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Abstract

This case study chronicles the 25 year history of the National EdD Program for Educational Leaders (Educational Leaders), a non-traditional doctoral program for practicing school administrators. Educational Leaders was the first national graduate education program in the country and served as a model within the Fischler Center for the Advancement of Education, Nova Southeastern University, and across the nation. The Program sought to resolve problems inherent in traditional higher education practices related to recruitment, selection, clinical experiences, placement, and school-university cooperation. Legal actions by state departments of education, media attacks, and licensure barriers proved the higher education system was highly resistant to change. Being in the vanguard was risky, expensive, and complex. President Fischler and Program directors demonstrated the dynamic spirit of innovation and the courage to break tradition. Legal battles were fought, laws were rewritten, distance education developed, and higher education was restructured.

Nova created a new educational delivery system, showed respect for individual learners, and required field-based practicums documenting educational change. The Program opened the highly guarded entry to doctoral education for more women and minorities and sustained a commitment to the underserved. National lecturers and Summer Institutes enabled participants to deal with complex national educational issues and to form a network of school leaders. Nova helped form the definition of distance education and continues to alter delivery in tandem with advances in technology.

The Educational Leaders Program survived more scrutiny than any other educational program in the country. By 1996, the 2,500 Program graduates completed school improvement projects, contributing more studies to ERIC regarding educational change than any other school. Educational Leaders played a critical role in reform of higher education and can stake the claim of a pioneer and leader in organizational change.

Archival documents, historical artifacts, anecdotal information, participant observer notes, and department records were collected and reviewed; extensive personal interviews and multiple surveys were designed, conducted, and analyzed by the author.
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Preface

Nova University: Conception

Nova University of Advanced Technology was chartered in 1964 in Florida as a graduate school. The founders envisioned a graduate science and technology program to respond to the American government and education priority for sophisticated research and educational development. The space race initiated by President Kennedy was not sustained by subsequent leaders, and funding for technology declined. Civil unrest and demonstrations on college campuses surged through the country, and the war in Vietnam forced cutbacks in federal funds for research and education. These external forces created turbulent times and fiscal instability for the new university, and the founders shifted focus in response.

To sustain financial survival, Nova formed an alliance with the New York Institute of Technology in 1970 and began a search for alternate forms of delivery of education. The institution was renamed Nova University in 1970 and began to redefine the existing concepts of higher education delivery. Traditional graduate programs required participant campus residency, were geographically site specific, were highly structured academically, had local faculty members, and demanded dissertations of highly technical quantitative research. Nova University's leaders proposed and implemented some radical variations that broke the mold of higher education in America. Nova revamped students, faculty, programs, and the college campus itself. The reasons for redefinition, the description of the new delivery system, and the evolutionary process of development are covered in this historiography. Since inception, innovation remained an integral force. Nova, through the years, demonstrated an ability to take risks and to survive in spite of the odds. The University became the nation's pioneer in off-campus delivery of educational programs and built a nationwide educational presence. Those were exciting and heady days, as higher education representatives responded to the new educational concepts developed by Nova.

The fight to save the University from fiscal mortality, the permission to be radical in redesigning higher education, and the leadership to structure and fund the programs came from Dr. Abraham Fischler. Abe Fischler was Nova University. He did not realize the risks and complexity he would face when he became President in 1970. He was no renegade, instead a respected national educational leader. His background included educational leadership roles at Columbia, Harvard, and Berkeley. The reasons to reform administrator preparation programs were well grounded in research conducted by the Ford Foundation; the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; the U.S. Commissioner of Education; and the National Education Association. In addition to furthering school reform, Fischler hoped to create a program to fulfill the learning needs of adult populations throughout the country. The National EdD Program for Educational Leaders (Educational Leaders) was the prototype for change within the University. The initial concepts embedded in the Program design, Program growth and development, and the impact that the Program had on participants and on public education follow.

Abraham Fischler
CHAPTER 1 The Courage to Lead: The Proposal

In 1971, Nova University was accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) as a special purpose institution for graduate study. A proposal for the National EdD Program for Educational Leaders was submitted by President Fischler and Dr. Louis Rubin, Dean of Continuing Education. The proposal for an off-campus program described a crisis in graduate education in a country in the midst of profound social changes. The authors called for the invention of institutions of higher learning with resilience and flexibility, alternative organizational form, and a different delivery system. They called for colleges and universities to make it possible for people to keep pace with the unprecedented expansion of knowledge and to engage in a lifelong learning process. President Fischler wanted to bring the University to the student in a form more relevant to the person's professional responsibilities. This program would not replicate the traditional on-campus experience but would increase accessibility, give merit to part-time study, and bridge the gap between theory and practice.

The lack of congruence between the needs inherent in an individual's professional obligations and the purposes of higher education inspired these alternatives for the design of the Educational Leaders Program:

1. Make it possible for graduate students to acquire higher education without interrupting their employment.
2. Make the advantages of graduate study available to a much larger population.
3. Parallel or supersede present educational delivery systems with more efficient investments of time, money, and energy.
4. Increase the connective tissue between theoretical insights and professional competence.
5. Utilize representative professional tasks as a basis for developing new understanding and skill.
6. Accommodate the individual idiosyncrasies of learners by permitting them to pursue their objectives through independent study.
7. Provide classrooms not merely on university campuses but wherever in the community there are useful lessons to be learned.
8. Adjust curricula to the particular interests and objectives of the learner, providing that these represent a defensible degree program.
9. Use demonstrated competency as the indispensable ingredient in the evaluation of learning.
10. Exploit the available technology to a greater extent.

Nova University proposed a program primarily for practicing school administrators designed to deliver comprehensive, rigorous, practical, and high quality curricula. The primary emphasis was on a delivery system that would permit the individual to function as a self-directed learner. While off-campus education might be more convenient, it would not be less rigorous and demanding than a traditional educational administrator.
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doctoral program. Relevance of course content and practical application were embedded in a structured delivery system. The intention was to eliminate the barrier between scholarship and professionalism. Students were required to demonstrate both theoretical knowledge and performance competence. Arbitrary lines of distinction between individual courses were diminished in favor of a cross-disciplinary program of study.

In the original proposal to SACS, eight competency areas were identified:

1. Finance and Management
2. Personnel Management and Staff Development
3. Curriculum Development
4. Administrative Theory
5. Educational Assessment and Statistics
6. Social Issues and School Law
7. Systems Management
8. Learning Theory

The concept of campus shifted dramatically. Anyone in the nation who met proposed enrollment criteria could choose to attend, and students were organized in geographical clusters with a cluster coordinator. Class hours were restructured from traditional shorter multiple class sessions to one intensive monthly class session. In addition to the three monthly class sessions for each of the competency areas, additional learning seminars were proposed. Each cluster would target pertinent local educational issues and meet with local educational or governmental experts to discuss the issues.

In 1971, a recommendation by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare called on colleges and universities to diversify faculty members. Nova University responded in a dynamic way when the proposal was approved. Lecturers were not restricted to a particular university setting or one geographical region. Program administrators hired the most notable experts in each field of study. National lecturers included women and minorities from across the nation.

In December 1971, SACS did give permission to begin the experimental program in January 1972. Dr. Fischler credited one man in particular as a long-term supporter. "Dr. Gordon Sweet (then Executive Secretary of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools) took a chance and should get a lot of credit; he took a lot of flack for accrediting Nova. He was sympathetic because he saw the need for innovation. He was careful and made sure the program demonstrated effectiveness and was evaluated at all levels. Nova was defended by Sweet because the programs met his expectations."

In addition to the proposal to SACS, a second document, Leadership in Public Education Study: A Look at the Overlooked by Donald Mitchell, profoundly influenced the design and development of the National EdD Program for Educational Leaders. In 1972, the Academy for Educational Development, Inc., produced this report commissioned by the Ford Foundation. The study identified four primary findings regarding leadership in public education: (1) At a time when national issues are overwhelming the schools, "localism" still dominates the system; (2) public school principals, the gatekeepers of educational change, have been overlooked as a vehicle for school reform; (3) in 1970, only 30% of those persons receiving doctorates in educational administration or supervision actually took leadership positions in the public schools; and (4) an oversupply of credentialed candidates stands in line for leadership positions in the nation's public schools. Donald P. Mitchell, the author, identified what was wrong with the system and proposed a plan for principal improvement.
Mitchell's report identified some of the barriers facing principals. "Those who assume positions of authority do not automatically have or develop the courage to change. In some instances they have been selected for the very reason that they can be counted on to play it safe, and, as they age in positions of authority, their mechanisms of self-protection become even stronger. Too many educational leaders have been unwilling or unable to make difficult decisions that seemed to threaten their job security or advancement. In times of uncertainty it does take courage to change, to move off dead center. Any proposal for change that intends to alter the quality of life in the school depends primarily on the principal. One can realign forces of power, change administrative structures, and increase budgets for materials and personnel, but the intended effects of all these changes will be drastically diluted by principals whose past experiences and training, interacting with certain personality factors, ill prepares them for the role of educational and intellectual leaders."

Demographically, American school principals at the time were primarily White, male, middle-aged, with 15 to 19 years of experience. They were likely to have spent most of their childhood on farms or in small towns. They came from families with somewhat lower educational attainments and had larger representation from families at the lowest income level; fewer came from families at higher income levels. They indicated "middle of the road" as their political preference and tended to assign institutions more power in controlling societal problems and individuals than men planning to go into other fields.

Mitchell's study cited the role public education played in sorting out the middle-class, predominantly White children, those already conditioned by the goals of home and society to become economically self-sufficient, and leaving the others behind. Severe educational handicaps of minority children were coupled with poverty, unemployment, restrictive hiring practices, bad housing, and poor medical care that reinforced their poor school performance. He saw a collision between the forces in society pushing for equality of opportunity regardless of race, color, or creed and the traditional methods used to select, promote, and economically reward people in the system.

To increase effectiveness, institutions of higher education would have to change recruitment, selection, substantive or clinical experiences, placement, and school-university cooperation. Even if they demonstrated a willingness to change, the change process would take too long. Given the number of traditionally trained and certified people already waiting for placement, and the 8% annual replacement rate of school administrators, a timely infusion of new leadership through attrition or turnover was unlikely. Mitchell found that in New York State in 1970, in excess of 15,000 teachers were certified as school principals but were not serving in that job.

In addition, stated Mitchell, educational administrators were not a geographically mobile group. In 1971, 92% of superintendents had served in only one state. Multiple studies documented that localism was not the result of happenstance but rather of standard hiring practices. More important than the local origins and lack of mobility of most principals was their local, as opposed to cosmopolitan, orientation. Even principals with a more cosmopolitan orientation were often forced into the local mold. Most of those who attempted change ran into opposition from entrenched job holders who felt themselves threatened. If the programs for preparing administrators did not become more cosmopolitan, principals were unlikely to move from localism.

School administrators have been thrown, somewhat against their own inclinations and desire for order and symmetry, into the center of all the issues and pressures of American society. Actual attacks, teacher strikes and negotiations, the caliber of superintendents
and school board members, inadequate financing, student unrest, and general social-cultural ferment forced some administrators out of their jobs.

Dr. Mitchell concluded that training an effective school administrator should include her-his exposure to national problems and processes to actively promote more cosmopolitan views. Mitchell envisioned a program that he believed would dynamically alter the relationship between organizations and society. He proposed that a national group of practicing administrators participate in a program that addressed the following:

1. Technology and its relationship to society and education
2. Process and product in national policy development
3. Implications of community organizations
4. The role of state agencies in the U.S.
5. A multicultural vs. melting pot society
6. Management theories and practices
7. Evaluation and decision making
8. The economics of society
9. Divergent educational views and practices
10. Esthetic and cultural experiences

President Fischler took full advantage of the congruence between the research and recommendations in Mitchell's report and the emergent proposals for the Nova administrator doctoral program. He hired Mitchell as the first director of the National EdD Program for Educational Leaders.
Directors

Donald P. Mitchell 1972-1978

The purpose of education is to improve the human condition; education must cause social change.

Donald Mitchell created an alternative administrator training program for those who felt the need for a different tune and a different drummer. The National EdD Program for Educational Leaders was a targeted, multistate, quality-controlled, time and study intensive, 3-year doctoral program that was operated in an external format. The Educational Leaders Program targeted practicing school administrators, those already in a school setting, rather than adding to the pool of administrators waiting for placement. Practicing school administrators held the promise for elementary and secondary school improvement.

Educational Leaders was not a traditional program with a different delivery system, but a different program that required a different delivery system. Central to the Program goals were the requirements that demanded that candidates carry out school improvement projects. These projects involved a process and a product that was not simply a research paper but documented evidence of change in a school system.

Abe Fischler refers to the impeccable, tight design and control of the Program under Donald Mitchell. "Mitchell deserves all the credit in the world for the National EdD Program for Educational Leaders." Mitchell's program design provided equity for participants in the sense of the same lecturers, same standards, and same practicum reviewers for all. Control of practicums was on campus. The Program provided immediate application of leadership skills toward the solution of real problems in schools and in society. This national Program would mitigate the localism characteristic of many schools and universities.

Mitchell believed that the Program goals and operational design could significantly affect public education. The Educational Leaders Program created an alternative route for leaders to emerge, and Mitchell declared the traditional credentialing system as the fallback of the bureaucrats. Mitchell's integrity, wisdom, and strong direction created an elegant and effective program. It was an alternative graduate program that employed the entire socioeconomic components of our society to develop competencies and demonstrate performance. The system was flexible, dynamic, and incorporated five basic components: independent study, local seminars, summer institutes, field practicums, and substantive examinations.

These elements made the Program radically different from traditional doctoral programs and formed the core of the Program design:

- Participants remained in their school settings
- Nova brought the campus to the participant
- Participant job responsibilities interacted with study areas
- National resources were delivered locally
- Practicum design was less structured and less academic than traditional dissertations
This Program was clearly not a PhD program and not an apprenticeship for future researchers, but a program to develop leadership in school administrators already practicing in public schools. One core component of the Program was the ingathering of participants and national educational leaders during the Summer Institute.

The first Summer Institute, chaired by Gerald Sroufe, was held in Fort Lauderdale in July 1972. Fifty participants from 12 states joined with cluster coordinators and national educational leaders. Shirley Chisholm, then Congresswoman from New York, and Charles Frankel, former Assistant Secretary of State for Education and Cultural Affairs, were the keynote speakers. In addition to discussion of national educational issues, participants asked for more involvement. Participants sought to influence Program policy and to define the function of clusters and the roles of cluster coordinators.

Sroufe left his position as Executive Director of the National Committee for the Support of the Public Schools in 1972 and brought with him wisdom, experience, and seasoned idealism to Nova. Gerald Sroufe became the first Director of Instruction for the Educational Leaders Program, and he defined each course content area and prepared study guides for Program courses in conjunction with Mitchell and incoming national lecturers. Each study guide was a package of experiences specifically tailored for educational leaders as opposed to the rewriting of standard texts. Real-world phenomena and participant insights would supplement the study guides in the learning process. Mastering real-life job responsibilities should be part of leadership development, and Sroufe tried to integrate curriculum content with participants’ existing roles and responsibilities.

Gaining the courage, knowledge, and skills to change public education clearly replaced the traditional emphasis on credit hours. Mitchell described a correlation between the preoccupation of Middle Ages philosophy with angels dancing on the head of a pin and the contemporary educational system’s emphasis on credentialing and dissertations. Raising social, moral, and economic issues was not popular; but in order to impart a sense of self-respect, power, and belonging, a break in tradition was required.

In 1972, the Ford Foundation awarded the National EdD Program for Educational Leaders a grant for $70,480 to enhance the Program’s scope and quality. A portion of the award would be used for Program evaluation. Allan Ellis, President of the Educational Research Corporation, was commissioned to isolate the Program objectives and perform an evaluation of how these aligned with the operational practices.

The Ford Foundation grant also enabled Nova to bring senior national lecturers, cluster coordinators, and the board of governors together in Washington in January 1973. On the agenda, the development of performance-based objectives for the Program was combined with exploring the available national resources for solving local problems.
Then Senator Walter Mondale encouraged the Nova group not to accept the idea that money spent on education was wasted or that educational programs were failures but to be combative about the successes and the potentials of the system. National lecturer Sharlene Hirsch called this planning session the most open, liberal, and flexible time in the Program's formation. The tension between leadership and scholarship, and between practical experience as opposed to theoretical knowledge, had to be maintained, said Sroufe, who found no validation for concentrating on one or the other. The Program itself functioned as a laboratory for the introduction of new elements and was open to modification.

No equivalent in American education met the dynamic potential of the Program's summer institutes. Leaders in the political world, academicians from multiple disciplines, and Nova staff interacted with participants from across the country. The July 1973 Summer Institute at the Diplomat Resort in Fort Lauderdale brought 32 national clusters together. One person from each local cluster joined with other cluster representatives to form national clusters. Supportive interaction among participants encouraged the exchange of ideas and problem discussion, and the probing of issues from a national perspective. For many participants, localism was transformed into a broader perspective through issues-oriented discussions.

National Lecturers

Another critical piece in Program development was the selection of recognized authorities as national lecturers. Nova recruited lecturers with national perspectives, high credibility, and influential political connections—people who carved out new roads of inquiry and believed in nontraditional options. Abe Fischler, Donald Mitchell, and Gerald Sroufe selected lecturers, and the number of candidates desiring a connection with the Program was overwhelming. That desire was sustained among many lecturers for decades, and some of the early lecturers are still with the Program in 1996.

The Nova Educational Leaders Program utilized a variety of teaching methods. These included presentations by lecturers, study guides, cluster discussions, computerized information systems, general readings, cassette tapes, and a videotape overview of each subject area. Lecturers used different teaching methods, but Mitchell insisted on equity for participants through consistent course content and by utilizing the same lecturers at each cluster site. Performance consistency and equity among advisors became a more complex program management issue.

The University's first class of 17 graduate students
Cluster Coordinators

Since Program inception, cluster coordinators recruited participants, led cluster development, and facilitated cluster meetings. Coordinators were district, regional, and state educational leaders. Early clusters were located in California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, New York, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Texas, Virginia, and Washington DC.

Cluster coordinators acted as advocates for participants in relation to the Program office and occasionally in the participant’s school settings. They tracked participant progress, and many offered coaching and counseling to their cluster members through the years. They acted as advocates for the program within local school and higher educational settings. During Summer Institutes, cluster coordinators assumed educational leadership roles in national cluster groups and occasionally presented in concurrent sessions. They worked together with Program faculty and participants to modify aspects of the Program at each site. Each national lecturer was greeted by the cluster coordinator, who ensured that materials were distributed and that facility arrangements were made prior to each class. Regular smooth operation of each class session was largely due to the efficiency of the cluster coordinators.

Program Evaluation

One highly significant strength of the National EdD Program for Educational Leaders under Mitchell’s leadership was intensive self-scrutiny. Mitchell invested heavily in program evaluation and openly reported concerns and findings. Continuous analysis of Program development was conducted, documented, and publicly reported. Every aspect of the program was monitored and adjusted. Because Educational Leaders was a new program, an alternative program, and a multistate program, it enjoyed more scrutiny than any other training program in administration in this country.

The progress of each participant was tracked and reported in the Program newsletter, the Gatekeepers’ Gazette. Participants were surveyed and the results published in the Gazette. An active advisory board, effective cluster coordinators, and participants helped shape and mold the Program. Educational Leaders maintained a high level of involvement with external agents and used expertise and evaluative findings to modify delivery, content, and process.

Dr. Allan Ellis heavily invested himself in the Program’s development and remained an integral player and supporter. In 1972, through his role as President of the Educational Research Corporation, Ellis conducted an intensive study of the program as it progressed through critical, formative stages of development. The Ford Foundation grant resulted in a 1973 study published by Ellis. The findings were also reported to the SACS. During the formative stages of the Program, Ellis identified the goals of the Program and measured how the Program was meeting the goals; he next identified critical issues facing the Nova National EdD Program for Educational Leaders.

The following is a summary of the critical issues identified in the study. Three assertions were made by Ellis: (1) Leadership is essential to the improvement of education, (2) educational leadership in schools is in dangerously short supply, and (3) conventional university programs to train educational leaders are inadequate. Traditional terminology was an immediate issue. The term student had to be redefined to reflect the middle-aged adult professionals in charge of whole districts or school staff and facilities. Adult administrators could not be called students; they actively participated in the Program and the Program responded to their developmental needs. The title participants reflected the intended interaction. The school administrator, usually the principal, functioned as gatekeeper (one who permits or limits change). The Educational Leaders Program was designed to provide the knowledge and skills to enable that gatekeeper administrator to become a leader and to
create situations within which the administrator could demonstrate leadership in the school setting.

Individualization of instruction, practicums, and learning materials emerged as one of two primary issues. The dynamics of structured versus unstructured, teaching or academic scholarship versus action, interplayed with individualization of learning. The Program individualized instruction by designing it in such a way that each person could take the time he or she needed to learn, not pressured by the progress rate of other participants. Mastering course content was an individual process. Time to learn in a program of individualized study became the participant's responsibility, and Educational Leaders provided sequential, time-specific progress demarcation points. However, the lock-step course sequence dictated by the calendar year could not respond to the individual's need to know specific content at a particular time. Neither the increased costs nor the delivery system logistics permitted resolution of this issue.

Interaction between the three required practicums and the study areas was an issue. Practicums were expected to relate to specific study areas, and participants wanted more flexibility in practicum topics. If one studied finance but had no job function in finance, performing a finance-related task did not match up with individual participant needs, nor did it deal with more imperative issues within the school setting. Ellis recommended more flexibility in the choice of practicum topics by participants.

Prior learning, diversity of experience, and past training varied considerably among participants, but lecturers were not expected to provide individualized instruction in response to these differences. The evaluation suggested that the solution rested with the participants; participants should take the initiative to increase interaction with the lecturers, conduct class meetings, and guide lecturer presentations. Participants' expertise and resource potential for one another remained untapped while at the same time they were expected to influence lecturer behavior. Individual learning styles, while addressed as important, could not be dealt with because little was known about learning styles at the time and the format of one full day of lecture was not a flexible component.
In addition, individual job roles could not be matched by a corresponding variety of approaches to the subjects and issues covered by lecturers. If participant school roles influenced the way individuals must address curricula, then no mechanism was in place to accommodate the need. The Program intention to broaden participants' perspectives addressed both of these findings. The Program role was not training people to stay in their current jobs, but to gear instruction so that all participants began to understand the various local and national issues and how policy impinges in different ways. Ellis' report stated that ongoing interaction between participants and lecturers could lend clarity in defining course scope and sequence and alignment to personal growth. Indeed, it is the Program’s greatest strength that it is itself a flexible, growing organism.

The logistics of timely materials acquisition and full library service suffered from breakdowns often enough to be identified as an issue. Local libraries could not be counted on as materials might not be in their collections nor be available. Bookstores often did not carry the required course materials, and advance mailings from the University required purchasing and recycling books. Materials had to be suitable for independent study, accessible, durable, and variable in type in addition to being relevant and required. The evaluation called for new materials in new formats and increased access to materials, and noted participant responsibility to seek out additional solutions to problems encountered.

Throughout the report, participants were identified as agents involved in Program improvement efforts. They were encouraged to take more active roles in cluster operations, including managing the cluster budget and running class meetings or seminars.

The report noted that the Program increasingly treated the practicum as a vehicle to improve a participant’s abilities to write clearly and to utilize scientific methods in solving problems and focused less on the participant’s development as a leader. It recommended more attention to the practicum as an opportunity for the participant to address directly other dimensions of leadership, and it recommended that conventional class lectures and exams should include more leadership opportunities and infuse more problem solving exercises.

The evaluation report led to the development of a new study area. What was missing from the Program was a careful procedure for describing educational leadership, that is, a way to observe, measure, critique, and discuss educational leadership in terms of specific behavior, relevant skills, and underlying dimensions. The Nova National EdD Program for Educational Leaders invested heavily in the development of this one study area, Educational Leadership Appraisal. Allan Ellis led the conceptualization and implementation of an analytical tool to diagnose leadership skills, increase self-reflection, and encourage personal growth. The selection of Ellis was based, in part, on the evaluator’s in-depth knowledge of the Educational Leaders Program.
Educational Leadership Appraisal

One study area is unique to the National EdD Program for Educational Leaders: Educational Leadership Appraisal (ELA). In the spring of 1973, Nova University contracted with Allan Ellis, President of the Educational Research Corporation (ERC), along with Gerald Sroufe, to investigate models used to assess leadership in business. Leadership assessment centers had a 20-year history of development in business. Ellis asserted that the dimensions of managerial success in business were not necessarily applicable to educational leadership. William Byham, President of Development Dimensions (DDI), met with Nova and ERC staff to formally construct a leadership assessment and training component specifically for educational leaders. Through this process, Educational Leaders became a national laboratory for the development of improved practices in education.

Ellis asserted that the dimensions of managerial success in business were not necessarily applicable to educational leadership. William Byham, President of Development Dimensions (DDI), met with Nova and ERC staff to formally construct a leadership assessment and training component specifically for educational leaders. Through this process, Educational Leaders became a national laboratory for the development of improved practices in education.

The task was to construct an assessment system for educational administrators consisting of leadership dimensions, situational exercises to elicit participant performance, and a mechanism for reporting to the participants on their performance. Nova staff, ERC staff, and consultants from DDI worked with a team of recognized educational leaders in education to derive a list of leadership dimensions that reflected the core elements. Following identification of leadership dimensions, an analysis of jobs of superintendents, principals, and other school administrators was conducted through interviews and observation. Next, ERC and DDI designed a set of exercises which would permit thorough and efficient measurement of participant performance on each dimension, and which would be perceived by the ELA participants as relevant to their jobs. It was important that the exercises, set in the context for a school administrator’s job, would be realistic in reflecting the issues, problems, and responsibilities typically handled by school administrators. Leadership potential was also measured as the exercises provided a challenge to ELA participants beyond their personal situation and role.

ELA was pilot tested with four sample clusters in 1974 by ERC. System weaknesses were identified and changes made, resulting in the expansion of ELA to provide leadership training as well as assessment. During the summer of 1976, ERC and Nova reformulated ELA as a regular 3-month study module for the Educational Leaders Program. In 1977, 20 leadership dimensions were identified, defined, measured, and promoted: planning and organizing, management control, use of delegation, written communication skills, oral communication skills, problem analysis, judgment, political behavior, decisiveness, risk taking, creativity, educational perspective, persistence, initiative, stress tolerance, group leadership, individual leadership, adaptability, flexibility, and considerateness. Tightly designed exercises provided the scenario for dimension development through observation, application, and self-appraisal, including personal prescriptions in improving performance as an educational leader.

Donald Mitchell believed that Educational Leaders was an effective training alternative, and he was able to document educational change. Abe Fischler cited the enduring strengths of the Program design, the tremendous faculty, the tightness of the practicum review process, and the national perspective gained during summer institutes. The notion of delivering education to
working adults in a way that was more accessible and maintained quality became the operating agenda for Nova University. The vision of Don Mitchell and the openness of the system resulted in the development of an alternative program that served well as a national model.

Mitchell was convinced that this alternative and all other genuine alternatives would be strangled by the traditionalists unless the consumers—the practitioners—played a responsible role in opening up the system and exercising their consumer rights. Indeed, open conflict and court battles erupted during the next decade (see the second section of this publication).
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Gerald E. Sroufe 1978-1985

We know what to do about education, we just don't do it.

If Donald Mitchell was the archetypal visionary of the National EdD Program for Educational Leaders, then Gerald Sroufe was the archetypal warrior. His honesty, articulate communication, integrity, wisdom and humor, served the Program well. That he is politically astute remains an understatement. Sroufe's most significant accomplishments were not in the classrooms or central office, but as a national leader in the National EdD Program's fight for life. He led the political battles for state-by-state acceptance and maintained accreditation and/or licensure without compromising the Program. He brought in national lecturers or other political allies and attorneys but was himself the primary voice for rights within each state. He fought for Program credibility and gained acclaim in a nationwide competition. In 1982, the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) honored the National EdD Program for Educational Leaders—selected as the best school administrator preparation program in the country.

Gerald Sroufe's educational background and national perspective deeply aligned with the stated intentions of the Program. He shared Mitchell's concerns about the huge number of administrator preparation programs in existence, the excessive number of certified administrators waiting in the wings for nonexistent openings, and the lack of national perspective among school administrators. Much of the credit for the developmental work under Donald Mitchell must be shared with Gerald Sroufe.

Sroufe started as a Senior National Lecturer in Education Policy Systems in 1973, then served as Director of Instruction from 1975-1977. He developed or formalized the study areas, curricula, instructional design, and the first summer institute. Sroufe's national perspective and political ties, along with Mitchell's Harvard connections, resulted in powerful summer institute activities and the selection of outstanding national lecturers. They looked for lecturers with national reputations who were mavericks in their field, had national perspective, and had established a high level of credibility that enabled them to take risks and win.

Freedom to design the course content was Sroufe's domain initially. The innovative delivery system prepared practicing school administrators at a financial rate far below traditional universities. Sroufe felt the character of the Program's leadership, lecturers, and participants would ensure the quality of the Program. Its constituency and its goals made the Program promising. To improve the skills of 800 practicing school administrators was paramount to Sroufe. Basic intelligence, strong self-concept, physical stamina, and unusual motivation formed the admission criteria and the participant profile. He added to that profile a sense of humor to tolerate the confusion and uncertainty pervading change.

Sroufe remains fully supportive of the initial practicum focus on flexibility and action. Reflective scholarship resulting in a report on what was done, not a pseudo-academic paper concerned with formatting, remained foremost. His concern was focused on the participants actions and the evaluation process used by the participant. The actions could be documented by a formal written report or photographs or notes. Sroufe cited studies showing that traditional research dissertations were not very useful for practicing school administrators and noted
The Courage to Lead

that the Harvard field studies served as a model for the Educational Leaders' major applied research projects (MARP's).

Sroufe led a brief foray of expansion into foreign countries through DODDS (Department of Defense Schools). Two London clusters began before the Program determined this was not within the mission. The military management style was not in alignment with site-based management, basic operating duty assignments compromised Program admission, participants had no control over the centralized system of school curriculum, and participants were often geographically reassigned before practicum projects could be completed. Changing education in a military base school proved difficult.

Sroufe shared his educational philosophy, "Creativity is the new currency, people are the assets of an organization; we hire on attitude — go do it. Practice 'just in time' education and satisfy the learners' need to know information. The quality bar keeps rising and the school system must be continually improving. Managing change is about managing relationships. Be autocatalytic."

Under Gerald Sroufe's leadership, the National EdD Program for Educational Leaders provided a high quality program. Graduates became superintendents and in turn sent their school principals to build leadership teams for school improvement. The goal of the program was not to produce big name superintendents but a national cadre of effective school administrators. Sroufe maintains an affiliation with Nova University as a national lecturer.

Lloyd DuVall 1985-1993

Our focus must be on quality, we must be responsive in discharging our responsibilities, and we must be caring about the people we serve.

Lloyd DuVall became interested in the National EdD Program for Educational Leaders because regionally credentialed graduates from administrator preparation programs were not demonstrating innovation in education; he believed that Nova's Educational Leaders Program represented a new approach. His primary contributions were in affirming the Program's credibility among accrediting agencies, other university professors, and potential participants. He continued on the path of providing a quality program.

DuVall was an excellent administrator: an analyzer, a planner, a scheduler, and a man with broad knowledge, integrity, and management skills. DuVall planned in large blocks of time and was opportunistic in the selection of specific tasks to be accomplished. His interpersonal approach was collegial not confrontational. He took risks to pursue a dream and to achieve creative satisfaction upon fulfilling that dream.

DuVall was well known nationally and held major offices in many national organizations including American Educational Research Association, American Association of School Administrators (AASA), and National Council of Professors of Educational Administration. Through a national marketing analysis of Program participants, he established that Program selection was primarily through word of mouth. He actively cam-
paigned on behalf of the Program, leaving a paper trail of accomplishments and documentation of the Program’s effectiveness in preparing school leaders. Closer relations with state department representatives and collaborative relationships with political allies were developed. He spoke at national conferences, with professors in local colleges with educational administration programs, and with local cluster members at their faculty meetings. At the same time, DuVall guarded the reputation of the Program and ensured Program standards.

He set new Program standards for the practicum process and product, called senior national lecturers together to make sure they represented the Program, altered the design of summer institute, and revised study areas. In 1985, four full-time advisors handled practicum documentation under DuVall and David Flight. Together with Ron Newell, they restructured the practicum process and created the Practicum Research study area. Regarding the practicum process, inservice training for advisors was provided and more typical university people were added to the rolls as adjunct faculty. Varied approaches were still favored over a single practicum model. The Practicum Research study area was theoretically linked with a second new study area, Research for School Improvement. DuVall ensured that Program participants would have a greater understanding of traditional research theory and practice and how to evaluate sophisticated research findings.

The designs of Summer Institutes under Jim Johnson were brilliant and elegant, but a logistical nightmare when participant numbers soared from 150 to 400. Design modifications, streamlined logistics, and increased communication resulted in a more functional model. The purpose of Summer Institute shifted with the design modification, and thematic content drove the week-long seminars, not participant-generated issues and answers. Instead of writing educational policy statements, participants attended issue-oriented presentations by national educators.

Communication in general became more open and direct, and each core group interrelated more effectively. DuVall encouraged a greater level of interaction within the central office and externally with constituent groups. National lecturers, cluster coordinators, Program faculty, advisors, and Program staff all enjoyed increased intercommunication. These constituent groups noted positive effects from the increased communication, and DuVall was quick to cite the effectiveness of these groups and their dedication to the Program.
In 1991, Lloyd DuVall reported that nearly 1,700 graduates of the National EdD Program for Educational Leaders had completed the eight study areas and practicum and MARP process. The 20-year anniversary Summer Institute provided an opportunity to assess the past and envision the future. DuVall asked these questions: (1) Where are the resources for addressing national educational goals? (2) What is the impact of the national goals on the curriculum and teachers in each school? (3) How can our past, however illustrious, inform our actions for the future? (4) Should we accept a set of national goals when our tradition and legal system mandate local control? (5) Why are the schools being blamed and being held accountable for curing the nation's social ills? (6) How will this nation address the constitutional need for financial equity? (7) Are all children of equal worth in our schools? (8) Will parent choice become a basic catalyst for school improvement? and (9) Can the nation afford the health care needed to ensure that all children are ready to learn? As educational leaders confront larger questions that go beyond the immediacy of teaching and learning, no simple answers can be found. The purpose of Summer Institute was to pursue questions, using insights from the past.

DuVall reaffirmed the enrollment criteria and believed that the Program brought a new level of intellectual stimulation to participants who would not or could not participate in a more traditional administration preparation program. The Educational Leaders Program continued to emphasize application of a broad field of knowledge.

Distance education offered potential that DuVall was eager to capture. He proposed the development of a Nova Notebook, a computerized learning system that would provide study area information to each student on a floppy disk prior to class. National lecturers would lead an analysis and synthesis of information among content areas and develop models of application in the field. His dream is now realized with portions of study areas which can be accessed online via the Internet.

Through his association with Nova University, Lloyd DuVall developed and expanded his cadre of friends and associates, and refined his own views of educational administration. He finds it gratifying that more institutions are following Educational Leaders. He was the archetypal administrator who led the Program during the less turbulent halcyon years, reaffirming credibility and building a more cohesive and collaborative organization.
CHAPTER 2 Rules and Regulations: Gaining Credibility

Nova University attained accredited status at the end of 1971 from SACS. The Southern Association had spent 3 years studying “nontraditional study programs” and thus was receptive to external degree proposals in December 1971. The Nova alternative program model was an external degree program delivered through distance education by a national faculty to cadres of practicing school administrators located in regional clusters across the nation. President Fischler established an efficient and cost-effective educational delivery system infused with the intention to improve the human condition.

Gordon Sweet (SACS); Abraham Fischler, President of Nova University; Lou Rubin, Dean of Continuing Education; Donald Mitchell, the first program director; and the SACS review committee began an exploratory relationship that resulted in substantial changes in many higher education institutions. Significant principles drove Abe Fischler: academic freedom, interstate commerce, and independence. Through the following years, Nova, SACS, and state boards of education wrote the rules and fought many battles together. They all knew that other universities were interested in alternative models of delivery and in protecting their own turf. They opened the door to possibility and began to expand reality.

Donald Mitchell established clusters in states across the nation as soon as a coordinator and a group of interested school administrators formed. Indifference to individual state requirements or even confrontational daring enabled Mitchell to open 11 clusters within the first year. There were 32 clusters by January of 1974, the maximum number planned for the first cycle of three years. Mitchell did not ask for approval; he did what he believed was right, aware of vested interests of higher education boards; he practiced defiant resistance to the stranglehold on creativity that state codes and regulations dictated. Mitchell was dead set against accommodating state regulations that indicated Program modification. Along the way, messy and serious issues emerged. Laws were changed, court cases heard, state battles won and lost; sometimes the price in winning was not commensurate with loss of face resulting from the original allegations.

From the initial special approval for the National EdD Program from SACS, questions about this nontraditional program emerged. Prior to the April 1971 session of the Florida legislature it was possible to operate and advertise an educational institution by simply paying a minimum corporate registration fee. In general, a college or university approved by agencies such as the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools or SACS, which are recognized by the United States Office of Education, was defined as accredited.

In 1971, in a session of the Florida Legislature, an act was passed to administer the licensing of educational institutions. This act was revised and tightened up by the 1972 legislature. A State Board of Independent Colleges and Universities was appointed by the Governor. The Board, conceived for consumer protection, would set up rules, regulations, and procedures which unaccredited institutions must adhere to in order to achieve accreditation. James Farquhar, Chairman of the Board of Trustees of Nova University served on the State Board.

Gordon Sweet attended a special meeting, funded in part by the Ford Foundation, hosted by the National EdD Program for Educational Leaders in Washington DC. This planning meeting in January 1973 brought cluster coordinators, participants, members of the Program’s Board of Governors, and national lecturers together for Program planning. “School people have a way of setting up straw men,” Sweet said, “They say, ‘We can’t do this or that because an accrediting agency will say it doesn’t like it.’ In fact, they may be making unwarranted assumptions.” Sweet was taken with the Nova proposal and warned against the easy slide into traditional channels; he encouraged vigorous resistance. Evaluation to verify that what was proposed was accomplished on every step of the way—that was what SACS wanted to see.
The Nova Educational Leaders Program was under continual evaluation by both internal and external bodies. In addition to the full-scale evaluation by the Educational Research Corporation, funded by the Ford Foundation in 1973, Nova University conducted a self-study, or major reaffirmation every 10 years since 1974-1975. Data were submitted to various organizations to attain accreditation or licensure.

In 1978, an Institutional Report on the National EdD Program for Educational Leaders was submitted to the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). After a positive campus visit by an NCATE team, NCATE denied accreditation. Nova appealed and later withdrew the application.

Prior to 1975, few state regulations dealt specifically with the Nova Program’s delivery system. Questions about diploma mills emerged and state departments of education or higher education departments demanded requirements. State by state, rules and requirements were written, most renewable every 5 years, some with ongoing approval. Each cluster site and each Nova University program was required to submit different forms to meet different state codes and standards. In 1980, Fischler said Nova spent between $100,000 and $150,000 a year to maintain approval in 20 states.

Vilification and written attacks on the Program erupted periodically. Richard Morland’s article, “The External Doctorate in Education: Blessing or Blasphemy?” in Phi Delta Kappan in 1973, naming Nova University, was most damaging. Morland stated that several hundred degrees a year were given away by Nova, implied an improper relationship between Nova and SACS, and questioned admission standards. Entrance requirements that did not require a specific academic average, nor the Graduate Records Exams (GRE) or other test scores, were declared insufficient by Morland. Performance assessment did not include comprehensive or oral examinations and that led Morland to assert that “You better know how to sign your name to a check.” Despite the innuendoes and unverified accusations, Morland’s article was cited in future attacks upon Nova.

Mitchell countered with the threat of legal action and in 1974, Phi Delta Kappan published “Let’s Set the Record Straight: A Case for Nova University’s External Doctorate in Education.” This was his response to Morland’s article and to the accompanying editorial references to “diploma mills,” “schools without scholarship,” and the “erosion of academic standards,” as well as the implication of an improper relationship with SACS. Mitchell stated that preparing research scholars was not the aim of the Program and should remain the goal of a PhD program in education. He wanted to train first-rate practitioners in the art of educational leadership, perhaps a more modest goal, but no less difficult and surely as worthwhile. The apparent failure of Morland to understand that the educational needs of a practicing school administrator might vary significantly from those of a research scholar became a recurrent problem for other Program critics.

In 1978, Nova University filed a $10-million libel suit against the Cincinnati Enquirer, which had called the university a “mail-order diploma mill,” and the Ohio state auditor, whose report had called Nova doctorates “unrecognized mail-order degrees” and said they could not be used by education administrators to qualify for salary increases. After the legal proceedings, the Enquirer published an article clearing Nova’s name, and the state removed the “mail order” reference and agreed to recognize Nova graduates for salary increases. This was one of several battle fronts in 1978.

Anomalies in U.S. external degree programs—particularly Nova University’s education doctorate—were attacked again in the Kappan November 1978 issue. Authors H. G. Vonk and Robert G. Brown feared that both the external and internal doctorates would sink into disgrace if GRE scores and grade-point average (GPA) minimums did not determine candidate acceptance into the Program.
Also in 1978, the University of North Carolina (UNC) board turned down Nova’s request for a license because it had only part-time faculty and alleged inadequate library facilities. Nova sued and the North Carolina Supreme Court ruled in Nova’s favor in 1982. New state regulations were adopted in 1984 to further block Nova. Frank Brown, Dean of the School of Education at UNC, Chapel Hill, said “It’s important for a student to come to a campus full-time to really think and reflect.” The article promoted campus residency, full-time status, and a traditional research dissertation as the requirements for a quality graduate program. UNC asserted that off-campus programs did not have quality laboratories and quality libraries, and did not produce intensive research dissertations. It was clear that Nova’s alternative delivery system and a practicum that demands on-site school improvement documentation did not fit the traditional mold. These were painful events for Nova University but pivotal events for higher education.

A November 1980 article in the Chronicle of Higher Education on Nova documented the decade of lawsuits and controversy that resulted from trying to do something unique. In the last few years, however, other higher education institutions, including the University of Massachusetts, Columbia University, Vanderbilt University, and Pepperdine University, have been offering programs much like Nova’s. They know this is the program of the future; “They are taking our model and running with it,” said Fischler.

Meeting SACS requirements, individual state requirements in 27 states, and clearing the University’s name after repeated attacks became an expensive and wearying obligation. SACS required notification of each new cluster site outside of a 25-mile radius of an existing site. Each application required a considerable amount of material preparation, and site visits had to be conducted. As each state wrote and rewrote license requirements, the formalized procedures and staff time needed for response resulted in the expansion of Nova’s management staff, and extraordinary amounts of money were shifted toward legal fees. Herschel Shanks and Tom Panza provided legal advice through the years. Being in the vanguard was expensive.
Bob Miles began his relationship with Nova University as one of the first cluster coordinators in Hartford, Connecticut, and, since 1985, Miles has led Nova Southeastern University's Licensure and State Relations Department. Miles continued on the trail blazed by his predecessors, Fred Nelson, Stephen Goldstein and Dan Austin. Miles states that Nova knows more about legal regulations at the state level than any educational entity. Longevity and experience have enabled Nova to be of assistance to states in the identification of pitfalls and documentation of how other states addressed issues. Miles played a national role in collaborating with state departments of education in establishing operational criteria. Nova does not operate in North Carolina despite a state supreme court ruling in Nova's favor; in fact, no outside university operates in that state. Connecticut, Ohio, Maryland, Washington, New York, Puerto Rico, and Michigan barred entry. Nova does provide programs in 22 states, Canada, the Bahamas, and Jamaica.

According to Miles, competition among providers is getting stronger, not in terms of size (most are smaller) but because there are more programs emerging. A wide range of educational institutions are offering off-campus or nonresidency programs: University of Massachusetts, Vanderbilt, Harvard, University of California at Los Angeles, Duquesne, Penn State, Walden, Webster, University of California at Berkeley, Edison, Antioch, Union, Apollo Group, and Columbia.

What were the underlying issues of the legal and credibility conflict? Quality of programs, a radically different approach to delivery of higher education, consumer satisfaction, interstate commerce regulations, and discriminatory state rules were the significant issues. Regarding quality, the Educational Leaders Program was subjected to more stringent review than any other program in the country. In 1982, the National EdD Program for Educational Leaders competed for the AASA Administrator Preparation Program. Educational Leaders was selected as the best in the nation. Consumers have reported satisfaction both through external analysis and internally as reported in the Gatekeepers' Gazette in June 1979, "Program Evaluation: The Graduate Questionnaire." Nova has maintained accreditation through SACS and is undergoing a review in 1996.

The National EdD Program for Educational Leaders has been the forerunner in distance education and in setting new standards for field-based school improvement projects. Proposed NCATE Curriculum Guidelines for Advanced Programs in Educational Leadership (Fourth Draft, August 1994) stated that universities "should plan and conduct beneficial bridging experiences between course content and the workplace that feature clinical exercises and/or field settings. Since life in schools is not compartmentalized as are content areas for the convenience of instruction, then teaching for the application of knowledge requires structures that provide transitions from isolated, focused concepts toward more realistic, interconnected patterns."
The development of distance learning programs among universities is now so widespread that SACS recognized that, as an accrediting body, it needed some definitions and a set of criteria for evaluating such programs. Whereas, the evaluative criteria used in the past were campus-based, the burgeoning development of distance education programs presented a new set of conditions for which the existing criteria were inappropriate.

Accordingly, in 1991, SACS created a committee to develop a definition for distance learning and to begin work on a set of criteria for evaluating those programs. Educational Leaders director Lloyd DuVall, as well as Al Mizell and other Nova administrators, served on the committee that wrote the definition. "Distance learning is that educational process that occurs by delivering instruction designed to accommodate students who are physically remote from the main campus or from a location or campus of origin. In this process, the requirements for a course or program may be completed through face-to-face interactions and/or through remote communications with instructional and support staff including one-way or two-way written, electronic, or other media forms."

Distance education is firmly established as a viable instructional delivery system in our nation's universities. Nova Southeastern University's National EdD Program for Educational Leaders has been followed by universities which established satellite centers, regional branch campuses, and alternative delivery systems. Distance learning technology evolves continually—videotapes, audio bridge, compressed video, interactive video, computers, and CD-ROM technology compete with satellite broadcasting, and online interactive multimedia. Individually driven learning is a far cry from an early concept of providing courses on a train or correspondence courses.

Nova Southeastern University played a critical role in reform of higher education and can stake claims as a pioneer organization and leader in organizational change. Lou Rubin cited four primary reasons for the long-term success of Nova. Demographic and marketing forces led other educational organizations down the same path, but Nova

- **first**, was driven to move faster because of hunger to become a viable organization;
- **second**, fought for independence, freedom, and interstate commerce by breaking new legal ground;
- **third**, evolved constantly because Fischler had a new 5-year plan every month; and,
- **fourth**, changed more rapidly than other institutions because each University program was largely independent of bureaucratic rules except its own.
People are the Program's greatest assets; they make the Program successful. The successful operational structure of the Educational Leaders Program is highly dependent upon people involved in all aspects of delivery. A web-like infrastructure links essential roles by function within the complex national delivery system. As the Program was developing,

- Each Program director provided the leadership to implement new Program goals;
- Cluster coordinators enlisted qualified applicants and encouraged commitment;
- National lecturers challenged participants with new concepts;
- Advisors enabled participants to change public education and to properly document the process;
- Faculty and staff managed the infrastructure, communication network, and programmatic development.

Participants reported benefits from their years in the Educational Leaders Program. Most significantly, public education benefited from the educational leadership of over 2,500 Program graduates. Most likely, those benefits did not end with the completion of the study areas and the practicum, for benefits probably extended over the career span and into each subsequent job or role function. Leadership skill application is highly transferable to other professional and community leadership challenges and opportunities. How deeply each participant's leadership skills pervaded our nation's schools and how long-lasting the effects of his or her practicum innovations remain undocumented. Documentation regarding the people and the processes that evolved to enable Program participants to improve public education follows.

National Lecturers

The unique national Program structure provided lecturers with exposure to public school administrators across the nation. Lecturers influenced educational leaders within a wider geographical base and with diverse levels of influence in public education. But significantly, lecturers cited the benefit of the development of their own national perspectives as they traveled to clusters across the nation. Many lecturers remained involved with Educational Leaders because of the access to this enriching opportunity for interaction.

From inception, nationally known and highly respected lecturers were a major attraction to the Program. No other university could offer the diverse level of expertise provided by the Educational Leaders Program's national lecturers. Participants were exposed to educational concepts by notable experts from Harvard University, University of Pittsburgh, University of California at Berkeley, University of Illinois, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Boston University, Cornell University, Old Dominion University, Ohio State University, University of Massachusetts, Stanford University, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, and Vanderbilt University. Early Gatekeepers' Gazettes and Program bulletins provided a review of some of the reasons for lecturers' involvement in the National EdD Program for Educational Leaders. Initially, national lecturers included the following notables.

David Champagne lectured in the field of Supervision and expressed concern for dialogue with participants especially because the off-campus Program shifted responsibility onto students for developing themselves through independent study. Involvement with the Program made Champagne "re-think what we were doing at the University of Pittsburgh; about changes that may be needed and the instructional modes that may be necessary to get what we’re after."
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Morris Cogan, University of Pittsburgh and Harvard University, was impressed with the quality of Nova's participants and the economy of time and finance embedded in the Program design. As senior national lecturer in the area of Supervision, Cogan emphasized the need for support for teachers when they were trying to master innovations.

Elliot Eisner credited the University with providing the opportunity for people in school settings to attend a doctoral program without leaving their schools. Furthermore, the Program structure, especially Summer Institute, drew upon the intellectual resources of the country and brought these to people. Participants can share their current work and can obtain feedback concerning their ideas from experts in the field. Eisner was a national lecturer in Curriculum while at the School of Education at Stanford University.

Resources for Improving Education was led by Sharlene Hirsch who believed in integrating education with experience and believed that Nova responded effectively to this ideal. Hirsch was also a Harvard graduate who served as Director of the Office of Human Resources Administration Educational Development Department of New York City. She served as a consultant to the Ford Foundation and designed an Institute for Educational Leadership. She recalled that her most effective leadership training was not in the formal doctoral studies at Harvard but as a Washington Intern in Education. Designing a study area that was the first in the nation to systematically link resources with participants resulted from her enthusiasm about the Program.

National lecturer in Evaluation, Richard M. Jaeger, was a Professor in the School of Education at the UNC at Greensboro. His expertise centered around evaluation design, methodology, and statistical analysis that came to the forefront nationally due to his dynamic leadership.


Harvey Scribner, senior national lecturer in the Managing the Schools study area, was a Professor of Education, University of Massachusetts. He was Chancellor of Education in New York City and State Commissioner of Education in Vermont. Scribner's approach to education administration was reflected in The Redistribution of School Power: A Populist Approach to Urban Education.
Senior national lecturer in Evaluation, Michael Scriven, was a Professor in the Department of Philosophy and Professor of Education with the University of California at Berkeley, and Director of the Evaluation Institute, School of Education, University of San Francisco. Oxford, Harvard, Indiana University, and Swarthmore were among the places where he held appointments. He was a prolific writer and was credited with the development of evaluation standards.

Richard Willard taught mathematics and statistics at Boston University, Harvard, and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology before becoming the senior national lecturer in the study area of Technology and Systems Management. Willard called himself a skeptic and a traditional lecturer before joining the Nova Program. He sought to instill a respect for and wise use of computers and technology and encouraged administrators to integrate them into formal education.

Evaluation senior national lecturer, Daniel Stufflebeam, was deeply concerned about accountability. He restructured his Ohio State University lectures for Nova participants. As Director of the Evaluation Center for Ohio State, he responded to the media call to set evaluation standards for federal programs and began to change his own ideas on evaluation.

James Guthrie, Louis Rubin, Allan Ellis, Fred Wirt, Ulysses Van Spiva, and Laurence Iannaccone remained national lecturers for nearly 25 years. Charles Achilles, Emil Haller, Dale Brubaker, and Paul Kleine joined the Program under Lloyd DuVall when Research for School Improvement developed as a study area. They also maintained a high level of long-term involvement. Here they share their perspectives on the growth and development of the Educational Leaders Program, as well as their personal reflections on educational matters.

James Guthrie was a Professor in the School of Education at the University of California at Berkeley following a post-doctoral fellowship at Harvard University. He testified before the Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity of the U.S. Senate on Inequality of Economic Resources in 1970. Guthrie joined the Program because of his deep social concerns about inequality of economic resources and deficiency in traditional credentialing systems. He sought equitable and creative ways to award credentials in the off-campus Program. Nova’s willingness to create a faculty with a sense of collective energy engaged in a common cause attracted him. He was attracted by the mission to create a high quality administrator preparation program. He developed the Finance study area; his provocative delivery of challenging concepts and contact with practitioners all over the country kept him involved. He sought contact with risk takers and a remedy for the major structural impediment that imperils school improvement: The disjuncture between authority residing with school boards and superintendents, and accountability residing among teachers and principals. He recently retired from Nova after 25 years of dynamic instruction. He serves as the Director of the Peabody Educational Policy Center, Vanderbilt University.

Fred Wirt, National Lecturer in Education Policy Systems since 1973, incorporated social science theory in his lectures and moved away from the highly prescriptive, formalistic concepts in traditional programs. The opportunity to meld practitioner concerns with concepts that were reshaped and refined because of the national contacts made Educational Leaders attractive and rewarding for Wirt. He labeled himself an idealist without illusions. As a national lecturer, Wirt was intrigued that professional standards could be sustained with such innovation and thought it unlikely that other higher education entities could measure up to the standards proposed by Educational Leaders. Wirt finely focused his central concepts and approach to presenting material to fit the Educational Leaders teaching schedule.
Administrators’ political roles and conflicts in schools shifted during his tenure: The benevolent autocrat was challenged to become the leader who empowered shareholders to reach agreed-upon outcomes. The practicum dealt with new ways of looking at reality, at larger life concepts. Practicums are full of social issues that reflect the conflict, climate, and culture in society in general. Practitioners and their practicums remain the strongest measure of Educational Leaders success. Wirt recommends comprehensive research to document the Program’s effects on practitioners’ careers and the effects of practicums on our nation’s schools. He retired from the Program in 1996. Wirt served as Professor in the Department of Political Science University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana.

Another key player, Louis Rubin, senior national lecturer for the Curriculum study area, envisioned education as a lifelong learning process for personal growth. His experience at the University of California at Berkeley and at Santa Barbara where he served as Director of the Center for Coordinated Education, along with consultation to UNESCO and prolific writing and lecturing, gave Rubin a broad, humanistic national perspective. Rubin’s perspective regarding Educational Leaders emerged from compelling logic: How could any university do a better job of preparing school personnel than a good school district? His answer was the unthinkable combination of no campus with the most prestigious faculty in the country; and no classic dissertation but an active attack on pressing concerns. Rubin aligns Nova’s practicums with the emergence of field-based knowledge or action research. Practicums provided the opportunity to share and generate solutions to real school problems with expert guidance. The Program can capture the national potential and power of school administrators. Leadership is more important than competency exams in educational change. “Educational Leaders was my most useful contribution to education,” said Rubin. He is a Professor of Education at the University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana.

Emil Haller, Cornell University, initiated Research for School Improvement in 1985 along with Charles Achilles and Charol Shakeshaft. He promoted sensible and competent use of research, not the training of researchers. Bound by time limits, his hard and heavy approach to cover material was balanced with dialogue with practitioners. He credits this dialogue with broadening his perspective. Haller applauds the model for delivery of instruction and plans better use of technology. His two goals are developing a Web site and providing reading material through electronic media for students to download.

Charles Achilles has the unique history of teaching Research for School Improvement, Management and Supervision, Hu-
man Resource Development, and then creating the Current Issues study area. Flexibility, a wide range of knowledge, and national professional contacts are combined with his techniques for leading process and demonstrating performance. Achilles' desire to observe, analyze, and experience the whole Program led him to teach in 6 study areas, serve as practicum advisor, and act as devil's advocate. He promotes high quality standards for admission and performance demonstration for participants, as well as high standards for advisors. "No other university can match Educational Leaders in the variety and quality of national lecturers or the networking opportunities for participants," said Achilles.

Ulysses Van Spiva, initially a reader of special projects under Donald Mitchell, became a Management and Supervision national lecturer in 1977. He brought cultural diversity and provided an excellent role model to participants. No lecturer showed more respect for each individual participant. Van Spiva is a humanist with broad perspective who understands the interplay of human nature in educational change. Making theory come alive, working with practitioners in the field, and broadening his own scope of vision were his motivations for staying involved. Van Spiva cites these lifetime benefits to participants and to public education: continuing growth and productivity, bonding and support networks, accessing sources of information and expertise, and ongoing application of practicum experience. He has remained dedicated to Nova even when he retired from Old Dominion University where he served as Dean of the School of Education.

Allan Ellis' most notable contributions to the Educational Leaders Program emerged from various roles—as a cluster coordinator, practicum advisor, evaluator, national lecturer, and developer of the ELA study area. Technology and the support of Dean Shelton resulted in the development of the first online educational leadership software in the University—ELA Online. His visionary leadership and wisdom provided guidance to the Program through the years. "I am eternally grateful," remarked Ellis regarding his long-term relationship with Educational Leaders.

Dale Brubaker, Curriculum Development lecturer, UNC at Greensboro, modeled informal instruction, used multimedia, and encouraged interpersonal interaction. He applauded the Program for providing a chance for students to succeed without cut-off scores on GRE or MAT tests and for promoting diversity, especially by recruiting more women and minorities as faculty, lecturers, and participants. His most recent books and articles have come from Nova experiences.

Paul Kleine, lecturer in Research for School Improvement, recently introduced qualitative research models into the study area curriculum. As Director of the Bureau of Educational Research, College of Education, in the University of Oklahoma, his experience in field-based qualitative research and technology application guided recent revisions of the study area and participant assessment. A new test design will provide diagnostic feedback on concept comprehension. Instrumental in the design of the Research Web page, Kleine looks forward to increased technology applications. He is eager to examine the alternatives in revising the scope, sequence, and articulation of Research with other study areas and the practicum process.
Cluster Coordinators

The first cluster began in February 1972, and the enrollment of venturesome candidates into the Program was immediate. By May 1973, 27 cluster coordinators were introduced nationally in the Gatekeepers' Gazette. Coordinators came from geographically diverse locations and background; women and minorities were selected. Most cluster coordinators were school superintendents and regional or state directors. Tuition was $2,000 per year for each of the three years. Within the first 5 years of operation, the National EdD Program for Educational Leaders provided the opportunity to pursue a doctorate to far greater numbers of students at any one time than any other education administration program in the country.

In early 1996, 34 cluster sites were operational. Many of the cluster coordinators were Program graduates. Women and minorities were represented and geographical diversity remained integral to the Program structure. Tuition, effective July 1, 1996, was $7,520 per year for each of the 3 years. Continuing participants pay a service charge of $1,100 per year to remain active while completing the practicum.

Earlier marketing surveys indicated personal contact as the primary reason for enrollment. Program graduates encouraged peers, as well as people that they supervised, to build leadership skills through the Program. Top graduates remained with the Program as cluster coordinators, advisors, or informal recruiters.

Neil Macy, Howard Hunt, Camille Casteel, Charles Greco, Dhyan Lal, Curtis Smith, and Alice Gay Kampfmueller represent Program graduates who serve as cluster coordinators. Spanning the duration of the Program, Neil Macy attended Educational Leaders' first class in 1972, and Alice Gay Kampfmueller graduated in 1995. In response to written surveys, cluster coordinators indicated the following:

Program Strengths

- Nontraditional model
- Quality and expertise of national lecturers
- Practicums led to improvement of our public schools
- Established network of colleagues across the country
- Able to continue working
- Monthly class schedule and independent study
- Strong leadership of directors
- Content applicable and relevant to practicing administrators
- Able to attend without GRE or MAT scores
- Summer Institute experience
- On cutting edge of change in regional issues
- Diversity of leaders
- Opportunity to encourage other professionals
- Achieved job promotion
- Professional growth and knowledge
- Befriended some of the finest minds in education
- Won AASA award for best doctoral administration program

These responses were cross-matched for analysis with participant feedback at the 1995 Summer Institute identifying the aspects of the Program that should not be changed. A very high degree of agreement resulted from the comparison.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>CLUSTER COORDINATORS 1973 • THEN</strong></th>
<th><strong>CLUSTER COORDINATORS 1996 • NOW</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, Georgia</td>
<td>Atlanta, Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Robert E. Flanders</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cade Gervais</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Educational Services Center</td>
<td>Executive Director Fulton County Board of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin, Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thomas H. Scannicchio</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Resource Development Training and Special Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Educational Development Laboratory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore, Maryland</td>
<td>Chesaapeake, Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Howard C. Allison</strong></td>
<td><strong>Eugene Karol</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant State Superintendent for Certification and Accreditation at the Maryland Department of Education</td>
<td>Educational Consultant Northern Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston, Massachusetts</td>
<td>Don Gainey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Robert W. Peebles</strong></td>
<td>Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent of Schools</td>
<td>Milford High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshfield Public Schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucks County, Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Bucks County, Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H. James Ross</strong></td>
<td><strong>J. Howard Hunt</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Executive Director</td>
<td>Educational and Business Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate Unit 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, Illinois</td>
<td>Chicago, Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Virginia F. Lewis</strong></td>
<td><strong>Curtis Smith</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Superintendent</td>
<td>Educational Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Public Schools</td>
<td>Michael Woods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati, Ohio</td>
<td>Principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>James N. Jacobs</strong></td>
<td>Westcott Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Superintendent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati Public Schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia, South Carolina</td>
<td>Susan Hoover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Principal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Cluster Coordinators 1973 - Then

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Person Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>District/School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dallas, Texas</td>
<td>Frank Alexander</td>
<td>Director of Elementary Operations</td>
<td>Dallas Independent School District (Dallas II, Texas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William J. Webster</td>
<td>Deputy Assistant Superintendent</td>
<td>Dallas Independent School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Randall L. Broyles</td>
<td>Assistant State Superintendent</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver, Colorado</td>
<td>Harold A. Stetzler</td>
<td>Director of Elementary School Personnel</td>
<td>Denver Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erie, Pennsylvania</td>
<td>William E. Bryan</td>
<td>Deputy Superintendent of Schools</td>
<td>Erie School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield, California</td>
<td>Daniel H. Muller</td>
<td>Assistant Superintendent of Instructional Services</td>
<td>Solano County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Lauderdale, Florida</td>
<td>Bert M. Kleiman</td>
<td>Director of Secondary Schools</td>
<td>Dade County Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gainesville, Florida</td>
<td>Jack B. Christian</td>
<td>Assistant Superintendent for Instruction</td>
<td>Alachua County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartford, Connecticut</td>
<td>John J. Allison, Jr.</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Capitol Region Education Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Cluster Coordinators 1996 - Now

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Person Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>District/School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dallas, Texas</td>
<td>Anita Krull</td>
<td>Instructional Specialist</td>
<td>Dallas Independent Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmington, Delaware</td>
<td>J. Howard Hunt</td>
<td>Educational Consultant</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Springs, Colorado</td>
<td>Tim &amp; Deena Tarlton</td>
<td>Principals Lincoln Elementary School</td>
<td>Colorado Springs, Colorado Willow Creek Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erie, Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Ron Kochman</td>
<td>Director of Legislative Services and Special Programs</td>
<td>Allegheny Intermediate Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broward County, Florida</td>
<td>Marilyn Grish</td>
<td>University Liaison Project</td>
<td>Broward County Public Schools and Nova Southeastern University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa, Florida</td>
<td>William Alvarez</td>
<td>Interim Coordinator</td>
<td>Alachua County Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program Professor, National EdD Program</td>
<td>for Educational Leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLUSTER COORDINATORS 1973 • THEN</td>
<td>CLUSTER COORDINATORS 1996 • NOW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville, Florida</td>
<td>Indianapolis, Indiana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernice S. Scott</td>
<td>Frederick Fishback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator of Special Programs and Continuing Education</td>
<td>Director of Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Florida</td>
<td>Western Boone School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Julian Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant Superintendent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coffee County Schools, GA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City, Missouri</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles LeBlanc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marquette Catholic High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Charles, Louisiana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanda Caldarera</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana Department of Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Center in Lake Charles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles, California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack J. Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent of Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario-Montclair School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles, California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhyan &amp; Shirley Lal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Dept. of Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University at</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominguez Hills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macon, Georgia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus Watkins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gene E. Megiveron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe Public Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile, Alabama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Masoner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byron College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLUSTER COORDINATORS 1973 • THEN</td>
<td>CLUSTER COORDINATORS 1996 • NOW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Haven, Connecticut</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rocco Orlando</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor of Administration and Supervision</td>
<td>Orlando, Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Connecticut State College</td>
<td>Elaine Stuart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educational Consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Rochelle, New York</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Robert R. Spillane</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent of Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New York City, New York</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>David S. Seeley</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of the Public Education Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Old Westbury, New York</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>John E Borum</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean of Teacher Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York Institute of Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Philadelphia, Pennsylvania</strong></td>
<td>Williamsport, Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thomas K. Minter</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent of District Seven</td>
<td>Charles Greco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia Public Schools</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Schuylkill School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pinellas County, Florida</strong></td>
<td>Phoenix, Arizona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peter Donchian</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Curriculum Consultant</td>
<td>Camille Casteel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinellas County Schools</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chandler Unified School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Portland, Oregon</strong></td>
<td>Dade County, Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Edwin Schneider</strong></td>
<td>John Goonen, Jr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent's Associate</td>
<td>Region Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland Public Schools</td>
<td>Dade County Public Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Providence, Rhode Island</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ian Malcolm</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrington Public Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLUSTER COORDINATORS 1973 • THEN</strong></td>
<td><strong>CLUSTER COORDINATORS 1996 • NOW</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond, Virginia</td>
<td>Richmond, Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>John E. Galloway</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alice Gay Kampfmueller</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Superintendent</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesterfield County Public Schools</td>
<td>Creeds Elementary School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento, California</td>
<td>San Francisco, California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fred J. Stewart</strong></td>
<td><strong>Don Johnson</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento School District</td>
<td>Shrine East-West Football Classic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Pageant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>Potomac, Maryland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paul E. Cawein</strong></td>
<td><strong>Michael Rush</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Superintendent</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Schools of the District of Columbia</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waukegan, Illinois</td>
<td>South Toms River Elementary School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marjorie Lerner</strong></td>
<td><strong>Robin Arden</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago Public School System</td>
<td>Abbotsford School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Palm Beach, Florida</td>
<td>South Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>John C. Thurber</strong></td>
<td><strong>Polly Ebbs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Inservice Education</td>
<td>Educational Consultant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Beach County Schools</td>
<td>NSU Lecturer, Advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vancouver, British Columbia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Robin Arden</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Orlando 1-A Cluster with coordinator Elaine Stuart**
Practicum Advisors

Mitchell, Sroufe, William Applebaum, and in 1975, David Flight, wanted to ensure equity at each level of Program function—in course content and in assessment of participant performance at all levels. The issue of consistency among advisors in their evaluative role was more difficult to control than course content. Each advisor behaved differently; each had a personal predilection for formal academic learning or for innovative action, for participant demonstration of scholastic performance, or for participant implementation of some innovative change within the school setting. The dynamic tension between the two schools of thought was balanced and reset by each subsequent director. For over 20 years, the number of advisors was strictly limited, in part, to control the quality and consistency of the advising process.

In 1985, Lloyd DuVall initiated changes in the practicum process and expanded the number of advisors from six in-house faculty. In 1989, the Practicum Research study area was developed by David Flight, Charles Faires, and Cynthia Jackson under the direction of DuVall. They set new academic standards and developed a practicum manual. Ron Newell and David Flight were the primary instructors for Practicum Research and the course was not taught in a 3-month sequence but was stretched out over a longer period of time. Fourteen advisors reviewed practicum documents. Sharon Santilli later joined this formidable team of wordsmiths and change agents.

By 1995, over 60 advisors served the Program’s needs for assessment and efficient processing of over 700 participant practicums. Advisors participated in mandatory professional development and orientation sessions to ensure quality. An Advisor Handbook served as the written guide for practicum review and advising. Participant progress records were tracked by special advisors who led teams of advisors and provided guidance to other advisors.

Ron Newell, Gloria Kuchinskas, David Flight, Charles Danowski, Charles Achilles, Lucille Beisner, John Kellmayer, and James Reuter represented advisors in written surveys. Advisors find dealing with real-world school issues a challenge and an opportunity. Ron Newell and David Flight were leaders in the number of practicums reviewed. With their skill and guidance, the process, content, and development of the practicum have significantly grown. Gloria Kuchinskas was the primary author of the Advisor Handbook, drawing on her 11 years as an advisor. John Kellmayer and James Reuter developed a Summer Institute seminar to assist participants with the writing requirements of the practicum. They continue to provide coaching and skill building to enable participants to complete the rigorous Program requirements.

Participants

The following section documents what is known about participants and the school improvement projects that they conducted. It describes enrollment patterns, highlights well-known graduates, lists award-winning practicums, and describes changes in practicum expectations and the dissemination of practicum project information.

Enrollment

Early records from the first 5 years, 1972-1977, show that active cumulative enrollment reached 1,005 participants. At the end of 5 years, 503 participants were graduated, 175 were still active, 281 had withdrawn, and 41 were terminated. Records show a 34% attrition rate in the 17 clusters that had completed 4 Program years. In a survey report, 64% of those who withdrew had not satisfied the study area requirements of one or more study areas. In 1975, Program participants responded to an externally conducted survey and the program was rated above average by 87.8% of respondents, and average by 11.9% (Gatekeepers’ Gazette, Vol. 6, No. 3, 1976-1977). Substantial Program growth since 1986 bears special mention. In 1986-1987, enrollment had fallen to 277 participants, by 1995-1996, enrollment rose to 1,060 participants.
Significant Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Advisors</th>
<th>Tuition/Yr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994-95</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$7,520</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant Program changes include major increases in the number of advisors serving participants in the Program; cumulative 5% tuition rate increases; and growth areas in participant enrollment patterns. The number of female participants grew from 42.7% in 1987 to 62%. The single most significant gain in enrollment numbers occurred in Black female participants. In 1986-1987, 36 Black female participants enrolled in the Program; in 1994-1995, 222 enrolled. The number of Black participants enrolled in 1975 was nearly double the average for other educational administration doctoral programs. In the September 22, 1994, edition of *Black Issues in Education*, Nova University ranked fifth in the number of doctoral degrees awarded to African-Americans in 1990-1991, based on U.S. Department of Education statistics. By 1995, Nova ranked third in the number of Black graduates of all universities in the country (*Black Issues in Higher Education*, June 1, 1995).

In the early years, clusters existed in 16 states. This shifted during the past 2 decades with some states barring entry, clusters closing, and reestablished or new state clusters forming. Sixteen states hosted Educational Leaders clusters along with Vancouver, British Columbia, in 1995.

By state of residence at the time of enrollment, from 1986 to 1995, the top 10 states for participant residence were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In February 1974, 51% of participants were assistant principals or principals; 11.3% were deputy, assistant, or full superintendents; and 37.6% were classified as other administrators. Early graduates remained in elementary or secondary school administration. The majority of graduates from programs at other universities lacked the opportunity to become school administrators.

The primary sources for early enrollment statistics and descriptors were Program Bulletins, the Program newsletter called the *Gatekeepers' Gazette*, and the Ford Foundation Evaluation of the Program (1973) conducted by the Educational Research Corporation. The *Gatekeepers' Gazette*, (Vol. 6. No. 3, 1976-1977) *Participant's Progress: The First Five Years*, a status report on candidates from February 1972 to January 1977 was the most significant source of early data. Later, statistics and information were provided by the University registrars' office, Einstein Library, Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC), Program documents, written surveys, and personal interviews.
Because of its national perspective, the Program has a very diverse enrollment. A typical snapshot of registrations shows a median age of 46, and a mode of 47, 58% female and 42% male, 69% White and 27% Black (of which 77% are female) and representing 35 states, British Columbia, and Jamaica (Winter 1995). Through the collaborative efforts of Charles LeBlanc, Kansas City Cluster Coordinator, and Kathy Hollywood, outreach to non-public school administrators has resulted in increased participation. Efforts are also underway to increase Hispanic enrollment, as well as other underserved populations.

Continuous statistical patterns since Program inception were unavailable; David Remington said, “It’s like trying to nail wet Jell-O to a tree.” Reporting terms, definitions, and formats changed over the years. Variable data were collected and stored, and some data remained accessible in various formats and systems. However, the data defy specific factor or pattern analysis.

**Admission and Grading**

In early Program bulletins, participants with intellectual ability and a penchant for action were sought. Candidate requirements included employment in an educational administrative position, a school administration license or credentials, a master’s degree from an accredited institution, and three letters of recommendation. Entrance requirements remain much the same today except in states mandating additional standards, such as Georgia and South Carolina, which require that graduate students complete the GRE or Miller Analogies Test (MAT).

According to the 1996-1997 National EdD Program Catalog, requirements now specify that candidates must have earned a master’s degree with at least a 3.0 GPA, and candidates must have the authority and the latitude to conduct an action research practicum designed to improve education in their own local school or school system. In addition, effective fall 1995, all participants admitted to the Program must have daily access to a computer with a modem. All class sessions must be attended. Airline and lodging costs incurred by the participant to make up a missed session remain an
expensive deterrent to class absence. The introduction of a 3.0 GPA entrance requirement and the requirement of GRE or MAT scores (in selected states) as planned changes to admission criteria represent a significant shift in Program philosophy.

Participants across the country can benefit from another aspect of the National EdD Program for Educational Leaders. The Program has to a great extent overcome the traditionally fierce competition among graduate students; it is not necessary for anyone to fail in order for others to succeed in the Program. Since inception, a pass or no-pass evaluation of participant achievement within each study area was practiced. Performance-based assessment of participants (not traditional comprehensive exams) in each study area were reported to the Program office by the senior national lecturer following course completion. The pass or no-pass grading system remains in place today. Competition, rating, and ranking of participants has never been a Program objective; individual mastery of content and performance mattered.

A 1983 external evaluation, made at the request of the Commissioner of Education for the State of Florida, stated, "The quality of students participating in the Program appears to be equal to or excel those to be found in more traditional EdD programs. Admission standards are high and rigorously administered."

---

**Practicums**

This section attempts to document the school improvement projects that participants implemented, to describe how the Program guided the process for those projects, and to identify the key people involved. No other aspect of the program has undergone more revisions than the documentation of the participants' school improvement project report. Expectations regarding the form, style, content, number, and depth of reports expanded and contracted like the tide. Through the years, participant reports evolved from mini-, midi-, and maxi-reports into practicums and MARPs, and then into pilot studies and extended practicums. In the early years videotapes, newspaper articles, slides, color photographs, and assorted narratives were sometimes components of the final practicum product.

For over two decades, practicing school administrators participating in the National EdD Program for Educational Leaders have faced critical issues in the operation of the school or school system, the instructional needs of students, and changing school and national demographics. Participants have identified the salient issues, developed an action-oriented plan to deal with the problems, implemented the plan, and evaluated the effectiveness of the action taken. The process has been documented in thousands of MARPs and practicum reports. A good practicum report can be used by an administrator in a district a thousand miles from the original site to help solve an important problem and thereby improve another school system. This action-oriented approach to school problems has resulted in a data base of solutions to problems encountered in elementary and secondary schools across the country.

Past Program directors, Donald Mitchell and Gerald Sroufe, clearly moved away from the traditional doctoral intention to create
research scholars toward creating action-oriented administrators. They asked an important question: Could the design of the Program help participants develop and manifest the courage and capacity to change public education? Each participant had to show evidence of change in a school system as a result of the participant’s school improvement projects.

In 1972, William Applebaum’s (Director of Practicums and Case Development under Mitchell) philosophy of creating opportunities for tolerating ambiguity, nourishing creativity, and practicing self-direction influenced the form of practicums. Applebaum constructed a barrier-free environment on the practitioner’s path for professional growth during completion of three practicum projects intended to be the best measure of the performance of the individual. Avoiding the formulation of definitive guidelines allowed individuals to comprehend specific school problems and to define relevant objectives and-or solutions. The practicum process and format was loosely designed under his direction. By 1973, more practicum definition was sought, and S.O. Kaylin published a manual for practitioners’ use in the preparation of practicum reports.

These original intentions guided the development of the practicum process and product: (a) Create opportunities for immediate application of theory and leadership skills in the real-world role of a school administrator, (b) use demonstrated competency as the measurement of learning, (c) change elementary and secondary schools through school improvement projects, and (d) use available technology to increase effectiveness.

### Practicums 1996

In 1995, the Program revised guidelines for the practicum project and refined articulation of the Practicum Research study area with updated expected outcomes. The Form and Style Guide and the Publication of the American Psychological Association 4th Edition (APA) must be followed. The following are characteristics of the practicum:

- Utilizes collaborative efforts
- Addresses a defined and documented problem or opportunity
- Displays a degree of risk
- Incorporates literature and research
- Comports to the rigor of scholarly inquiry
- Integrates responsible evaluation methods
- Creates a documentable change
- Demonstrates doctoral level conceptualization and writing
- Provides for leadership growth
- Generates knowledge or theory from experience
- Demonstrates creativity
- Serves as a model for others through dissemination

The practicum is probably the Program’s most positively conceived aspect. It is significant to mention that the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) (1996) proposed standards for school administrator training are highly reflective of the practicum process developed by the Educational Leaders Program. All practicum reports are now on a Nova Southeastern University database accessible to all participants.
The Courage to Lead

Practicum Dissemination

Another strength of Program structure is that the practicums, study groups, and cluster activities draw heavily upon the expertise and resources of all participants and make resources as accessible as technology permits. Within the Program office, practicum reviews documented learning experiences in administrative action, mechanisms for strengthening leadership skills, and contributions to the betterment of public education. During the first years of the Program, some 900 mini- and midi-reports and the first of the maxi-level reports from 771 participants in 32 clusters were reviewed and logged on index cards. After 2 years of operation, the Program sought outside scrutiny for impartial screening of the reports.

National experts formed the Committee for Practicum Evaluation. The Committee applied the following criteria: (a) Does the practicum deal with a significant educational-administrative problem or issue? (b) Was the work transferable to other educational situations? (c) Did the practicum represent work in problem solving that no one else was addressing?

Early Gatekeepers’ Gazettes provided abstracts of practicums to serve as resources for practitioners. The action-oriented practicum report documented the problem resolution reflected in an improvement in the participant’s school setting. Nova participants in 18 states and the District of Columbia could access the wide diversification of subjects and presentations in toto through the Gazette lists. Through the Directory of Participants published in the Program bulletins and Summer Institute Participant Directory, participants could continue alliances with others throughout the nation.

During Summer Institute 1973, plans were developed to submit selected Practicum reports to the ERIC system so that reports would be available as resource documents to others in education. Nova’s ERIC listings of selected practicum reports serve as a well of thoughtful approaches to school development projects. In addition to practicum inclusion and dissemination available through ERIC, Nova developed in 1976 an Information Retrieval Service. With the addition of an Information Specialist on campus, computer searches, ERIC microfiche, and consultation services became available to Program participants and graduates. The Thesaurus of ERIC Descriptors, Resources in Education (RIE), and Current Index to Journal in Education (CIJE) indexes were searched and computer generated bibliographies produced for $20 a search. Libraries and information centers in all 50 states and 15 foreign countries comprised ERIC’s document base.

The 3-week turnaround time in operation then is superseded with the instantaneous online electronic library services offered today to all Nova Southeastern University participants.

By June 1974, over 100 practicum reports were submitted to ERIC. During two decades, 1972-1992, 923 practicum reports completed by Nova graduate students were accepted into the ERIC system. Printed, microfiche, online electronic abstracts, and-or full-text practicums can be accessed by an educator from anywhere in the world. Former Dean Richard Goldman stated (Graduate Students as Change Agents, 1992), “We believe that no other university has committed this deeply to ERIC and, by extension, to the changes required for survival in the next century.”
Today, through the Einstein Library on campus and the electronic library services, participants can identify appropriate research, conduct literature reviews, and access information from libraries around the world. With the click of a mouse, a participant can browse through abstracts of practicums, MARPs, and other on-line information relevant to educational change.

**Graduates**

The Program's strength lies in its graduates. Over 300 superintendents and assistant superintendents are graduates of the Program. Nine superintendents from among the nation's 47 largest school districts are graduates of Educational Leaders. Some well-known graduates include Joseph Fernandez, former Chancellor of New York City Schools, President of the Council of the Great City Schools, and President and CEO of School Improvement Services, Inc.; Effie Grear, 1992 Florida Principal of Excellence; Victor Herbert, former Superintendent, Phoenix Union High School District; Franklin Smith, Superintendent, Washington, DC; and Frank Petruzielo, Superintendent of Broward County Schools. Within the past few years Allan Bonilla, Jack Currie, William Wright, Camille Casteel, Judi Hughes, Pat Tillotson, Victor L. Rossetti, and Clinton Wright won state awards for outstanding leadership.
Kathleen Cooper Wright Award

School Improvement Award-Winning Practicum 1980-1996:


Arthur Iacuzio, Jr. -1981- “An Articulation Model for Identified Entering Freshman With School Adjustment Problems”

Corrine Piatt -1982- “A Program That Integrates Perceptual Training With Reading and Arithmetic”

Ralph Morgan -1983- “Development and Implementation of a Follow-up Component for the Schyflkill Intermediate Unit Day-Treatment Program for Asocial School-Age Youths in Grades 7-12”

Robert Saddler -1984- “Improving Student Achievement Through Implementation of Strategies Designed to Increase Parental Participation”

Jerry Wiseman -1985- “Development of a Program to Reduce Full-Day Truancy at Lake Park High School”

Doris Fassino -1986- “Improving Instructional Leadership Skills of Principals Through a Systematic Program of Instruction, Practice and Feedback”

Robert Censullo -1987- “The Development and Implementation of a Program to Improve Communication and Computation Skills of Students in Grades Seven and Eight”

Ellen Clark and Daniel Cobb -1988- “Improving the Performance of Mildly Handicapped Students in Grades One Through Eight on the South Carolina Reading and Mathematics Basic Skills Test”

Mabel Brooks -1989- “Reduction of Student Failure in Twenty-One, First-Year Algebra and Twenty-Four Biology Classes at Five Senior High Schools Through a Staff Development Program for Teachers”


Doris Dunn -1991- “Developing and Implementing a Shared Decision-Making Model for School Improvement Consistent With the Climate of a Rural School System”


Mary Stephens -1993- “Developing and Implementing a Curriculum and Instructional Program to Improve Reading Achievement of Middle-Grade Students with Learning Disabilities in a Rural School District”

Michelle Rhule -1994- “A Program to Promote Higher Order Thinking Within an Elementary School”


Judith R. Merz -1996- “School-Business Partnerships: Pursuing the Opportunity”
While leading a major school district is indeed laudable, each graduate must be credited with changing his or her school or school system and for contributing to the information about the change process. Each participant does benefit from the Program during the years of study area classes and Summer Institutes and through the Practicum process. Each school and school district benefits from the improvement projects that participants conduct. Access to that record of school improvement remains available to other participants and educators around the globe. Several graduates have published books related to their practicum experiences. Educational Leaders graduates continue to lead change.

Anthony DeNapoli, Program Graduate Coordinator, is developing a Directory of Graduates for the purpose of promoting networking among graduates across the county, and around the globe. A Home Page on the World Wide Web for the National EdD Program for Educational Leaders (http://www.nova.edu/edl) includes information about regional and national alumni activities, a discussion forum for school administrators, study area updates, and a job vacancy bulletin board. DeNapoli, Fischler, Rubin, and Shelton are developing concepts for a post-doctoral program.

DeNapoli interfaces with Edwin Manson, Director of the Office of Alumni Relations, and coordinator of over 30 alumni chapters. Manson, a graduate of Educational Leaders, applauds the Program for creating a national cadre of change catalysts and for surviving more scrutiny than any other educational program in the country.

*President Fischler congratulates the University's first 4 graduates in 1970.*
CHAPTER 4 Current Status and Future Development

Maria M. Shelton 1994–1996

Participants come first. There are no sacred cows. We will do whatever we can to make this the premier program in the nation.

Maria M. Shelton became Director of the National EdD Program for Educational Leaders in January 1994, and in 1996, she was named the first Program Dean. As the dynamic touchstone for the Program, she made operational commitment to constant growth and development. Shelton looked at every aspect of the Program; she took action and got people to pay attention. Her courage to lead change is greatly admired. Collegial leadership is practiced through open discussions about all aspects of the Program and an open door policy. Her infectious laugh sounds through the Program office as a call to action.

During Shelton's tenure, study areas were added, deleted, and updated; the practicum process was renewed; and new faculty, staff, national lecturers, advisors, cluster coordinators, and Advisory Board members joined the Program. Following on the heels of establishing a cluster in Vancouver, British Columbia, international cluster development is being explored in the Bahamas, Mexico, England, and Sweden. Summer Institute 1996 was held in Uppsala, Sweden. But the two most significant directions taken by Shelton were the formulation of a strategic plan and the many developments in technology. The long-term benefits of these changes are not yet realized.

Internally, the department was restructured, the number of faculty and staff increased along with resources, salaries, and professional roles and responsibilities. Within the past two years, William Alvarez, Phil DeTurk, Kathy Hollywood, Anthony Sharp, and Edna Suarez-Colomba, a Program graduate, joined Charles Faires, Jack Kaufhold, Sharon Santilli, and Ron Newell as full-time faculty members. Shelton increased faculty status and salary within the University. The number of staff members and their roles and responsibilities have increased along with participant enrollment. Johnnie Perry and Sheila Childs Hauer, two staff members, hold the records for time and commitment to Educational Leaders. They were joint recipients of the 1996 Dean's Award for exemplifying the spirit and integrity of the Program. Shelton showed determination in consistently working towards increased representation by, and service to, women, minorities, and physically challenged people.

In 1995, Shelton brought senior national lecturers and corporate leaders together to set new directions in curriculum, assessment, and instructional delivery. National lecturers and faculty continually search for modifications in class sequence and articulation within the practicum process. More lecturers shifted to problem-based-learning and performance mastery. New national lecturers have been hired. The newest study area, Current Issues, began in 1996, under Charles Achilles.

David Hinojosa, Texas A&M; Rosemary Papalewis, California State; and Nan Restine, Oklahoma State University joined with Program graduates Robin Arden, Superintendent, Abbotsford School District, Vancouver; Joan Lagoulis, Palm Beach Lakes Community High School; and Franklin Smith, Superintendent, Washington, DC to form the Educational Leaders Advisory Board, along with Louis Rubin and John Scigliano. The Advisory Board members join participants and advisors each year at Summer Institute for Program update and modification.
The 1996 Summer Institute, cohosted by the University of Uppsala, was presented jointly with faculty from other Swedish universities. Over 100 different speakers, representing South Africa, Romania, Italy, Ireland, Australia, England, and Norway, presented to over 600 educational leaders primarily from the United States, Canada, Sweden, and Europe. The theme, "Global Perspective on School Leadership: A Platform for the Future," dealt with changing worldwide demographics and cultures, a threatened environment and dwindling resources, and changing educational systems. There are few experiences in graduate education equivalent to the Educational Leaders' Summer Institute. The opportunities for networking and cross-fertilization of innovative practice abound during Summer Institute.

In 1995, Educational Leaders established the first Canadian cluster in Vancouver, British Columbia, under the leadership of Robin Arden, a Program graduate. The 40 cluster members are served by the same delivery format as those in the United States. However, planning continues for the International Cluster designed to use multiple-delivery formats to bring the Educational Leaders Program to professionals in locations that cannot be served through the local cluster delivery format. Through the technology of e-mail, Internet, electronic classroom, audio teleconferencing, audiorbridge, and compressed video, participants will complete all requirements without taking leave from their positions or relocating. A combination of field-based delivery, supervised study, and formal instruction will bring international participants together six times during the 3-year Program. This proposed use of technology is one of many employed by the Educational Leaders Program.
Technology Development

In 1994, John Scigliano advised Educational Leaders to use information technology as the base to support the re-engineering of various Program elements. Multiple technology goals have been developed by Anthony Sharp to achieve the mission to provide a model technology network for instructional delivery, Program communication, and technology support among all segments and members of the Program. Goals include:

1. Developing a systems approach to technology training for all stakeholders.

2. Increasing and maintaining stakeholders' proficiency, confidence, and reliance on the use of e-mail, electronic library, and the Internet.

3. Teaching participants and other stakeholders the processes of uploading and downloading documents online and using presentation software and multimedia technology.

4. Establishing an information exchange system concerning technology and distance education.

5. Facilitating the infusion of technology into the instructional study areas to enhance learning.

6. Investigating the feasibility of developing a technology study area.

7. Evaluating and recommending statistical software programs for data analysis.

Comptech Coaches serve clusters throughout North America by offering field-based technical assistance and training on multimedia computers provided to each cluster by the Program. During Summer Institute 1995, 540 participants and 75 staff members participated in technology training in the use of e-mail, electronic library, and Internet resources.

In 1995, the Educational Leadership menu enabled participants to access the latest announcements from the Dean, the office directory, e-mail addresses of others involved with the Program, cluster listings, coordinators, class schedules, study area descriptions, practicum information, and Program announcements. Through electronic access, e-mail became a primary means of communication among all constituents. The electronic library enables constituents to access NSU's Einstein Library, as well as libraries around the globe and to browse the Internet for resources.

Teleconferences facilitate planning sessions for the Summer Institute in Uppsala, Sweden
In 1996, Educational Leaders developed a Home Page on the World Wide Web to provide Program information and links to other Web sites and Internet resources. An informational videotape has also been produced and distributed. Also accessible electronically are links to FCAE, ELA Online, and the Educational Leaders’ strategic plan. Many of these sites are interactive and are under ongoing development.

ELA III is the University’s first online, interactive electronic leadership development program. It articulates with Allan Ellis’ ALE study area and enables participants to electronically complete diagnostic performance activities. Participant knowledge and use of leadership dimensions in various simulated administrative situations are electronically entered into a database for analysis. ELA III promotes self-reflection, increases participant knowledge and skills, and adds to the field of information regarding leadership actions.

ELA Online, upon completion, will enable participants to perform a leadership appraisal, establish growth goals, and develop an action plan for targeted leadership growth. Once the plan is operational, participants will then implement and document the growth activities and assess the attainment of goals. Finally, participant achievement of goals will serve as a portfolio.

Development of ELA III is a move toward the cutting edge in the application of computers, multimedia design, and communications technology to graduate instruction in educational leadership.
Strategic Planning

In late 1994 and early 1995, various constituent groups met to discuss trends and challenges facing the National EdD Program for Educational Leaders. In late 1994, James Reuter (a graduate) led a group of stakeholder representatives in the development of a proposed mission statement, organizational values, and Program goals. A draft document was presented to constituents for review during Summer Institute 1995. A cadre of representatives led by Phil DeTurk continued to refine the plan. In January 1996, an online strategic plan discussion group was established. By April 1996, an official strategic plan was approved.

The mission of the National EdD Program for Educational Leaders is as follows:

Through a dynamic doctoral program of study, assessment, and action, our mission is to provide practicing education leaders the opportunity for acquiring knowledge and developing leadership to foster innovative and effective learning environments.

Based on feedback from the 1995 Summer Institute regarding what the Program should change, eight goals were established, 12 ongoing action projects with accountability measures were formed, and appropriate objectives were adopted. The eight Program goals are:

1. Improving schools and other learning environments through the leadership of Program participants and graduates.

2. Providing a field-based doctoral program accessible to diverse populations of practitioners.

3. Assisting participants in the creation and implementation of individual leadership development plans.

4. Enabling participants to expand their administrative competence and to model visionary leadership.

5. Advocating and implementing educational improvement using
   • informed action research
   • effective application of change theory
   • collaborative decision making and strategic planning
   • risk and creativity
   • appropriate evaluation

6. Identifying and addressing contemporary and future educational issues in a changing world.

7. Promoting and modeling new applications of technology.

8. Promoting personal and professional networking.

Many benefits of strategic planning will emerge over the 5-year implementation schedule. The following actions are in various stages of reformation:

• New practicum advisory system to effect quality and equity

• LeAP to facilitate individual leadership growth

• Technology Council to facilitate training and utilization planning

• Four handbooks to clarify policies and procedures for advisors, coordinators, lecturers and participants

• Project Atlantis to reconceptualize and integrate study areas

• Experimental clusters for piloting innovations
• International Cluster to reach unserved locations
• Summer Institute design to improve effectiveness
• Systematic program assessment strategies to ensure quality
• Redesigned *Feedback Loop* newsletter to improve communication frequency and content

The strategic plan will enrich the organizational structure and enable the participant-centered Program to meet the needs of school administrators as they explore new approaches to the improvement of elementary and secondary schools. The focus on real-life situations and school problems constitutes a national and international laboratory in which practicum interventions are explored, tested, implemented, and evaluated.

The rapid growth in the number of new participants, advisors, and faculty members requires special information management and systematic communication to support and parallel Program development. Important communication cannot be left to chance; it is a constant priority and challenge. Investment of resources and personnel to ensure a strong infrastructure, maintain accurate and accessible records, and monitor participant progress is essential.

Further development of electronic communication capabilities and improved on-line access among all constituents can improve communication as well as save staff time, money, and supplies and ensure accurate and immediate information. Regular e-mail announcements, additional online Program information sources, and expanded issues of the *Feedback Loop* will improve communication. Improved file transfer capabilities and additional training in uploading and downloading files will benefit all constituents. Online access to study area material is just beginning.

Educational Leaders has embarked on a systemic Program evaluation to provide information by which insightful descriptions and judgments of educational realities may be drawn and decisions made related to improvement efforts. Data-driven decision making is a process which provides Program personnel both qualitative and quantitative data related to
valued change in the areas of Program improvement and professional development. The evaluation system is aligned with the University mission, the Program mission, and the Program statement of values and goals. It is an interactive process by which information related to participant learning outcomes and the development of educational leaders is collected, organized, and examined. Evaluation results are used as the basis for decision making.

Under the direction of Bill Alvarez, evaluation instruments have been developed, field tested, and revised and are in the initial stages of implementation. The ultimate challenge of the National EdD Program for Educational Leaders’ evaluation system is to take evaluation beyond the learning outcomes and participant leadership development to a level which demonstrates that, as a result of being in the Program, real improvement in educational practices occur under the leadership of Program participants. This effort to document the effect of the Educational Leaders Program will sustain Program growth and keep it on the cutting edge of performance.

While in office, Dean Shelton used this decision-making filter, “Whatever is best for participants,” to guide her leadership and to determine future Program direction. In October 1996, María Shelton was named Associate Provost of The Fischler Center for the Advancement of Education under the new provost, Dr. H. Wells Singleton. Shelton’s courage to lead will permeate all FCAE Programs in the future.
Charles L. Faires
1996 to Present

We must provide a dynamic, rigorous, and experiential Program in which leaders will learn and grow.

In December 1996, Charles Faires was named the Program Dean of the National EdD Program for Educational Leaders. Well known to participants across the nation as the Associate Director of the Program, Faires traveled the country building and maintaining good relations with stakeholders. During his 8 years with the Program, Faires served as a practicum research instructor and advisor. He, along with Sharon Santilli and David Flight, continually molded the practicum and research components of the Program and the three of them authored the Practicum Research Manual. Faires has also promoted plans to articulate study areas with the practicum process under project Atlantis. After serving as Director of Field Relations, then Practicum Coordinator from 1989 to 1991, he became Associate Director in 1991.

His long-term commitment to the Program, pragmatic approach to change, and in-depth knowledge of all aspects of the Program have earned him the respect of lecturers, cluster coordinators, and Program office staff and faculty. Faires balances rigor and clarity with wit and humor to inspire camaraderie among constituents.

Together with Phil DeTurk and Allan Ellis, the direction of LeAP, ELA-III, and Atlantis and implementation of the strategic plan will remain Program priorities along with the international cluster and Program evaluation projects. His stated goals include: "Maintaining quality services to participants, strengthening the Program infrastructure, and moving the Program to a new and futuristic level of preparing leaders for education roles in the 21st Century."
Conclusion

In 1972, Program developers saw higher education at a crossroads. Higher education needed to break new ground, carve a new path. Three goals have consistently influenced the Program: (1) a shift toward improved technology and distance education, (2) a focus on study areas that connect content and practicums that target improving education, and (3) an intention to serve the underserved. As the educational quality bar rises and complex forces demand higher skills, the Educational Leaders Program strives to improve every aspect of Program delivery to enable school administrators to improve public education.

The National EdD Program for Educational Leaders was a national change agent. Program leaders were politically connected, shared deep social concerns, and fought and taught for educational change on the national level. The Educational Leaders Program served as the Nova Southeastern University model for programs and influenced the development of subsequent programs within the Fischler Center for the Advancement of Education. FCAE is now the largest graduate school of education in the United States. Together, FCAE programs serve as models for distance education, have established exemplary graduation rates for minorities and women, and remain pioneers in the utilization of educational technology.

Since inception, NSU's enrollment has grown from 20 students to more than 14,000; 7,400 are part-time students who are working adults. NSU provides educational programs in more than 20 states and in four international locations. Of the 17 off-campus programs operated by NSU, Educational Leaders still holds the University record for the greatest number of clusters located in the most states. Educational Leaders graduates have contributed to the advancement of education across the nation through their school improvement practicums and educational leadership.

Highlights

The National EdD Program for Educational Leaders has prepared participants for leadership roles for 25 years. The following section highlights what mattered along the way, some significant benchmarks that were attained, and what might further enrich the future potential for society, our public and non-public schools, the Educational Leaders Program, and the University.

- As of June 1996, 2,500 participants were graduated from Educational Leaders.
- The Program has survived and prospered under more scrutiny than any administrator preparation program in the country.
- The practicum remains the vehicle for bringing about positive changes in schools and school systems.
- During two decades, 1972-1992, 923 practicum reports completed by Nova graduate students were accepted into the ERIC system. No other university has contributed this deeply to ERIC and, by extension, to the educational changes required for survival in the next century.
- The number of academic advisors grew from 3 in 1972, to 12 in 1990, to over 60 by 1996.
- There is no experience in graduate education equivalent to the Educational Leaders' Summer Institute. The opportunities for networking and cross-fertilization of innovative practice abound during Summer Institute.
- Over 300 superintendents and assistant superintendents are graduates. Nine superintendents from the nation’s largest school districts are graduates of Educational Leaders. The strength of the Program lies in the accomplishments of the participants.
- No other school administrator preparation program offers participants the exposure to leading national lecturers.
- The national impact of lifelong career productivity of Program graduate administrators bears more study and documentation.
- Educational Leaders has overcome the traditional fierce competition among graduate students; it is not necessary for anyone to fail in order for others to succeed in the Program. Rather, participants work together toward professional and personal growth.
- Practicums, study groups, and cluster activities draw heavily upon the expertise and resources of all participants and make resources as accessible as technology permits.
- A recent issue of Briefs, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education's newsletter, listed Nova Southeastern University as the number one university in the United States for preparing school administrators (AACTE Briefs, December 18, 1995, p. 3.).
- Tuition gradually rose from $2,000 per year in 1972, to $7,520 per year in 1996.
- Students have home access to unlimited resources through NSU’s Internet connection.
- Development of LeAP is a move toward the cutting edge in the application of computers, multimedia design, and communications technology to graduate instruction in educational leadership.
- Electronic library search capabilities through Nova Southeastern University’s Einstein Library provide access to 60 different databases and selected full-text articles, hypertext Internet access to specific library catalogs around the world, collections of 15,000 libraries world wide, and over 30 million books, videotapes, and dissertations. Distance library services to field-based participants have doubled each year.
- The Program's organizational design is more cost-effective than other traditional graduate programs.
Future Challenge

Have Educational Leaders, Nova Southeastern University, and higher education done everything possible to achieve their goals? Not so, in the perspective of Abe Fischler: “The notion of delivering education to working adults in a way that makes it accessible and maintains quality is a trend that will continue to grow as technology develops. Higher education is due for another transformation; there is nothing magic about credits, majors, disciplines, degrees. It takes people with vision, receptivity, and resources to make the changes.”

The rising quality bar, dramatic technical advancements, and the high level of growth in the University have resulted in an increased need for a strong infrastructure that takes full advantage of available technology. Higher education can maximize future potential by investing more resources in advanced technology. Mutual benefits and increased technology access for participants can create and sustain new options for the university.

Such things as the development of online course registration for classes, online attendance and participant progress reports from cluster coordinators, and electronic record keeping systems for advisors are just a few options. Instructional design rooted in interactive electronic course development could spawn modules that could be accessed by participants in multiple university programs anywhere in the world. Increased access to and delivery of interactive online courses that students can experience for self-directed learning may become a part of the university of the future. Such advancements require collaboration among skilled, technically capable people from a variety of backgrounds, and the infrastructure to support and sustain it. Collaboration among various departments could result in shared gains especially in the application of technology.

Higher education institutions are now challenged to invent new delivery systems that can instantly respond to any individual’s need to know. Can institutions develop the capacity to connect learners with information in an electronic instant and do transform the experience of learning through new technology? Those institutions that accept this challenge will become the electronic universities of the future.
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