to succeed even if given additional six months, are terminated. They may appeal, as discussed below.

Because each of the eight study areas must be passed, a participant attempting and failing in an Alternative Evaluation Procedure (see above) is automatically terminated.

Finally, the program reserves the right to terminate any participant, at any time, if it becomes obvious that they are not able to satisfy the intellectual requirements or if their academic behavior is reprehensible (e.g. cheating, plagiarism).

Appeals Process  Participants are entitled to appeal any evaluations received in the program; participants are entitled to appeal for reinstatement following termination. (They may not appeal for a time extension beyond the four year and six month maximum, however.)
The general form of the appeal process was originally suggested by program participants. It utilizes a panel of graduates, called the Appeals Panel. The Appeals Panel meets at regularly scheduled intervals and, when necessary, interim meetings are scheduled.

All pertinent materials, including correspondence of the applicant setting forth his or her case, are made available to the Appeals Panel, which may seek further information from the participant or staff. Each member of the panel submits an independent report to the Director after examining all the evidence; the Director’s decision is based on these independent reports.

Complete information about the Appeals Panel—names of members, schedule of meetings, terms of appointment and appeal forms—are available from the program office.

The University regards the appeal process as the final administrative procedure for resolving grievances within the academic program. It is a mandatory step in the grievance procedure.
Biographical Information

ALLEN CALVIN, National Lecturer in Resources, is Professor of Organizational Leadership at the University of San Francisco. Prior positions include the Deanship of the School of Education at that same institution; and he has served on the faculties of a number of Institutions. He has published over 100 publications and authored and/or edited five books. Mr. Calvin is a fellow in the American Association for the Advancement of Science and a fellow in the American Psychological Association. He is a consultant to numerous organizations and associations.

CLEVELAND CLARKE, Associate in Practicums, assumed practicum responsibilities in January 1983 arriving directly from service as Associate Provost, University of Massachusetts, Boston campus. Previously he was Associate Academic Dean at Boston State College and Professor of Education there, 1973-81. Clarke also taught at Northeastern University and Quincy Junior College in Earth Sciences and Biology, respectively. His earliest teaching was in the sciences, too, at Quincy High School (MA) and Dinthill High School (Jamaica, W.I.).

Clarke completed the Ed.D. degree in Science Education at Boston University in 1971. He completed the M.Ed. degree at the same institution in Administration and Supervision and his B.S. at Pennsylvania State University in Agronomy. Among a wide range of activities which documented his continuing concern for improving public schools was Clarke's Directorship of two Teacher Corps Projects in Boston, for which he was also responsible for funding through 1983, and his participation in the Pittsburgh/AACTE Urban Leadership Project created for the development and testing of protocol materials for the training of teachers for urban schools. Two recent conference presentations further illustrate his interests: "New Approaches in Classroom Staffing Patterns: Professional and Nonprofessional Partnerships" and "Desegregating Public Schools: The Essential Role of Parents and Community Groups."

BARBARA GROSS DAVIS, National Lecturer in Evaluation, is currently a research psychologist with Teaching Innovation and Evaluation Services at the University of California at Berkeley. In this role she evaluates on campus projects, curricula, academic programs and formative evaluation designed to improve teaching. Ms. Gross Davis has been an evaluation consultant to school districts, universities, educational organizations, and federal agencies. She has taught courses in evaluation at the University of San Francisco, Holy Name College (Oakland, Ca.) and the University of California—Berkeley Extension. Ms. Gross Davis is the co-author of Technical Evaluation Reports, articles and monographs on evaluation, and she is currently the editor of Evaluation News. She earned her Ph.D. from the University of California in 1976.

ELLIOT WAYNE EISNER, National Lecturer in Curriculum, is Professor of Education and Art at the School of Education of Stanford University. He received a B.A. degree from Roosevelt University, an M.S. degree from the Illinois Institute of Technology, Institute of Design, and the degrees of M.S. in Education and Ph.D. in Education from the University of Chicago. He was a teacher of art at Carl Shurz High School, Chicago, from 1956 to 1958, and at the Laboratory School of the University of Chicago from 1958 to 1960. He subsequently served on the faculties of Ohio State University and the University of Chicago. He has contributed papers to many conferences and symposia. Recent papers include "The Perceptive Eye: Toward a Reformation of Educational Evaluation," an invited address before the American Educational Research Association. His most recent publications are Conflicting Conceptions of Curriculum, with Elizabeth Vallance (McCutcheon Printing Company, Berkeley, 1973) and The Design and Evaluation of Educational Programs (McMillan Company, New York, 1978).

CONTACT: Stanford University, School of Education, Stanford, CA 94305. (415) 497-2100.
ALLAN B. ELLIS, Senior National Lecturer in Appraising Leadership in Education, is President of Allan Ellis Associates. Mr. Ellis has been President of Educational Research Corporation, a professor of education at Harvard Graduate School of Education, Director of Research of the New England School Development Council, Director of the New England Education Data Systems, and a teacher at the Port Washington High School. Mr. Ellis has served as a consultant to educational institutions at all levels, and has published extensively about the use of computers in education and about the development and measurement of educational leadership. His most recent books include, *The Use and Misuse of Computers in Education* (McGraw-Hill) and *Educational Leadership Appraisal* (Nova University). Mr. Ellis earned his B.A. and M.S. degrees from Queens College, and his Ed.D. degree from Harvard University.

CONTACT: 270 Winter Street, Weston, MA. 02193, (617) 237-2125

MARIO D. FANTINI, Senior National Lecturer in Resource Management: Utilizing Resources for Improving Education, is Professor and Dean of Education at the School of Education, University of Massachusetts/Amherst. Mr. Fantini has been Professor and Dean at the State University of New York at New Paltz. He has been a teacher and Director of Special Projects in the Syracuse (New York) Public Schools. While a Program Officer with the Ford Foundation, he designed the controversial school decentralization plan for New York City. He was responsible for promoting some of the most inventive efforts at school improvement. He served as chief consultant to a number of cities and states including the Ft. Lincoln New Town and Anastacia Community School Projects in Washington, D.C., and to the Superintendent of the Boston Public Schools during the controversial 1975-1976 period of school desegregation. Mr. Fantini earned his Ed.D. degree at Harvard University. Among the over one-hundred publications are a dozen books including *Alternative Education: A Source Book for Parents, Teachers, Students and Administrators* (Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1976); *Public Schools of Choice* (Simon and Schuster, 1974); *Designing Education for Tomorrow's Cities* (with Milton Young: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970); *Making Urban Schools Work* (Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968); *The Disadvantaged: Challenge to Education* (Harper and Row, 1968). Mr. Fantini is co-editing a forthcoming book entitled *Parenting in a Multicultural Society* (Longman, Inc., Publishers).

CONTACT: School of Education, University of MA. Amherst, MA 01003. (413) 545-0233.

DAVID S. FLIGHT, Director of Practicums and National Education Professor, has served as principal, assistant principal, and teacher in public elementary and secondary schools in Connecticut, Missouri, and Illinois. He was principal of the Lower School at the University of Chicago Laboratory Schools, and later directed a preservice and inservice teacher preparation program in the Amherst, Massachusetts, public schools. As professor at the School of Education, University of Massachusetts, he held positions of Director of the Center for Leadership and Administration, and Chairman of the Division of Educational Planning and Management. He was also a director of the Consortium for Educational Leadership as well as professor-in-charge of Consortium training activity on the University of Massachusetts campus. He was editor of the *Newsletter* of the University Council for Educational Administration and assistant editor of the *Educational Administration Quarterly*. He did his undergraduate work at the University of Pennsylvania where he was elected to Phi Beta Kappa. After master's work at Teachers College, Columbia University, he completed his Ph.D. at the University of Chicago. His publications include a number of articles on general educational topics.
JOHN M. GEMELLO, National Lecturer in Finance, is a Lecturer in the Department of Economics at San Francisco State University. He has also taught at Stanford University, the University of Toronto, and the University of California at Davis. Mr. Gemello received a B.A. degree in economics from the University of Santa Clara and his Ph.D. degree in economics from Stanford University. Among the papers he has presented are: "Social Science Graduates and the Entry into the Labor Market: Analysis of the Problem and Proposals for Improvement," Employment Studies Program Research Series, San Francisco State University, August 1977, and "Income, Wealth, and Aid for Education," presented at the Western Economic Association meetings, San Francisco, June 25-27, 1976. He has served on the staff of the U.S. Senate Select Committee on Equal Education Opportunity and is an editorial consultant to Houghton Mifflin Company.


ANDREA M. GOLDMAN, National Lecturer in Appraising Leadership in Education, is a private consultant specializing in designing and delivering educational programs for diverse audiences in both the public and private sectors. She has had extensive experience in designing, coordinating, and conducting investigative research on social, political, and science policy issues. Other areas of expertise include writing and reviewing grant proposals and designing strategic plans in areas related to human resource development. Prior positions include Director of Issues Research (Woodward, McDowell and Larson: San Francisco, California); Consultant: Community Affairs (Raychem Corporation: Menlo Park, California); Trainer and National Director of Foundation Projects (Lifespring: San Rafael, California); Acting Program Director and Regional Seminar Director (American Association for the Advancement of Science: Washington, D.C.); and Co-Director of the National College Intern Program and Coordinator of Executive Recruitment (National Institute of Education: Washington, D.C.).

CONTACT: 4052 Colfax Avenue South, Minneapolis, Minn. 55409. (612) 473-0221.

JAMES W. GUTHRIE, Senior National Lecturer in Finance, is a Professor in the School of Education at the University of California at Berkeley. He was Deputy Director of the New York State Education Commission from 1970 to 1972. Stanford University awarded him the degrees of B.A. in anthropology, M.A. in education, and Ph.D. in educational administration. He was selected as an Alfred North Whitehead Postdoctoral Fellow at Harvard University, 1969-1970. His publications include: Schools and Inequality, with George B. Kleindorfer, Henry M. Levin, and Robert T. Stout (Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1971); New Models for American Education, edited with Edward Wynne (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1971); and "What the Coleman Reanalysis Didn't Tell Us," in Saturday Review, July 22, 1972. He has been a consultant to the U.S. Commissioner of Education, the Ford Foundation, the Florida State Legislature, the California State Department of Education, the New York State Department of Education and National Urban Coalition, among others. He has served as Educational Specialist to the U.S. Senate and was Deputy Director, 1970 to 1972, and Director, Urban Education Program, School of Education, University of California, Berkeley, 1968 to 1971. Mr. Guthrie was elected to the Berkeley Unified District Board of Education in 1975 and was elected President of the body in 1977.

CONTACT: University of California, School of Education, Berkeley, CA 94720. (415) 655-4969.

LAURENCE IANNACCONE, Senior National Lecturer in Education Policy Systems, is Professor of Education at the University of California, Santa Barbara. Mr. Iannaccone has been a member of the faculties of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Harvard, Claremont Graduate School,
Washington University and Teachers College, Columbia. Mr. Iannaccone has served as a member of the Advisory Board of the Educational Policy Research Center at Syracuse and as a consultant to the federally supported Experimental Schools Program. He is presently a member of the National Institute of Education’s Task Force on Educational Governance and Organization. Politics in Education (Prentice Hall, 1967) and Politics, Power and Policy; The Governing of Local School Districts with Frank Lutz (Charles Merrill Publishing Company, 1970) are titles representative of his continuing research interest. His most recent publication is a 1974 monograph, with Peter Cistone, developed for the ERIC Clearinghouse on Education Management, The Politics of Education.

He earned his B.A. and M.A. degrees in Government at the University of Buffalo, studied Scienza Politica at the University of Florence, and earned his Ed.D. degree from Teachers College, Columbia.

CONTACT: School of Education, University of California at Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, CA 93126. (805) 968-6274.

RICHARD M. JAEGGER, National Lecturer in Evaluation, is a Professor in the School of Education, University of North Carolina at Greensboro. He was Professor in the College of Education, University of South Florida, 1971 to 1976. He has served as Director of the Federal-State Developmental Staff of the Office of the Deputy Commissioner for Development, U.S. Office of Education, and Chief of Evaluation Methodology and of Evaluation Design in the Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education. From 1965 to 1967 he was a mathematical statistician in the Mathematical Sciences Department, Stanford Research Institute. Previously he had been a senior research engineer for General Motors Corporation, a mathematical statistician for Philco Corporation, and an analyst and statistician at the Space Technology Laboratories — Aerospace Corporation. He received a B.A. degree in mathematics from Pepperdine College. Stanford University awarded him an M.S. degree in mathematical statistics and a Ph.D. degree in educational research. He has been a consultant to Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, the National Center for Educational Research and Development of the U.S. Office of Education, the Right to Read Program, and the National Center for Educational Statistics of the U.S. Office of Education, and co-director, American Educational Research Association Training Institute, Sampling Design and the Statistics of Sampling for Educational Researchers. A book, Minimum Competency Achievement Testing, is in press (McCutchan). Mr. Jaeger is past President of the Florida Educational Research Association (1976-1977), past Chairman of the Research Training Committee of the American Educational Research Association (1976-1979), on the Board of Directors of the North Carolina Association for Research in Education (1976-1979), and former editor of the Journal of Educational Measurement.

CONTACT: University of North Carolina at Greensboro, NC 27412. (919) 379-5100.

JAMES A. JOHNSON, JR., is the program’s Director of Instruction and a National Education Professor. He joined the staff after serving as Director of the Jefferson County Education Consortium in Louisville, Kentucky, where he also held the rank of Associate Professor at the University of Kentucky. Mr. Johnson’s professional career began as a teacher in New York City, where he also served as administrator and consultant to various educational projects. He later became an Associate Director of the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, San Francisco, and then served as Associate Superintendent for Planning, Research and Evaluation in the District of Columbia Public Schools. He has also taught at a number of higher education institutions. Mr. Johnson did his undergraduate and master’s level work at the City University of New York and was
awarded the Ph.D. degree at the University of California at Irvine. He has been consultant to numerous school systems and to such organizations as the Community Relations Division of the Justice Department, the National Educational Broadcasters Association, the National Association of Community Schools, the National Urban League, and the U.S. Office of Education. His extensive publications focus on urban problems, with particular attention to early childhood and the education of Black children.

ALEXANDER I. LAW, National Lecturer in Evaluation, is Assistant Superintendent and Chief, California State Department of Education, Office of Program Evaluation and Research. Mr. Law has served as a psychologist in the U.S. Army, a school psychologist in California, and performed a variety of duties with Educational Testing Service. In 1963 Mr. Law taught educational data processing at Stanford University, and during the period 1967-1969 he taught educational tests and measurement at Sacramento State University. Mr. Law has been a visiting scholar at UCLA (1978) and Stanford University (1979). He has also served on the Board of Directors of the Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, the California Advisory Council on Educational Research, and the ERIC Clearinghouse on tests and measurements. Mr. Law has, in addition, been responsible for the publication of more than 50 evaluation reports for the California State Department of Education. His Ed.D. degree in educational psychology was earned at the University of Southern California.


JAMES B. MACDONALD, National Lecturer in Curriculum, is Distinguished Professor of Education at the University of North Carolina. He has been a public school teacher and principal of a laboratory school, and has served on the faculties of the Minnesota, Texas, Wisconsin and London Universities. He earned his Ph.D. degree at the University of Wisconsin. Mr. Macdonald is a former member of the Executive Council of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development and has served as chairperson of the Research Council and Publications Committees, and as a member of the Multi-Cultural Commission of A.S.C.D. He has been an editor and contributor to three curriculum books and authored over seventy-five articles and monographs in professional journals. His major concern lies in the area of curriculum theory, and he has engaged in research in the area of reading and has worked on developing alternative programs in public schools.

CONTACT: University of North Carolina, School of Education, Greensboro, NC 27412. (919) 379-5100.

LOUIS MASOTTI, National Lecturer in Education Policy Systems, is Professor of Political Science and Urban Affairs, and Director of the Center for Urban Affairs, at Northwestern University. He has been a faculty member at Case Western Reserve and Johns Hopkins (Bologna, Italy), and a consultant to Los Angeles and Detroit in their efforts to redesign their education electoral systems. He is the author of thirteen books, among them: Education and Politics in Suburbs (Western Reserve Press, 1967), Metropolis in Crisis (Peacock, 1971), Urbanization of the Suburbs (Sage, 1973), Urban Policy and Urban Problems (Lexington, 1975) and The New Urban Politics (Ballinger, 1976). His M.A. and Ph.D. degrees in political science were earned at Northwestern University.

CONTACT: Northwestern University, Evanston, IL 60201. (312) 492-3395.

GORDON L. McANDREW, National Lecturer in Managing the Schools, is Superintendent of Schools of Columbia, S.C. (half time), and he is on the faculty of the University of South Carolina (half time). Previously he was Superintendent of Schools, Gary Indiana; Director of the Learning
Institute of North Carolina; Director of the North Carolina Advancement School, organized to combat the state's 50 percent drop-out rate for boy students; Instructor at the University of California at Berkeley; Director of the Interagency Project of the Oakland California Public Schools; and Coordinator of Secondary Education and Summer Schools at Oakland. His degrees from the University of California at Berkeley are: A.B. with highest honors in political science; M.A. in education; and Ph.D. with concentration in administration and curriculum. In 1952 and 1953 he did graduate work in comparative education at the University of London.


RON NEWELL, Associate in Practicums and National Education Professor, joined the faculty in October 1982. Previously he was Director of the Graduate Division of Biscayne College in Miami, 1980-82. Throughout the 1970s, he served as director, dean or administrator of programs at Nevada, Central Florida, Florida International, and Florida Atlantic Universities. At FIU he was also Director of the School Service Center and Off-Campus Credit Programs. Concurrently with these administrative responsibilities, he taught in departments of secondary education, sociology, and education. His public school teaching career extended from 1959-66 and embraced grades 6-12 in Sterling (IL), Las Vegas, and Tucson. Newell completed the Ed.D. degree in Secondary Education and School Administration at the University of Arizona in 1966. He holds two prior degrees from Southern Illinois University, the M.S. in Education with a Sociology major and the B.S. in Education. Newell has consulted widely in Florida and other states, and has supervised a large number and variety of programs and projects, for many of which he also secured funding. Two recent projects illustrate the range of his research and development interests: "The Effect of Observation Techniques on Class-room Interaction" and "The Development of a Model for Migrant Social Education." Programs he has conducted have addressed issues in such areas as Urban Agent Training, Learning Resources Centers, Volunteer Training, Educational Programs in Prisons, and Relicensure of Cuban Refugee Professionals.

ELIZABETH (BETH) A. POLINER, Director of the Information Retrieval Service, supervises bibliographic research and disseminations for the Center for School Leadership Development and two other graduate education centers at Nova University. In addition, Ms. Poliner continues to serve as an adjunct instructor and curriculum consultant to Nova's Center for the Advancement of Education. Ms. Poliner has been a teacher and educational specialist/curriculum writer for elementary and secondary education and federally funded projects for the Dade County Public Schools in Miami, Florida. She also served as a staff associate for Research for Better Schools in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and a teacher/workshop consultant for McGraw-Hill Book Company. Ms. Poliner has designed and developed curriculum for elementary students and handicapped secondary students. At Nova, she developed, wrote, and edited a proposal submitted to the Florida State Department of Education entitled, Evaluation of Teacher Education Centers in Florida, and she served as editor for A Book of Readings in Modern Curriculum Design, published in 1982. Ms. Poliner attended Lesley College in Cambridge, Massachusetts, and received a bachelor of education degree from the University of Miami in Coral Gables, Florida. She also earned a master of education degree in college student personnel services from the University of Miami, with additional graduate work completed for Florida State Certification in educational administration.
AUDREY H. ROSS, National Lecturer in Resources for Improving Education, is the Past President of the National School Volunteer Program, Inc. She is currently on leave from her position as Coordinator of the School Volunteer Program in the Dade County, Florida Public Schools, the fifth largest school system in the nation. Her position in the Dade County schools entails the planning, organizing, and directing of school volunteer services in all of the county's public schools.

Appointed as the first Coordinator of School Volunteer Services in Miami, Dr. Ross began the program in the Dade County schools and supervised the expansion of the program, first into all parts of the school district and later into many school districts outside the State of Florida. This innovative program has been the model school volunteer program for the U.S. Office of Education since 1975. Ms. Ross received an A.B. degree from the University of South Carolina, an M.Ed. degree from Florida Atlantic University, and a Ph.D. degree from the University of Miami.

Ms. Ross is the author of Plan, Polish and Practice a School Volunteer Program (The Florida Educational Research and Development Council, 1973) and numerous articles and booklets on the subject of school volunteers. She is consultant in the areas of community involvement and the operation of volunteer programs for the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare as well as for the Florida State Department of Education. Ms. Ross was a teacher, demonstration teacher, and in-service coordinator in the Dade County schools prior to beginning the school volunteer program.

CONTACT: 120 Leucadendra Drive, Coral Gables, FL 33156. (305) 665-4008.

LOUIS J. RUBIN, Senior National Lecturer in Curriculum, is Professor of Education at the University of Illinois, Urbana. He holds a Master's degree in Musicology and a Ph.D. degree in Curriculum from the University of California at Berkeley. He has served as a visiting professor at Emory University; the University of Nebraska; the University of California, Berkeley; and Stanford University. He has also served as Director of the Center for Coordinated Education at the University of California, Santa Barbara, and as Executive Director of the Communications Coalition for Educational Change in Washington, D.C. At various points in his career he has worked as an educational consultant for the United States Peace Corps, UNESCO, the United States Department of State, and many school districts throughout the nation. His writings include Process as Content (Rand-McNally, 1965); Frontiers in Educational Leadership (Rand-McNally, 1967); Facts and Feelings in the Classroom (Walker Publishing Company, 1973); Improving In-Service Education - Proposals and Procedures for Change (Allyn-Bacon, 1971); The Alternative Futures of Education (Allyn-Bacon, 1975); and the Handbook of Curriculum, 2 volumes (Allyn-Bacon, 1977). Three other books are currently in press; Educational Reform In A Changing Society; Critical Issues in Educational Policy; An Administrator's Overview; and In-Service Education: Trends, Processes & Prescriptions; all to be published by Allyn-Bacon.

CONTACT: University of Illinois, Urbana, IL 61801. (217) 333-1832.

HARVEY SCRIBNER, Senior National Lecturer in the Managing the Schools study area, is Professor of Education, University of Massachusetts. He has been Chancellor of Education in New York City, State Commissioner of Education in Vermont and Superintendent of Schools in Teneran, New Jersey. Mr. Scribner has also served as a teacher and principal in a number of New England communities. He earned his Ed.D. degree at Boston University and his M.A. at the University of Maine. Mr. Scribner's most recent book is Make Your Schools Work, written with Leonard Stevens (Simon and Schuster, 1975).

CONTACT: School of Education, Hills South, Room 163, Amherst, MA 01003. (413) 545-2764.

ROBERT SINGLETON, National Lecturer in Finance, is the President of Robert Singleton and Associates. Mr. Singleton was Director of the Education Reform Project, an Economist at the Graduate School of Business Administration, Director of Afro-American Studies Center, and Economics Professor at the University of California. He has held various positions as a researcher for government agencies as well as for the University of California. Representative of his many honors and awards, he is listed in Marquis Who's Who, the International Who's Who in Community Service, and Community Leaders and Noteworthy Americans. His publications and presentations cover a wide range of topics, including the problems of drop-outs; poverty; school finance; and presentations to the California legislature. He has also written numerous unpublished articles, and has held several positions as President or Chairman of a wide-range of organizations. He was the Founder and Chairman of the Journal of Black Studies, the Founding Director of the UCLA Center for Afro-American Studies; Board Member of the American Education Finance Association; Member of the Board of
the Education Commission of the States — School Finance Division; and a member of at least ten other organizations. He received his B.A. in Political Science and his M.A. in Economics from the University of California, Los Angeles. He also holds an Interpreter-Translator's Certificate from the Army Language School. Mr. Singleton joined Nova's staff in October of 1978.

CONTACT: 5301 Brynhurst Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90043. (213) 294-0051.

MICHAEL SCRIVEN, Senior National Lecturer in Evaluation, has since 1966 been Professor in the Department of Philosophy, and also, since 1975, Professor of Education, University of California at Berkeley. During 1977-78, he is Director of the Evaluation Institute, School of Education, University of San Francisco. He received his B.A. degree from the Honors School of mathematics, University of Melbourne, and his M.A. degree from the Combined Honors School of Mathematics and Philosophy, University of Melbourne. The School of Literae Humaniores, Oxford University, granted him the D.Phil. degree. In 1970-71 he received an Alfred North Whitehead Fellowship for Advanced Study in Education at Harvard University. From 1960 to 1966 he was Professor, Department of the History and Philosophy of Science, at Indiana University. Previously he had faculty appointments at the University of Minnesota and Swarthmore College. His summer and visiting appointments include: Sydney University, Australia; Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions; RAND Corporation; Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences; Wesleyan University; Yeshiva University; and New School for Social Research. He holds numerous appointments to editorial boards and editorial consultancies, including those of Journal for the History of the Behavioral Sciences, Educational Researcher, American Educational Research Journal, and Metaphilosophy. He is president of the Evaluation Network, editor of Evaluation News and he was president-elect of the American Educational Research Association in 1977. He has current consultant positions with six federal and many state and local agencies. He has more than two hundred publications, ranging over fields from engineering to parapsychology.

CONTACT: University of San Francisco, USF, Evaluation Institute, Rossi Wing, Lone Mountain Campus, San Francisco, CA 94117. (415) 666-6266.

NICK L. SMITH, National Lecturer in Evaluation, is Director of the Research on Evaluation Program at the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. Mr. Smith has served as Series Editor for New Perspectives in Evaluation (Sage Publications), a member of the Editorial Board for Evaluation and Program Planning, Associate Editor of Evaluation Review, and President of the Evaluation Network (1980). He has made forty-nine presentations at professional meetings, written twenty-six Research and Evaluation Reports, and is the author of sixty publications. Mr. Smith earned his Ph.D. at the University of Illinois (Urbana-Champaign).

CONTACT: 18205 N.W. Bronson, #H 1, Portland, Ore. 97229. (503) 248-6800 x384, or 645-3460.

ULYSSES VAN SPIVA, National Lecturer in Supervision, is Dean of the Darden School of Education, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, Virginia. Before joining the ODU staff in March 1979, Mr. Spiva served as Associate Executive Vice President at Florida International University. Prior to joining the FIU staff in 1972, Mr. Spiva served as Special Assistant to the Director of the National Follow Through Program in the Division of Compensatory Education, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C. Prior to that, Dr. Spiva served as Assistant to the Dean of the Graduate School of Education at Stanford University. He began his career in education as a mathematics teacher in the Cleveland, Ohio school system in 1955 and, for several years, served as a senior high school mathematics department chairman and as principal of an
adult education school. Mr. Spiva received the B.S. degree in mathematics from Tennessee State University, and the Ph.D. degree in general educational administration and political science from Stanford University. He serves as a general consultant to the Division of Follow Through at the U.S. Office of Education.

CONTACT: Old Dominion University, Darden School of Education, Norfolk, VA 23508. (804) 440-3324.

GERALD E. SROUFE has been Director of the National Ed.D. Program for Educational Leaders since 1978. He previously served as Director of Instruction (1972-1977). He earned his Ph.D. in education at the University of Chicago. He has served on the faculties of Chicago and Claremont Graduate School. Prior to coming to Nova University he served as Executive Director of the National Committee for Support of Public Schools, Washington, D.C. He has been a consultant to the National Association of State Boards of Education, the U.S. Office of Education, N.I.E., and several state departments of education. Pertinent publications include Educational Futurism in 1985 (written with Hack, Briner, Knezevitch, Lonsdale and Olm, McCutchan Press, 1972), Strengthening State Departments of Education (with Roald Campbell and Donald Layton, Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, and “State Boards of Education and the Education Policy Systems,” (Planning and Changing), and a chapter “Evaluation and Politics” in the seventy-sixth NSSE Yearbook.

RICHARD W. WILLARD, National Lecturer in Appraising Leadership in Education, is Director of Research and Computing at the Bilingual Center at Lesley College and President of Educational Research Corporation. Educated at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Harvard University, where he received his doctorate, Mr. Willard served in the administration of MIT for fourteen years prior to becoming President of Hewes, Holz and Willard, Inc., a firm devoted to consulting with school systems on administrative uses of computers. Subsequently, he was Senior Associate of the New England School Development Council and Director of Systems and Programming of the New England Education Data Systems.

CONTACT: NADC-Lesley College, 49 Washington Avenue, Cambridge, MA 02140. (617) 492-0505.

FREDERICK M. WIRT, National Lecturer in Education Policy Systems, is Professor, Department of Political Science, University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana. From 1969 to 1972 he was Research Political Scientist, Institute of Governmental Studies, and Lecturer, School of Education, at Berkeley; from 1970 to 1972 he directed the Institute for Desegregation Problems there under a federal grant. He received the B.A. degree from DePauw University, and the M.A. and Ph.D. degrees from Ohio State University. He served as Instructor through Professor at Denison University from 1952 to 1969. His most recent books include: The Policy of the School (D.C. Heath, 1975); Power in the City: Decision Making in San Francisco (University of California Press, 1974); Political and Social Foundations of Education, with Michael Kirst (McCutchan, 1975). Mr. Wirt is the author of On the City’s Rim: Suburban Politics and Policies (D.C. Heath, 1972); and Politics of Southern Equality: Law and Social Change in a Mississippi County, foreword by Gunnar Myrdal (Aldine, 1970), which received honorable mention for best book that year from the American Political Science Association. He is a member of the editorial boards of Policy Studies Journal, Journal of Politics, and Social Science Quarterly. Since 1973 he has been consultant with Rand Corporation, Stanford Research Institute and Planar Corporation, National Institute of Education, and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission of the State of California.

CONTACT: University of Illinois, Department of
KATHLEEN WRIGHT, Associate in Practicums and National Education Professor joined the faculty of the National Ed.D. Program in July, 1981. She earned her B.S. degree in secondary education at Florida A & M University in 1958 and her Master's degree in social studies education at Florida State University ten years later. Mrs. Wright holds the doctorate in educational administration and supervision from Florida Atlantic University. She is well known in Ft. Lauderdale as a second-term member and former president of the Broward County Board of Education. She serves on the national board of Delta Sigma Theta sorority and consults regularly with university and other educational groups. Dr. Wright has taught at the secondary school level in the Broward County public schools as well as in the Nova College program on the main campus and was active in various social studies organizations and projects throughout the 1970's. She was a Charles Stewart Mott Fellow in 1979-80. Before joining the Ed Leaders practicums faculty, Dr. Wright taught at Florida Atlantic University.
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The Advisory Board of the National Ed.D. Program for Educational Leaders has a unique and important responsibility: to help assure that the program continues to provide quality graduate education centered on the needs of contemporary school administrators.

The Board provides advice about curriculum, policies and procedures, program development, and representation of the program to the education community. The Advisory Board generally meets twice each year, once in conjunction with AASA and again at the time of the Summer Institute.
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Nova University Degree Offerings

**Doctoral and Professional Degrees**
Doctor of Arts (D.A.) in Information Science
Doctor of Business Administration (D.B.A.)
Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) in Early and Middle Childhood Education
Higher Education Leadership in Adult Education
School Administration Vocational, Technical, and Occupational Education
Juris Doctor (J.D., Law)
Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.)
Applied Developmental Psychology
Clinical Psychology
Oceanography
Doctor of Psychology (Psy.D.) in Clinical Psychology
Doctor of Public Administration (D.P.A.)

**Master’s Degrees**
Master of Accounting (M.Ac.)
Master of Arts in Teaching (M.A.T.)
Master of Business Administration (M.B.A.)
Master of Public Administration (M.P.A.)
Master of Science (M.S.) in Applied Psychology
Child and Youth Care Administration
Coastal Studies
Computer Education
Computer Management
Computer Science
Counseling
Criminal Justice Education (23 majors)
Engineering Management
Gerontology
Health Education
Human Resource Management
Human Services
Learning Resources
Microcomputer Applications in Higher Education
Microcomputer Applications in Leadership in Adult Education
Microcomputer Applications in Management
Microcomputer Applications in Vocational, Technical, and Occupational Education
Psychometry
School Guidance
Security Management

**Specialist Degrees**
Counseling Specialist (C.S.) in Mental Health Counseling
Educational Specialist (Ed.S.) in Computer Education
Education (23 majors)
Microcomputer Applications in Higher Education
Microcomputer Applications in Leadership in Adult Education
Microcomputer Applications in Vocational, Technical, and Occupational Education
School Psychology
Bachelor's Degrees
Bachelor of Science (B.S.) in
Accounting
Administrative Studies
Business Administration
Computer Engineering
Computer Information Systems
Computer Science
Computer Systems
Electrical Engineering
Elementary Education
Exceptional Education
Health Care Services
Life Science
Mathematics/Computer Programming
Professional Management
Psychology—Community, General, and Organizational
Secondary Education

Special Undergraduate Programs
Bachelor of Arts in Leadership Studies
Bachelor of Science in General Studies
Computer Education Specialty
Latin American and Caribbean Studies Specialty
Law School Preparation
Medical School Preparation
The provisions set forth in this bulletin are not to be regarded as an irrevocable contract between the student and Nova University. The regulations and requirements herein, including tuition and fees, are necessarily subject to change without notice at any time at the discretion of the administration. The University further reserves the right to require a student to withdraw at any time, as well as the right to impose probation on any student whose conduct is unsatisfactory. Any admission on the basis of false statements or documents is void upon the discovery of the fraud, and the student is not entitled to any credit for work which he may have done at the University. Upon dismissal or suspension from the University for cause, there will be no refund of tuition and fees. The balance due Nova University will be considered receivable and will be collected.

A transcript of a student's academic record cannot be released until all his/her accounts, academic and non-academic, are paid.

Nova University maintains a system of records which includes application forms, letters of recommendation, admission test scores and transcripts of students' previous academic records and Nova University transcripts. These records may be made available upon written request through the Office of Registrar. The law limits access and disclosure to a third party. Such access is given only upon consent of the student or if required by law. A person does not have the right of access to educational records until he or she has been admitted and has actually begun attending Nova University. There is no prohibition from disclosing such information to the parents of students who are listed on their parents' federal income tax forms.

Parents or eligible students will be provided a hearing by Nova University if they wish to challenge the content of the record. If still not satisfied, the parents or eligible student may add explanatory or rebuttal matter to the record. If the student or parents are denied access to a hearing or if records are alleged to have been illegally disclosed to a third party, the student or parents may file a complaint with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) Office, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D.C. 20201.

Nova University does not discriminate on the basis of handicap, sex, race, religion, national or ethnic origin in admission, access or employment for any of its programs and activities. The University Registrar and Director of Personnel have been designated as student and employee coordinators, respectively, to assure compliance with the provisions of the applicable laws and regulations relative to non-discrimination. Nova University programs are approved by the coordinator for Veterans Approval, State of Florida, Department of Education, for veterans' educational benefits.

The school is authorized under Federal Law to enroll non-immigrant alien students.

The Nova University general policies on Student Relations are on file in the office of the registrar.